

*Organizational Commitment and Job
Satisfaction of Employees in IT and
ITES Companies*

CHAPTER V

ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT AND JOB SATISFACTION OF EMPLOYEES IN IT AN ITES COMPANIES

The second objective of the study deals with the organisational commitment and job satisfaction of employees in IT and ITES companies. This chapter is divided into to two sections

- Part I deals with organisational commitment of the employees.
- Part II explores the job satisfaction of employees in IT and ITES Companies.

PART I - ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT OF THE EMPLOYEES.

Organisational commitment is the level to which an employee is being committed, both emotionally and psychologically, towards the work, assignment, and vision of the organization. Commitment can be seen as a discriminating level of ownership where each employee wants to do whatever they can do for the benefit and for the success of the organization.

5.1 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS- ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

The employees of the organizations were asked to express the opinion regarding Organisational Commitment on 5 point scale. The scales included strongly agree to strongly disagree. The organisational commitment scale includes 17 statements. The higher rating shows more agreeability to the particular statement. The descriptive statistics and mean rating for statement have been depicted in the following table.

Table 5.1**Descriptive Statistics- Organisational Commitment**

	Statements	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	S.D
1	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4050	1.26292
2	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3225	.97513
3	I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.	400	1.00	5.00	3.1475	1.00910
4	I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3550	1.03035
5	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me	400	1.00	5.00	3.4900	1.09448
6	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to	400	1.00	5.00	3.5425	1.08218
7	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5050	1.12834
8	I believe I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3875	1.00243
9	One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4250	1.10337
10	One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice: another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5375	1.05896
11	If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4500	1.01245
12	I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer	400	1.00	5.00	3.3750	1.05221
13	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now	400	1.00	5.00	3.4875	1.04526
14	I would feel guilty if I left my organization now	400	1.00	5.00	3.3175	1.11795
15	This organization deserves my loyalty.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4050	1.14860
16	I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6725	.91780
17	I owe a great deal to my organization.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5225	1.01837

Source-Primary Data

It is seen from the above table that the ratings of the respondents vary from a minimum of 1 (Strongly Disagree) to a maximum of 5 (Strongly Agree) for all the statements. The highest mean rating is 3.6725 for the statement ‘I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.’. That is on average the opinion of the respondents (employees) with respect to this statement fall within the agreeability level of Agree (4) and Strongly Agree(5). The lowest mean rating is 3.1475 for the statement ‘I do not feel like part of the family at my organization. That is the agreeability level for this statement ranged between Neutral (3) and Agree (4). The table shows that for most of the statements the mean ratings are above 3 and below 4. That is, the agreeability level of the respondents fall between ‘Neutral’ and ‘Agree’ for most of the statements. To sum up, the opinion of the respondents regarding Organisation Commitment fall between ‘Neutral’ and ‘Agree’.

5.2 FACTOR ANALYSIS FOR ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

The Organisational Commitment consisted of 17 items which were factor analysed as have been done in the previous sections. The following steps discuss the results of Factor Analysis.

Table 5.2

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy		.889
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4105.685
	Df	136
	Sig.	**

** - Significant at 1% level (P<0.01)

The KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity test were used for the sampling adequacy norms. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity was used to test whether the correlation matrix (Appendix xxx) is an identity matrix. The test value (4105.685) and the significance level (P<.01) indicate that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix, i.e., there exists correlations between the variables.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test is a measure of sampling adequacy. Higher the value of KMO (at least above 0.5) measure is closer to 1, then it is good to use factor

analysis. The value of test statistic is shown above as 0.889 which means the factor analysis for the selected variables is found to be more appropriate to the data.

Principal Components Analysis (PCA) is used to extract factors. As mentioned earlier, PCA is a method used to transform a set of correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables (here factors) so that the factors are unrelated and the variables selected for each factor are related. Next PCA is used to extract the no. of factors required to represent the data. given below. For our study, we have 17 variables(items) each with a variance of 1 then the total variability that can potentially be extracted is equal to 17 times 1. The variance accounted for by successive factors is summarized as follows:

Table 5.3
Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings (Rotated)		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	7.598	44.692	44.692	3.972	23.366	23.366
2	1.866	10.978	55.670	3.918	23.049	46.415
3	1.488	8.755	64.425	2.064	12.142	58.557
4	1.042	6.130	70.556	2.040	11.999	70.556
5	.751	4.416	74.972			
6	.615	3.619	78.591			
7	.538	3.166	81.757			
8	.477	2.805	84.562			
9	.419	2.463	87.025			
10	.376	2.210	89.235			
11	.350	2.058	91.293			
12	.316	1.860	93.152			
13	.281	1.650	94.803			
14	.260	1.530	96.333			
15	.233	1.368	97.700			
16	.227	1.334	99.034			
17	.164	.966	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

From the table given above, in the second column we find the variance on the new factors that were successively extracted. In the third column, these values are expressed as a percent of the total variance. Factor 1 accounts for about 45 percent of the total variance, factor 2 about 11 percent, and so on. As expected, the sum of the eigen values is equal to the number of variables. The third column contains the cumulative variance extracted. The variances extracted by the factors are called the *eigen values*. We can retain only four factors with eigen values greater than 1. The total variance explained by the four factor model in the original set of variables is (70.56%).

The table shown below gives the Component Matrix or Factor Matrix where PCA extracted four factors. These are all coefficients used to express a standardized variable in terms of the factors. These coefficients are called factor loadings, since they indicate how much weight is assigned to each factor. Factors with large coefficients (in absolute value) for a variable are closely related to that variable. For example, Factor 1 is the factor with largest loading (0.813) for the item, namely **“I would feel guilty if I left my organization now”**. These are all the correlations between the factors and the variables, Hence the correlation between this Statement and Factor 1 is 0.813. Thus the factor matrix is obtained. These are the initially obtained estimates of factors.

Table 5.4

Compound Matrix

Statements	Component			
	1	2	3	4
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now	.813	-.096	-.012	-.161
This organization deserves my loyalty.	.794	-.150	.083	-.288
I owe a great deal to my organization.	.785	-.106	-.033	-.255
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me	.773	-.066	.006	-.130
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now	.743	.023	-.111	-.154
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice: another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	.734	-.145	-.047	.118

Statements	Component			
	1	2	3	4
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	.721	-.228	.083	.343
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to	.712	-.388	.208	.121
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.	.709	-.293	.265	.277
I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	.703	.048	-.257	-.265
I believe I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	.692	-.235	-.005	.400
I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer	.594	.264	-.581	-.074
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	.545	.411	-.304	.444
If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	.537	.400	-.425	-.069
I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.	.240	.790	.203	.327
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	.400	.576	.508	-.174
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	.587	.310	.608	-.173

Step 3

The Component matrix obtained in the extraction phase indicates the relationship between the factors and the individual variables. Further to identify meaningful factors based on this matrix, the rotation phase of the factor analysis is used which attempts to transfer initial matrix into one that is easier to interpret. It is called the rotation of the factor matrix. The Rotated Factor Matrix with varimax rotation (Rotated Component Matrix) is given in Table xxx where each factor identifies itself with a few set of variables. The variables which identify with each of the factors were sorted in the decreasing order and are highlighted against each column and row.

Table 5.5
Rotated Component Matrix

Statements	Component			
	1	2	3	4
I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	.723	.212	.064	.246
I owe a great deal to my organization.	.710	.404	.153	.057
This organization deserves my loyalty.	.705	.442	.217	-.048
I would feel guilty if I left my organization now	.658	.473	.170	.104
Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now	.630	.349	.152	.216
This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me	.602	.454	.187	.117
Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.	.218	.812	.168	.009
One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	.233	.777	.070	.185
I believe I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	.203	.769	-.014	.247
It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to	.349	.760	.088	-.093
One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice: another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	.430	.589	.058	.203
I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	.191	.019	.855	.111
I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	.299	.292	.814	-.055
I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.	-.173	.006	.658	.605
I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	.130	.311	.122	.792
I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer	.609	.057	-.092	.619
If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	.511	.000	.090	.604

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization

Rotation converged in 21 iterations

Step 4

Normally, from the factor results arrived above, factor score coefficients can be calculated for all variables (since each factor is a linear combination of all variables) which are then used to calculate the factor scores for each individual. Since PCA has used in extraction of initial factors, all methods will result in estimating same factor score coefficients. However, for the study, original values of the variables were retained for further analysis and factor scores have been obtained by adding the values (ratings given by the respondents) of the respective variables for that particular factor, for each respondent.

Conclusion

Thus the 17 variables in the data have been reduced to four factor model and each factor may identified with the corresponding variables as follows:

Table 5.6
Factors Identified Relating to the Organisational Commitment of Respondents

S. No	Statements	Factors Identified
Factor I	I would not leave my organization right now because I have a sense of obligation to the people in it.	Loyalty
	I owe a great deal to my organization.	
	This organization deserves my loyalty.	
	I would feel guilty if I left my organization now	
	Even if it were to my advantage, I do not feel it would be right to leave my organization now	
	This organization has a great deal of personal meaning for me	
Factor II	Too much of my life would be disrupted if I decided I wanted to leave my organization right now.	Personal Limitations
	One of the few negative consequences of leaving this organization would be the scarcity of available alternatives.	
	I believe I have too few options to consider leaving this organization.	
	It would be very hard for me to leave my organization right now, even if I wanted to	
	One of the major reasons I continue to work for this organization is that leaving would require considerable personal sacrifice: another organization may not match the overall benefits I have here.	

S. No	Statements	Factors Identified
Factor III	I really feel as if this organization's problems are my own.	Belongingness
	I would be very happy to spend the rest of my career in this organization.	
	I do not feel like part of the family at my organization.	
Factor IV	I do not feel emotionally attached to this organization.	Emotional Attachment
	I do not feel any obligation to remain with my current employer	
	If I had not already put so much of myself into this organization, I might consider working elsewhere.	

From the above table it is clear that , four different factors, such as, loyalty, personal limitations, belongings and emotional attachment have been identified under the organisational commitment.

5.3 MANOVA FOR PERSONAL AND JOB RELATED FACTORS

MANOVA Technique is used in this section for the analysis of organisational commitment. The organisational scale consisted of 17 statements grouped under four factors namely loyalty, personal limitations, belongings and emotional attachment. These factors were arrived at by applying factor analysis on Organisational Commitment.

The hypothesis has been tested with the help of MANOVA, the test statistics, Wilks' Lambda and the corresponding Approximate F value are given for all the Personal and Job related Factors. The effect of the Personal and job related Factors is tested upon the liner combination of Four Organisational commitment factors, the constant term is given for all the tables given below , however it has no particular importance represented in the below tables for all the personal and job related factors. The constant term, Intercept is given below however it has no particular importance here.

Organisational Commitment Vs Gender

The organisational commitment factors namely, loyalty, personal limitations, belongings and emotional attachment are simultaneously compared across personal variables. Following table shows mean values for the four different factors across gender groups.

Table 5.7**Organisational Commitment Vs Gender**

	Gender					
	Male			Female		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Loyalty	20.08	5.08	242	22.14	5.07	158
Personal limitations	16.94	4.53	242	18.09	4.08	158
Belongingness	9.83	2.65	242	9.94	2.72	158
Emotional attachment	10.09	2.45	242	10.32	2.65	158

The table gives the mean scores of organisation commitment factors among male and female groups. The Perception regarding Loyalty is higher (22.14) among female respondents where as Personal limitations (18.09), Belongingness (9.94) and Emotional attachment (10.32) the scores are found to be high for the males respondents.

Ho. The perception factors of Organisational commitment namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among male and female groups of respondents.

Table 5.7(1)**MANOVA for Organisational Commitment Factors Vs Gender**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.036	2636.882	4.000	395.000	**	3.367
Gender	Wilks' Lambda	.951	5.042	4.000	395.000	**	3.367

** - Significant at 1% level.

* - Significant at 5% level.

It is observed from the above table that, the F-value (5.042) are found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 3.367). The MANOVA scores are significant for all the Organisational commitment factors. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal one-way ANOVA) among the gender groups to find which commitment factor differs significantly among these two groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 5.7(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Gender Groups)

Source	Dependent Variable	Type I Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Gender	Loyalty	404.306	1	404.306	15.694	**	6.699
	Personal limitations	127.031	1	127.031	6.680	**	6.699
	Belongingness	1.209	1	1.209	.168	Ns	3.865
	Emotional attachment	5.324	1	5.324	.830	Ns	3.865
Error	Loyalty	10253.284	398	25.762			
	Personal limitations	7568.766	398	19.017			
	Belongingness	2858.541	398	7.182			
	Emotional attachment	2553.716	398	6.416			
Total	Loyalty	10657.590	399				
	Personal limitations	7695.798	399				
	Belongingness	2859.750	399				
	Emotional attachment	2559.040	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Loyalty and Personal limitations has significant difference among gender groups at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other two factors Belongingness and Emotional attachment do not find any significant difference between male and female respondents. The result reveals that while taking loyalty and personal limitation the female employees are found to be different when compare to male respondents.

Organisational Commitments Vs Age

The 4 Organisational Commitment namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment are simultaneously compared across Age groups. Following table gives the mean values for the four different factors across Age groups.

Table 5.8

Organisational Commitments Vs Age

	Age											
	20-25 yrs			26-30 yrs			31-35 yrs			36-40 yrs		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Loyalty	21.99	5.25	169	19.33	5.07	156	21.67	4.76	60	21.80	2.37	15
Personal limitations	18.78	3.71	169	15.84	4.77	156	18.23	3.68	60	14.73	3.92	15
Belongingness	10.36	2.97	169	9.44	2.41	156	9.80	2.23	60	9.27	2.74	15
Emotional attachment	10.42	2.76	169	10.18	2.18	156	9.62	2.79	60	9.73	1.98	15

The table 6.8 gives the mean scores of Organisational commitment factors among age groups. The organisational commitment factors such as Loyalty (21.9), Personal limitations (18.78), Belongingness (10.36) and Emotional attachment (10.42) are high for the age group of 20-25 years.

Ho: The Organisational commitment factors namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among age groups of respondents.

Table 5.8(1)

MANOVA for Perception on Organisational Commitment Factors Vs Age

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.034	2765.421	4.000	393.000	**	3.367
Age	Wilks' Lambda	.809	7.242	12.000	1040.072	**	2.202

** - Significant at 1% level.

* - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (7.242) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2.202). “The perception factors of Organisational commitment namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among age groups of respondents.” (no significant effect of age on Organisational commitment) is rejected.

Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal one-way ANOVA) among the age groups to find which perception factor differs significantly among the these two groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 5.8(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Age Groups)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Age	Loyalty	633.553	3	211.184	8.343	**	3.831
	Personal limitations	847.682	3	282.561	16.339	**	3.831
	Belongingness	75.875	3	25.292	3.598	*	2.627
	Emotional attachment	31.777	3	10.592	1.660	Ns	2.627
Error	Loyalty	10024.037	396	25.313			
	Personal limitations	6848.116	396	17.293			
	Belongingness	2783.875	396	7.030			
	Emotional attachment	2527.263	396	6.382			
Total	Loyalty	10657.590	399				
	Personal limitations	7695.798	399				
	Belongingness	2859.750	399				
	Emotional attachment	2559.040	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Loyalty, Personal limitations and Belongingness has significant differences among the age groups at 1% and 5% level

of significance respectively. The other factor Emotional attachment does not find significant difference between age of the respondents. With respect to loyalty, personal limitations and belongings factors the respondents in the age group 20-25 are found to be significant and they are more committed to the organization.

Organisational Commitment Vs Sector Employed

The men scores of organisational commitment and sector employed are presented in the following table.

Table 5.9

Organisational Commitment Vs Sector Employed

	Sector Employed					
	IT			ITES		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Loyalty	19.83	5.16	136	21.44	5.10	264
Personal limitations	15.86	4.81	136	18.19	3.94	264
Belongingness	9.66	2.59	136	9.98	2.72	264
Emotional attachment	10.28	2.31	136	10.13	2.64	264

It is observed from the above table the average mean scores of Organisational commitment factors among IT an ITES groups. The Organisational commitment factors such as Loyalty (21.44), Personal limitations (18.1), Belongingness (9.98) are found to be high for ITES employees. Whereas for Emotional attachment (10.28) the scores are high for IT sector employees.

Ho. The Organisational commitment factors namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among sector employed.

Table 5.9(1)**MANOVA for Organisational Commitment Factors by Sector Employed**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.036	2657.545	4.000	395.000	**	3.367
Sector Employed	Wilks' Lambda	.913	9.371	4.000	395.000	**	3.367

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (9.371) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 3.367). Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, the hypothesis framed has been rejected for all the four organisational Commitment factors.

Table 5.9(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Sector Employed)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Sector Employed	Loyalty	233.332	1	233.332	8.909	**	6.699
	Personal limitations	486.922	1	486.922	26.883	**	6.699
	Belongingness	9.369	1	9.369	1.308	Ns	3.865
	Emotional attachment	2.036	1	2.036	.317	Ns	3.865
Error	Loyalty	10424.258	398	26.192			
	Personal limitations	7208.876	398	18.113			
	Belongingness	2850.381	398	7.162			
	Emotional attachment	2557.004	398	6.425			
Total	Loyalty	10657.590	399				
	Personal limitations	7695.798	399				
	Belongingness	2859.750	399				
	Emotional attachment	2559.040	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Loyalty, Personal limitations has significant differences among sector employed at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other factor Belongingness, Emotional attachment does not find significant difference between sector employed of the respondents. Loyalty and personal limitations scores are found to be more significant for the employees who are working in ITES sector.

Organisational Commitment Vs Experience

The following table shows the mean values for organisational commitment compared with experience of the employees.

Table 5.10

Organisational Commitment Vs Experience

	Experience											
	1-2 yrs			3-4 yrs			5-6 yrs			7 yrs & above		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Loyalty	21.26	5.52	128	20.72	4.76	140	20.41	5.49	82	21.24	4.86	50
Personal limitations	18.35	4.13	128	16.65	4.20	140	17.39	4.95	82	17.06	4.27	50
Belongingness	10.05	2.96	128	10.19	2.52	140	8.90	2.31	82	10.16	2.60	50
Emotional attachment	10.48	2.54	128	9.93	2.29	140	10.12	2.84	82	10.22	2.61	50

The table gives the mean scores of Organisational commitment factors among experience of the employees in IT and ITES companies. The commitment factors such as Loyalty (21.26), Personal limitations(18.35), Emotional attachment (10.48) is high for the employees having 1-2 years of experience similarly it is high for the factor Belongingness (10.16) for the employees having 3-4 years of experience.

Ho. The Organisational commitment factors namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among experience of IT and ITES employees.

Table 5.10(1)**MANOVA for Organisational Commitment Factors Vs Experience**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.036	2644.473	4.000	393.000	**	3.367
Experience	Wilks' Lambda	.910	3.149	12.000	1040.072	**	2.202

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (3.149) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2.202). It is found from the above table that the, MANOVA Scores are found to be significant for all the organisational commitment factors. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 5.10(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Experiences)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F		Table Value
Experience	Loyalty	45.940	3	15.313	.571	Ns	2.627
	Personal limitations	200.436	3	66.812	3.530	*	2.627
	Belongingness	98.920	3	32.973	4.730	**	3.831
	Emotional attachment	20.464	3	6.821	1.064	Ns	2.627
Error	Loyalty	10611.650	396	26.797			
	Personal limitations	7495.362	396	18.928			
	Belongingness	2760.830	396	6.972			
	Emotional attachment	2538.576	396	6.411			
Total	Loyalty	10657.590	399				
	Personal limitations	7695.798	399				
	Belongingness	2859.750	399				
	Emotional attachment	2559.040	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Personal limitations, Belongingness has significant differences among experience of the employees at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other factor Loyalty and Emotional attachment does not find significant difference between experience of the respondents. The employees who have less experience are significantly differed in personal limitations and belongingness.

Organisational Commitment Vs Monthly Salary

The organisational commitment factors are simultaneously compared with monthly salary of the employees. The mean scores are depicted in the following table.

Table 5.11

Organisational Commitment Vs Monthly Salary

	Monthly Salary																	
	Less than 10000			10001-20000			21001- 30000			30001-40000			40001-50000			Above 50000		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Loyalty	18.75	4.56	36	21.87	5.03	134	21.50	5.09	103	19.13	5.58	72	21.24	4.94	46	20.56	2.40	9
Personal limitations	17.14	2.37	36	18.09	4.15	134	18.16	4.64	103	15.89	5.06	72	17.20	3.59	46	12.56	3.71	9
Belongingness	9.00	2.38	36	9.96	2.85	134	10.64	2.37	103	9.99	2.65	72	8.70	2.34	46	8.56	3.40	9
Emotional attachment	8.53	1.92	36	10.54	2.53	134	10.16	2.82	103	10.15	2.16	72	10.61	2.49	46	9.67	1.80	9

It was observed from the above table, that Mean score for Loyalty (21.87) and found to be high in the monthly salary group of Rs. 10000-Rs. 20000 whereas, with respect to the mean score of Personal limitations (18.16) Belongingness(10.64) are found to be high for the employees earning monthly salary of Rs. 21001 – Rs. 30000. Similarly it could observe that the scores are higher for the Emotional attachment for the respondents having salary of Rs. 40001-Rs. 50000 (10.61). The effect of salary on the perception factors were tested by framing the following hypothesis.

Ho. The Organisational commitment factors namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among the employees classified based of monthly salary.

Table 5.11(1)**MANOVA for Organisational Commitment Factors Vs Monthly Salary**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.034	2738.993	4.000	391.000	**	3.367
Salary	Wilks' Lambda	.784	4.937	20.000	1297.750	**	1.893

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (4.937) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 1.893). Since the effect of experience is tested upon the linear combination of the Four perception factors of Organisation commitment, the constant term, Intercept is given above however it has no particular importance here. In the MANOVA table, since the F-value for the experience effect is significant the hypothesis that “The perception factors of Organisational commitment namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among salary of respondents.” framed has been rejected for all the organisational commitment factors.

Table 5.11(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Monthly Salary)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Salary	Loyalty	561.044	5	112.209	4.379	**	3.064
	Personal limitations	502.480	5	100.496	5.504	**	3.064
	Belongingness	169.362	5	33.872	4.961	**	3.064
	Emotional attachment	127.046	5	25.409	4.116	**	3.064
Error	Loyalty	10096.546	394	25.626			
	Personal limitations	7193.318	394	18.257			
	Belongingness	2690.388	394	6.828			
	Emotional attachment	2431.994	394	6.173			
Total	Loyalty	10657.590	399				
	Personal limitations	7695.798	399				
	Belongingness	2859.750	399				
	Emotional attachment	2559.040	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Loyalty, Personal limitations, Belongingness and Emotional attachment have significant differences among monthly salary groups at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The respondents who have been earning Rs.10,000 to Rs.30000 are more committed towards the organization when compare to other earning groups.

Organisational Commitment Vs Education

The mean scores for organisational commitment and education of the employees are explained in the following table.

Table 5.12

Organisational Commitment Vs Education

	Education														
	Graduate			Post Graduate			Engineering			Professional Degree			Others		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Loyalty	20.99	5.25	150	21.65	4.75	110	20.72	5.04	105	18.08	6.34	26	20.22	4.60	9
Personal limitations	18.44	3.91	150	17.41	4.41	110	16.81	4.24	105	14.04	5.52	26	16.44	4.59	9
Belongingness	9.13	2.50	150	10.69	2.51	110	10.20	2.89	105	8.96	2.24	26	11.11	2.37	9
Emotional attachment	10.18	2.73	150	10.26	2.51	110	10.21	2.30	105	9.65	2.56	26	10.33	2.12	9

It was found the above table that the average mean scores are found to be high for Loyalty factor (21.65) for the employees who are Post graduates. With respect to Personal limitations (18.44) the scores are found to be high for the employees who have Graduate degree. For Belongingness (11.11) and Emotional attachment (10.33) the scores are found to be high for the employees having other degrees.

Ho. The Organisational commitment factors namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among the employees classified based of education.

Table 5.12(1)**MANOVA for Organisational Commitment Factors Vs Education**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.035	2671.483	4.000	392.000	**	3.367
Education	Wilks' Lambda	.827	4.797	16.000	1198.217	**	2.015

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (4.797) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2.015). The scores are found to be significant for all the organisational commitment factors. Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal oneway ANOVA) among the experience groups to find which perception factor differs significantly among the these two groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 5.12(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Education)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Education	Loyalty	278.352	4	69.588	2.648	*	2.395
	Personal limitations	500.872	4	125.218	6.874	**	3.367
	Belongingness	202.275	4	50.569	7.516	**	3.367
	Emotional attachment	8.270	4	2.068	.320	Ns	2.395
Error	Loyalty	10379.238	395	26.277			
	Personal limitations	7194.925	395	18.215			
	Belongingness	2657.475	395	6.728			
	Emotional attachment	2550.770	395	6.458			
Total	Loyalty	10657.590	399				
	Personal limitations	7695.798	399				
	Belongingness	2859.750	399				
	Emotional attachment	2559.040	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Loyalty, Personal limitations and Belongingness has a significant difference among education groups at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other factor, Emotional attachment does not find significant difference between Education of the respondents.

Organisational Commitment Vs Shift

The organisational commitment is simultaneously compared with working shift of the employees. The results are given in the following table.

Table 5.13

Organisational Commitment Vs Shift

	Shift								
	Day			Night			Both		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Loyalty	20.07	5.49	166	22.94	4.00	70	20.85	5.06	164
Personal limitations	16.42	4.68	166	18.73	3.37	70	17.82	4.28	164
Belongingness	9.30	2.67	166	11.66	1.89	70	9.70	2.66	164
Emotional attachment	10.24	2.30	166	10.57	2.56	70	9.95	2.73	164

The above table gives the average mean scores of perception on Organisational commitment among employees working in different Shifts. With respect to Loyalty (22.94), Personal Limitations (18.73), Belongingness (11.66), Emotional Attachment (10.57) the scores are high for the employees working in Night shift.

Ho. The Organisational commitment factors namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among the employees classified based of shift they are working.

Table 5.13(1)

MANOVA for Organisational Commitment Factors by Shift

Effect		Value	F for all the	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.034	2775.127	4.000	394.000	**	3.367
Shift	Wilks' Lambda	.857	7.886	8.000	788.000	**	2.534

** - Significant at 1% level.

* - Significant at 5% level.

As discussed previously, the hypothesis has tested with the help of MANOVA. The test statistic, Wilk’s Lambda and the corresponding approximate F-value are given above. The F-value (7.886) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2.534). Since the effect of education is tested upon the linear combination of the Four perception factors of Organisation commitment, the constant term, Intercept is given above however it has no particular importance here. In the MANOVA table, since the F-value for the shift effect is significant the hypothesis that “The perception factors of Organisation commitment namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment have no significant difference among shift of respondents.” (no significant effect of experience on **Organisation commitment**) is rejected.

Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal oneway ANOVA) among the Shift groups to find which perception factor differs significantly among the these two groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 5.13(2)
Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Shift)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table value
Shift	Loyalty	406.198	2	203.099	7.865	**	3.018
	Personal limitations	313.763	2	156.882	8.437	**	4.659
	Belongingness	282.283	2	141.141	21.740	**	4.659
	Emotional attachment	19.926	2	9.963	1.558	Ns	3.018
Error	Loyalty	10251.392	397	25.822			
	Personal limitations	7382.034	397	18.595			
	Belongingness	2577.467	397	6.492			
	Emotional attachment	2539.114	397	6.396			
Total	Loyalty	10657.590	399				
	Personal limitations	7695.798	399				
	Belongingness	2859.750	399				
	Emotional attachment	2559.040	399				

Ns- Not significant

* - Significant at 5% level

** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Loyalty, Personal limitations and Belongingness has significant differences among working shift of the employees at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other factor, Emotional attachment does not find significant difference between working shift of the respondents. The employees who are working in night shift are significantly differed and they are more committed than other working group.

5.4 REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT

The influence of socio-economic and employment related variables on the Organization Commitment of the employees has studied using Multiple Regression Analysis. The scores found for Organisation Commitment have been used in this analysis. The Organization commitment score has considered as the dependent variable. Multiple Regression is mainly building an equation wherein the coefficients of predictor variables are estimated. The general Multiple Regression equation is of the form,

$$Y = a_0 + a_1X_1 + a_2X_2 + \dots + a_nX_n$$

where Y, the dependent variable

a_0 , constant

a_1, a_2, \dots, a_n are the regression coefficients for the independent variables X_1, X_2, \dots, X_n respectively.

The results of the regression analysis are given below

Table 5.14

Regression Analysis

Dependent Variable: Organisation Commitment Score

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	56.079	7.967			
Gender	3.030	1.274	.125	2.379	*
Age	-.092	.191	-.033	-.482	Ns
Sector Employed	3.076	1.331	.123	2.311	*

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
Experience	.014	.348	.003	.040	Ns
Salary	.615	.621	.064	.990	Ns
Education	-1.015	.597	-.089	-1.701	Ns
English	-4.303	5.370	-.040	-.801	Ns
Hindi	-.299	1.543	-.011	-.194	Ns
Any other language known	-2.921	1.238	-.123	-2.360	*
Shift	.709	.699	.054	1.015	Ns

R	R Square	F	Sig.
.262	.069	2.869	**

The table given above shows the results of regression analysis, giving details of multiple correlation coefficient (R), R², F-ratio value and significance. The R value indicates that less correlation (0.262) exists between the dependent variable (Organisational Commitment score) and the set of predictor variables. The R square value is the squared value of R, which when expressed in percentage, explains that 6.9% of the variation in the dependent variable is due to the ten predictor variables in the equation. The F-ratio value (2.869) called F-statistic, is calculated for R which is used to find whether R value is significant or not. The associated significance level tells us that R is significant at 1% level.

The regression table shows that, among the ten independent variables considered for the regression analysis, only three variables have been found to be significant. Gender, Sector Employed Any other language known have been found to be significant effect on Organisational commitment at 5% level.

Gender is a dummy variable (coded as 0-Male 1 –Female) shows that on average, the Organisational Commitment scores are higher for females when compared to males. Sector employed is another dummy variable (IT-0, ITES-1) found to have significant effect on Organisation Commitment. That is, the positive regression coefficient (3.076)

shows that respondents working in the ITES have higher Organisational Commitment scores compared to those working in IT sector.

Any other language known is also another dummy variable (Yes-0, No-1) found to have significant effect on Organisational Commitment. That is, the negative regression coefficient (2.921) shows that employees who know any language other than Hindi or English have lesser Organisational Commitment scores compared to those who do not know languages other than English or Hindi. T-tests were applied to test the significance of the regression coefficients.

Standardised regression coefficients (Beta) are calculated for the variables included in the model. These coefficients are free from units of measurement with which the independent variables were measured and hence comparable. The relative contribution of each variable in determining the opinion score of the respondents can be understood from these coefficient values. From the Beta coefficients it is seen that, in absolute terms, Gender, is more influential on the dependent variable compared to other variables with a beta value of 0.125. Sector employed and Any other language known are equally contributing to Organisational Commitment with each having beta value of 0.123 (absolute).

PART II - JOB SATISFACTION OF THE EMPLOYEES.

Human resources are the most significant resources in the organization. In order to make sure an organization can compete to other firms it is very important to retain efficient and experienced employees. Therefore, the first and most important way that an employer can retain the employees is to increase the employees' satisfaction level in their job. Moreover, job satisfaction implies what they expect to gain from the job or exceed their expectation. Very commonly, employees are satisfied when their job provides the things that they feel importance. If the organization's employees feel that they are working harder than others but they are receive less rewards, they will have a negative attitudes towards the work. Therefore Irrespective of job title and pay rating, employees who report high job satisfaction lean to achieve higher productivity and profits.

5.5 DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS - JOB SATISFACTION

Descriptive Statistics has been applied to find the mean scores for the job satisfaction. The employees of the organisation have been asked to express the opinion regarding Job satisfaction on 5 point scale. The scales included strongly agree to strongly disagree. The Job satisfaction scale includes 38 statements. The higher rating shows more agreeability to the particular statement. The descriptive statistics and mean rating for statement have been depicted in the following table.

Table 5.15

Descriptive Statistics- Job Satisfaction

S. No.	Job Satisfaction	N	Mini- mum	Maxi- mum	Mean	S.D
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6775	1.10750
2	Raises are too few and far between.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4100	.89661
3	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5100	1.19728
4	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4325	1.22441
5	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3200	1.17944
6	I feel my salary is comparable to others performing the same or similar jobs.	400	1.00	5.00	3.1100	1.27356
7	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3300	1.13989
8	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3475	1.07220
9	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	400	1.00	5.00	3.2375	1.15083
10	I am not satisfied with the benefits i receive.	400	1.00	5.00	3.2150	1.08938
11	My supervisor is unfair to me.	400	1.00	5.00	3.1700	1.18728
12	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	400	1.00	5.00	3.2650	1.13269

S. No.	Job Satisfaction	N	Mini- mum	Maxi- mum	Mean	S.D
13	My supervisors are more supportive for my professional growth.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4525	1.09350
14	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	400	1.00	5.00	3.1475	1.11753
15	The benefit package we have is equitable.	400	1.00	5.00	3.0975	1.16033
16	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6125	1.17294
17	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	400	1.00	5.00	3.2450	1.32073
18	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4700	1.09641
19	There are few rewards for those who work here.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3400	.98327
20	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6350	1.07222
21	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3675	1.21496
22	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	400	1.00	5.00	3.2850	1.08707
23	I have too much paperwork.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4725	1.08729
24	I like the people I work with.	400	1.00	5.00	3.7125	1.02590
25	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4050	1.28651
26	I enjoy working with my coworkers	400	1.00	5.00	3.8575	1.00734
27	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	400	1.00	5.00	3.2525	1.18205
28	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	400	1.00	5.00	3.2150	1.13446
29	I like doing the things I do at work.	400	1.00	5.00	3.3750	1.17381
30	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4875	1.02590
31	My job is enjoyable.	400	1.00	5.00	3.4550	1.07511

S. No.	Job Satisfaction	N	Mini-mum	Maxi-mum	Mean	S.D
32	Communications seem good within this organization.	400	1.00	5.00	3.6900	.95193
33	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	400	1.00	5.00	3.0725	1.15133
34	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	400	1.00	5.00	3.0050	1.17193
35	Work assignments are not fully explained.	400	1.00	5.00	3.0800	1.16275
36	I am permitted to wear mandated article of clothing.	400	1.00	5.00	3.1600	1.11468
37	I have too much to do at work.	400	1.00	5.00	3.5650	1.12425
38	My colleagues are supportive and helpful to achieve my job task	400	1.00	5.00	3.5050	.98864

Source-Primary Data

It is seen from the above table that, the ratings of the respondents vary from minimum 1 (Strongly Disagree) to a maximum of 5 (Strongly Agree) for all the statements. The highest mean rating is 3.8575 for the statement ‘I enjoy working with my coworkers’. The second high rating has been found for the statement, “communications seem good within this organisation” That is on average the opinion of the respondents (employees) with respect to this statement fall within the agreeability level of Agree (4) and Strongly Agree(5). The lowest mean rating is 3.0050 for the statement ‘I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization. That is the agreeability level for this statement ranged between Neutral (3) and Agree (4). The table shows that for most of the statements the mean ratings are above 3 and below 4. That is, the agreeability level of the respondents fall between ‘Neutral’ and ‘Agree’ for most of the statements. To sum up, the opinion of the respondents regarding organizational characteristics majorly fall between ‘Neutral’ and ‘Agree’. It is found from the statements that the employees in IT and ITES sector are satisfied with their job and organisation.

5.6 FACTOR ANALYSIS OF JOB SATISFACTION OF IT AND ITES SECTOR

The purpose of factor analysis in general is to find a method of summarizing the information contained in a number of original variables in to a smaller set of new composite dimensions (Factors) with minimum loss of information. That is, the underlying dimensions contained in the original variables are identified and defined using Factor Analysis. The Factor Analysis procedure is applied in this study to find out the underlying dimensions in the set of statements relating to the Organisational Characteristics of IT and ITES companies as expressed by their employees.

Factor analysis is conducted as follows:

1. The correlation matrix for all variables is computed and the variables that do not appear to be related to other variables can be identified from the matrix. The relevance of the factor model can also be calculated.
2. Second step is, factor extraction. The number of factors necessary to represent the data and the method of calculating them are determined and also how well the chosen model fits the data is also ascertained.
3. Rotation of the factor matrix by transforming the factors to make them more interpretable.
4. Scores for each factor can be computed for each case. These scores are then used for further analysis.

The set of 38 variables (statements) which measure the job satisfaction of IT/ITES companies were used to find the underlying factors in it.

Step 1:

Correlation matrix (Appendix I) for the variables, item 1 to item 38, was examined initially for possible inclusion in Factor Analysis.

One of the goals of the factor analysis is to obtain 'factors' that help explain these correlations and the variables must be related to each other for the factor model to be appropriate. A closer examination of the correlation matrix may reveal what are the variables which do not have any correlations or low correlations. Usually a correlation

value of 0.3 (absolute value) is taken as sufficient to explain the relation between variables. All the variables from 1 to 38 have been retained for further analysis. Further, two tests are applied to the resultant correlation matrix to test whether the relationship among the variables is significant or not.

Table 5.16
KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.819
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	7662.913
	Df	703
	Sig.	**

** - Significant at 1% level (P<0.01)

The KMO and Bartlett's test of sphericity test for the sampling adequacy norms. Bartlett's Test of Sphericity has been used to test whether the correlation matrix (7662.913) is an identity matrix. The test value (7662.913) and the significance level (P<.01) indicate that the correlation matrix is not an identity matrix, that is, there exists correlations between the variables.

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) test is a measure of sampling adequacy. Higher the value of KMO (at least above 0.5) measure is closer to 1, then it is good to apply factor analysis. The value of test statistic (0.819) is given above which shows that the factor analysis for the selected variables is found to be appropriate to the data.

Step 2

Since the Sampling Adequacy tests indicated that factor analysis can be proceeded further, Principal Components Analysis (PCA) is used to extract factors. As mentioned earlier, PCA is a method used to transform a set of correlated variables into a set of uncorrelated variables (here factors) so that the factors are unrelated and the variables selected for each factor are related. Next PCA is used to extract the number of factors required to represent the data. The results are given below.

For this study, 38 items (variables) each with a variance of 1 then the total 1 variability that can potentially be extracted is equal to 38 times 1. The variances accounted for by successive factors are summarized as follows:

Table 5.17

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings (Rotated)		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
(1)	(2)	(3)	(4)	(5)	(6)	(7)
1	8.600	22.631	22.631	4.637	12.202	12.202
2	4.728	12.441	35.073	3.889	10.234	22.436
3	2.592	6.820	41.893	2.945	7.751	30.187
4	2.139	5.628	47.521	2.896	7.620	37.807
5	1.605	4.224	51.745	2.735	7.197	45.004
6	1.517	3.991	55.736	2.467	6.493	51.497
7	1.213	3.191	58.927	2.025	5.330	56.826
8	1.186	3.120	62.047	1.984	5.221	62.047
9	.987	2.598	64.645			
10	.953	2.509	67.154			
11	.914	2.405	69.559			
12	.890	2.342	71.902			
13	.815	2.145	74.047			
14	.766	2.016	76.062			
15	.712	1.873	77.935			
16	.686	1.806	79.741			
17	.632	1.662	81.403			
18	.600	1.579	82.982			

Component	Initial Eigen values			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings (Rotated)		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
19	.541	1.424	84.406			
20	.507	1.335	85.740			
21	.495	1.303	87.043			
22	.477	1.254	88.298			
23	.450	1.183	89.481			
24	.411	1.082	90.563			
25	.376	.989	91.551			
26	.358	.943	92.495			
27	.340	.896	93.390			
28	.335	.881	94.272			
29	.294	.774	95.046			
30	.284	.747	95.793			
31	.268	.706	96.499			
32	.232	.611	97.109			
33	.227	.596	97.705			
34	.200	.526	98.232			
35	.195	.514	98.746			
36	.179	.471	99.217			
37	.157	.413	99.631			
38	.140	.369	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

From the table given above, in the second column it has been found the variance on the new factors that have been successively extracted. In the third column, these values are expressed as a percent of the total variance. Factor 1 accounts for about 23 percent of the total variance, factor 2 about 12 percent, and so on. As expected, the sum

of the eigen values is equal to the number of variables. The third column contains the cumulative variance extracted. The variances extracted by the factors are called the *eigen values*. It can retain only 8 factors with eigen values greater than 1. The total variance explained by the 8 factor model in the original set of variables is 62.05%.

Table 5.18
Component Matrix

Statements	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
The benefit package we have is equitable.	.643	-.020	-.047	-.335	-.221	-.006	-.029	-.060
I am not satisfied with the benefits i receive.	.632	.169	-.055	-.258	-.019	.085	-.174	.107
The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	.628	-.255	.218	-.020	.206	.149	-.099	-.332
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	.628	-.284	.209	.115	.106	.162	-.120	-.306
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.619	-.044	-.132	-.170	-.130	-.424	.348	-.090
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	.616	.008	-.361	-.295	-.092	.231	-.077	.063
I feel my salary is comparable to others performing the same or similar jobs.	.615	-.156	.041	-.335	-.240	.026	.017	-.104
Raises are too few and far between.	.610	-.139	-.289	-.137	-.193	-.190	.176	-.058
Work assignments are not fully explained.	.595	-.221	.426	.061	.278	-.008	.200	-.094
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	.589	.154	-.112	-.273	.176	-.058	.248	-.210
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	.565	-.360	.160	.090	.056	.161	-.003	-.026
My supervisor is unfair to me.	.559	-.273	-.273	.097	.081	-.257	-.168	.257
I am permitted to wear mandated article of clothing.	.551	-.326	.426	-.038	.077	.126	-.042	-.037
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	.549	-.259	.209	-.020	-.061	-.177	-.094	.301

Statements	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	.542	-.329	.060	.040	.096	.137	-.383	.179
There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	.539	-.332	-.339	.337	-.128	.096	-.077	-.177
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	.537	-.269	-.006	.001	-.079	-.160	-.137	.488
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	.531	.216	.165	-.376	.029	.377	.193	.050
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	.524	-.445	-.031	.230	-.162	.097	.147	.003
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	.478	.252	-.119	-.206	.418	.249	.137	.091
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	.477	-.158	.086	.066	.221	-.441	.189	-.044
There are few rewards for those who work here.	.352	.128	.235	.245	-.279	.351	.200	.285
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	.336	.617	-.145	-.172	.165	-.187	.001	.012
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	.367	.582	-.424	-.046	.117	-.139	-.055	-.171
I like doing the things I do at work.	.225	.582	.469	.073	-.262	.019	.049	.088
I like the people I work with.	.198	.555	-.032	.192	-.115	.345	.240	.091
My supervisors are more supportive for my professional growth.	.335	.534	-.019	-.083	.025	-.116	-.079	.233
I enjoy working with my coworkers	.254	.534	-.312	.238	-.168	.180	.137	-.053
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	.278	.517	.289	.174	-.329	.028	-.305	-.143
I have too much to do at work.	.194	.504	.480	.154	.203	-.083	.158	.085
My job is enjoyable.	.328	.484	.386	.149	-.322	-.204	-.055	-.143
There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	.339	.482	-.314	-.099	.290	.147	-.313	.162
Communications seem good within this organization.	.374	.416	-.004	.092	-.204	-.216	-.409	-.320
My colleagues are supportive and helpful to	.315	.187	.347	.178	.182	-.309	.003	.174

Statements	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
achieve my job task								
I have too much paperwork.	.232	.174	.065	.525	.411	-.051	-.055	-.023
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	.446	-.374	-.277	.494	-.092	.083	.001	-.042
I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	.202	.337	-.307	.461	.310	.113	.033	-.059
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	.389	.001	-.378	.436	-.238	-.098	.237	.135

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

8 components extracted.

The table shown above gives the Component Matrix or Factor Matrix where PCA extracted 8 factors. These are all coefficients used to express a standardized variable in terms of the factors. These coefficients are called factor loadings, since they indicate how much weight is assigned to each factor. Factors with large coefficients (in absolute value) for a variable are closely related to that variable. For example, Factor 1 is the factor with largest loading (0.643) for the item, namely **“The benefit package we have is equitable”**. These are all the correlations between the factors and the variables, Hence, the correlation between this item and Factor 1 is 0.643. Thus the factor matrix is obtained. These are the initially obtained estimates of factors.

Step 3

The Component matrix obtained in the extraction phase indicates the relationship between the factors and the individual variables. Further to identify meaningful factors based on this matrix, the rotation phase of the factor analysis is used which attempts to transfer initial matrix into one that is easier to interpret. It is called the rotation of the factor matrix. The Rotated Factor Matrix with varimax rotation (Table titled Rotated Component Matrix) is given in Table 5.5 where each factor identifies itself with a few set of variables. The variables which identify with each of the factors were sorted in the decreasing order and are highlighted against each column and row.

Table 5.19

Rotated Component Matrix

Statements	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	.795	.111	.148	.098	.076	.033	.061	-.081
I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	.770	.031	.098	.220	.129	.067	.049	-.039
I am permitted to wear mandated article of clothing.	.710	-.098	.112	-.044	.041	.255	.107	.109
Work assignments are not fully explained.	.680	-.026	.246	.004	-.038	.106	.403	.122
My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	.619	-.032	.118	.211	-.051	.239	.037	.096
I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	.529	.128	-.101	.166	.011	.521	-.060	-.065
There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	-.006	.795	-.121	.036	.117	.156	-.003	.003
I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	-.134	.701	.261	.190	.285	-.127	.059	-.084
People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	.289	.642	.142	-.050	-.187	.018	.123	.207
There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	-.127	.629	.263	-.095	.269	-.006	.205	.039
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	.281	.488	.305	.174	-.011	.264	-.379	.121
My supervisors are more supportive for my professional growth.	-.126	.487	.127	-.085	.303	.212	.178	.187
I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	.307	.469	.234	-.018	.199	.329	-.119	.123
I enjoy working with my coworkers	-.167	.424	.082	.371	.270	-.195	-.023	.350
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.143	.103	.805	.171	.077	.163	.123	-.008
Raises are too few and far between.	.191	.155	.620	.302	.029	.220	-.126	-.003

Statements	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	.322	.435	.540	.011	.007	-.074	.083	.041
I feel my salary is comparable to others performing the same or similar jobs.	.444	.091	.480	-.008	.150	.232	-.258	.090
The benefit package we have is equitable.	.355	.233	.477	.013	.202	.258	-.243	.084
I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	.261	.014	.449	.133	-.023	.187	.441	-.167
I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	.303	-.065	.051	.737	-.058	.179	-.016	.005
There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	.377	.048	.146	.690	.028	.140	-.157	-.073
I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	-.109	.062	.268	.677	.037	.162	.079	.214
I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	-.023	.453	-.160	.467	.020	-.186	.294	.063
Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	.442	-.177	.236	.460	-.090	.238	-.044	.152
I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	.087	.144	-.090	.009	.773	.003	.041	.212
My job is enjoyable.	.056	.021	.175	-.037	.732	-.004	.239	.232
Communications seem good within this organization.	.087	.284	.098	.137	.728	.009	.002	-.181
I like doing the things I do at work.	-.006	.086	.037	-.204	.580	.013	.238	.500
My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	.188	.045	.184	.162	-.032	.737	.053	.072
My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	.337	-.052	.224	.049	.069	.592	.137	.064
My supervisor is unfair to me.	.181	.189	.231	.377	-.073	.570	.083	-.195
I have too much to do at work.	.069	.172	-.009	-.218	.294	-.063	.586	.331
My colleagues are supportive and helpful to achieve my job task	.112	.069	.082	-.058	.224	.244	.552	.066

Statements	Component							
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8
I have too much paperwork.	.166	.221	-.223	.319	.081	-.036	.550	-.028
There are few rewards for those who work here.	.177	-.023	-.027	.176	.145	.175	.046	.679
I like the people I work with.	-.086	.348	-.030	.153	.197	-.184	.067	.594
Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	.416	.394	.259	-.232	.019	.037	-.102	.467

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Rotation converged in 40 iterations.

Step 4

Normally, from the factor results arrived above, factor score coefficients can be calculated for all variables (since each factor is a linear combination of all variables) which are then used to calculate the factor scores for each individual. Since PCA has been used in extraction of initial factors, all methods will result in estimating same factor score coefficients. However, for the study, original values of the variables were retained for further analysis and factor scores were thus obtained by adding the values (ratings given by the respondents) of the respective variables for that particular factor, for each respondent.

Conclusion

Thus the 38 variables in the data have been reduced to 8 factor model and each factor may identified with the corresponding variables as follows:

Table 5.20

Factors Identified against Statements Relating to Job Satisfaction

S. No.	Statements	Factors identified
Factor I	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	Obscured Organisation Goals
	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	
	I am permitted to wear mandated article of clothing.	
	Work assignments are not fully explained.	
	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	
	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	
Factor II	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	Career prospects
	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	
	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	
	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	
	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	
	My supervisors are more supportive for my professional growth.	
	I am not satisfied with the benefits i receive.	
	I enjoy working with my coworkers	
Factor III	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	Monetary benefits
	Raises are too few and far between.	
	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	
	I feel my salary is comparable to others performing the same or similar jobs.	
	The benefit package we have is equitable.	
	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	

S. No.	Statements	Factors identified
Factor IV	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	Thankless job
	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	
	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	
	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	
	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	
Factor V	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	Job Contentment
	My job is enjoyable.	
	Communications seem good within this organization.	
	I like doing the things I do at work.	
Factor VI	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	Problematic Supervisor
	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	
	My supervisor is unfair to me.	
Factor VII	I have too much to do at work.	Heavy Work load
	My colleagues are supportive and helpful to achieve my job task	
	I have too much paperwork.	
Factor VIII	There are few rewards for those who work here.	Job recognition
	I like the people I work with.	
	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	

The 8 different factors identified from factor analysis are Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition

5.7 MANOVA FOR PERSONAL AND JOB RELATED FACTORS

MANOVA Technique is used in this section for the analysis of factors relating to the objective, ‘To find out the level of job satisfaction’. The job satisfaction scores are analyzed for both personal and job related factors. The job satisfaction factors namely, Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load and Job recognition. Personal and job related factors includes Gender, Age, Sector Employed, Education, Experience , Monthly Salary and working shift of the employees.

Job Satisfaction Vs Gender

The 8 job satisfaction factors are simultaneously compared with the gender groups. Following table shows mean values for the eight different factors across gender groups.

Table 5.21

Job Satisfaction Vs Gender

Dependent Variable	Gender					
	Male			Female		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Obscured Organisation Goals	19.21	5.07	242	18.22	5.22	158
Career prospects	26.67	6.56	242	28.73	4.86	158
Monetary benefits	19.78	4.92	242	20.45	4.47	158
Thankless job	17.44	3.60	242	16.66	4.66	158
Job Contentment	13.88	3.25	242	14.20	3.33	158
Problematic Supervisor	9.52	2.61	242	9.67	2.90	158
Heavy Work load	10.50	2.31	242	10.60	2.35	158
Job recognition	10.41	2.32	242	10.34	2.21	158

The table gives the mean scores of job satisfaction factors among male and female groups. The job satisfaction with respect to Obscured Organisation Goals (19.21),

Thankless job (17.47), Job recognition (10.41) are found to be high for female whereas Career prospects (28.73), Monetary benefits (20.45), Job Contentment (14.20), Problematic Supervisor (9.67) and Heavy Work load (10.60) are found to be high for the male employees.

Ho. The Job satisfaction factors have no significant difference among male and female group of respondents.

Table 5.21(1)

(MANOVA) for Perception on Job satisfaction Factors by Gender

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.020	2389.227	8.000	391.000	**	2.557
Gender	Wilks' Lambda	.928	3.766	8.000	391.000	**	2.557

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (3.766) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value : 2.557). Since the effect of Gender is tested upon the linear combination of the eight perception factors of Job Satisfaction, the constant term, Intercept is given above however it has no particular importance here. In the MANOVA table, since the F-value for the Gender effect is significant the hypothesis that “The perception factors of job satisfaction namely, Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition have no significant difference among male and female groups of respondents.” (no significant effect of Gender on Job Satisfaction) is rejected.

Table 5.21(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Gender Groups)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Gender	Obsured Organisation Goals	92.761	1	92.761	3.526	Ns	3.865
	Career prospects	409.154	1	409.154	11.563	**	6.669
	Monetary benefits	43.232	1	43.232	1.920	Ns	3.865
	Thankless job	58.125	1	58.125	3.546	Ns	3.865
	Job Contentment	9.934	1	9.934	.920	Ns	3.865
	Problematic Supervisor	2.040	1	2.040	.274	Ns	3.865
	Heavy Work load	.902	1	.902	.167	Ns	3.865
	Job recognition	.578	1	.578	.112	Ns	3.865
Error	Obsured Organisation Goals	10470.916	398	26.309			
	Career prospects	14082.724	398	35.384			
	Monetary benefits	8963.045	398	22.520			
	Thankless job	6523.115	398	16.390			
	Job Contentment	4297.044	398	10.797			
	Problematic Supervisor	2961.237	398	7.440			
	Heavy Work load	2150.376	398	5.403			
	Job recognition	2063.899	398	5.186			
Total	Obsured Organisation Goals	10563.678	399				
	Career prospects	14491.878	399				
	Monetary benefits	9006.277	399				
	Thankless job	6581.240	399				
	Job Contentment	4306.978	399				
	Problematic Supervisor	2963.278	399				
	Heavy Work load	2151.277	399				
	Job recognition	2064.478	399				

Ns- Not significant

* - Significant at 5% level

** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor show that Career prospects has significant difference among gender groups at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other seven factors namely, Obscured Organisation Goals, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition do not find significant difference between male and female respondents. There is no much difference in the job satisfaction scores among male and female respondents except career prospects. In this factor female are more satisfied when compare to male respondents.

Job Satisfaction Vs Age

The 8 job satisfaction factor namely, Loyalty, Personal Limitations, Belongingness, Emotional Attachment Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition are simultaneously compared across Age groups. Following table gives the mean values for the eight different factors across age groups.

Table 5.22

Job Satisfaction Vs Age

	Age											
	20-25 yrs			26-30 yrs			31-35 yrs			36-40 yrs		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Obscured Organisation Goals	19.93	5.00	169	18.24	5.28	156	17.48	5.13	60	17.60	2.67	15
Career prospects	28.63	5.49	169	25.90	6.84	156	28.80	4.46	60	25.73	4.17	15
Monetary benefits	21.36	4.42	169	18.83	4.73	156	19.13	5.11	60	21.40	2.90	15
Thankless job	17.75	4.10	169	16.63	4.21	156	17.03	3.54	60	15.67	3.04	15
Job Contentment	14.31	3.43	169	13.76	3.14	156	14.08	2.86	60	12.93	4.43	15
Problematic Supervisor	10.17	2.59	169	9.25	2.89	156	8.75	2.55	60	9.73	1.71	15
Heavy Work load	11.06	2.14	169	10.17	2.54	156	10.17	2.10	60	10.13	1.81	15
Job recognition	10.40	2.27	169	10.10	2.14	156	10.73	2.43	60	11.67	2.61	15

It is observed from the above table that, The mean scores are found to be high for the factor Obscured Organisational Goals (19.93), Thankless job (17.75), Job Contentment (14.31), heavy workload (11.06) and Problematic Supervisor (10.17) for the respondents in the age group of 20-25years, with respect to Career prospects (28.80) the scores are high for the respondents in the age groups of 31-35 years ,for the factor Monetary benefits (21.40)the scores are found to be high for the respondents in the age group of 36-40 years.

Ho. The Job satisfaction factors have no significant difference among the respondents classified based on Age groups.

Table 5.22(1)

MANOVA for Perception on Job Satisfaction Factors Vs Age

Effect		Value	F	Hypo-thesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.019	2508.885	8.000	389.000	**	1.962
Age	Wilks' Lambda	.798	3.800	24.000	1128.820	**	1.808

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (3.800) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value:1.808). The scores are found to be significant for all the 8 factors. Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal one-way ANOVA) among the Age groups to find which perception factor differs significantly among the these age groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 5.22(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Age Groups)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Age	Obsured Organisation Goals	392.586	3	130.862	5.095	**	3.831
	Career prospects	760.272	3	253.424	7.308	**	3.831
	Monetary benefits	599.095	3	199.698	9.406	**	3.831
	Thankless job	136.238	3	45.413	2.790	*	2.627
	Job Contentment	42.717	3	14.239	1.322	Ns	2.627
	Problematic Supervisor	117.820	3	39.273	5.466	**	3.831
	Heavy Work load	78.136	3	26.045	4.975	**	3.831
	Job recognition	44.413	3	14.804	2.902	*	2.627
Error	Obsured Organisation Goals	10171.092	396	25.685			
	Career prospects	13731.606	396	34.676			
	Monetary benefits	8407.182	396	21.230			
	Thankless job	6445.002	396	16.275			
	Job Contentment	4264.260	396	10.768			
	Problematic Supervisor	2845.457	396	7.185			
	Heavy Work load	2073.142	396	5.235			
	Job recognition	2020.065	396	5.101			
Total	Obsured Organisation Goals	10563.678	399				
	Career prospects	14491.878	399				
	Monetary benefits	9006.277	399				
	Thankless job	6581.240	399				
	Job Contentment	4306.978	399				
	Problematic Supervisor	2963.278	399				
	Heavy Work load	2151.277	399				
	Job recognition	2064.478	399				

Ns- Not significant

* - Significant at 5% level

** - Significant at 1% level

It is observed from the ANOVA results the job satisfaction factor shows that, Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition have a significant differences among age groups at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected. With respect to Job Contentment the hypothesis framed has been accepted.

Job Satisfaction Vs Sector Employed

The mean scores of job satisfaction and sector employed are presented in the following table.

Table 5.23

Job Satisfaction Vs Sector Employed

Dependent Variable	Sector Employed					
	IT			ITES		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Obscured Organisation Goals	18.21	5.39	136	19.13	4.99	264
Career prospects	25.93	7.11	136	28.28	5.23	264
Monetary benefits	19.81	4.79	136	20.16	4.73	264
Thankless job	17.12	4.01	136	17.14	4.10	264
Job Contentment	14.04	3.31	136	13.99	3.28	264
Problematic Supervisor	9.43	2.79	136	9.66	2.69	264
Heavy Work load	10.70	2.27	136	10.46	2.35	264
Job recognition	10.50	2.13	136	10.32	2.35	264

The table gives the Average mean scores of job satisfaction among IT and ITES employees. For Obscured Organisation Goals (19.13), Career prospects (28.28), Monetary benefits (20.16), Thankless job (17.14), Problematic Supervisor (9.66) the scores are higher for ITES employees. With respect to Job Contentment (14.04), Heavy Work load (10.70), Job recognition (10.50) the scores comparatively high for the employees in IT sector.

Ho. The Job satisfaction factors have no significant difference among the employees classified based on sector employed.

Table 5.23(1)**MANOVA for Job Satisfaction Factors Vs Sector Employed**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.020	2388.559	8.000	391.000	**	2.557
Sector Employed	Wilks' Lambda	.908	4.965	8.000	391.000	**	2.557

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (4.965) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2.557). Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, the hypothesis framed has been rejected for all the eight job satisfaction factors.

Table 5.23(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Sector Employed)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Sector Employed	Obscured Organisation Goals	75.240	1	75.240	2.855	Ns	3.865
	Career prospects	494.216	1	494.216	14.052	**	6.699
	Monetary benefits	11.252	1	11.252	.498	Ns	3.865
	Thankless job	.031	1	.031	.002	Ns	3.865
	Job Contentment	.276	1	.276	.026	Ns	3.865
	Problematic Supervisor	5.017	1	5.017	.675	Ns	3.865
	Heavy Work load	5.017	1	5.017	.930	Ns	3.865
	Job recognition	2.845	1	2.845	.549	Ns	3.865

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Error	Obscured Organisation Goals	10488.437	398	26.353			
	Career prospects	13997.662	398	35.170			
	Monetary benefits	8995.026	398	22.601			
	Thankless job	6581.209	398	16.536			
	Job Contentment	4306.701	398	10.821			
	Problematic Supervisor	2958.261	398	7.433			
	Heavy Work load	2146.261	398	5.393			
	Job recognition	2061.633	398	5.180			
Total	Obscured Organisation Goals	10563.678	399				
	Career prospects	14491.878	399				
	Monetary benefits	9006.277	399				
	Thankless job	6581.240	399				
	Job Contentment	4306.978	399				
	Problematic Supervisor	2963.278	399				
	Heavy Work load	2151.277	399				
	Job recognition	2064.478	399				

Ns- Not significant

* - Significant at 5% level

** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows, that Career prospects has significant difference with respect to Sector Employed at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other seven factors namely, Obscured Organisation Goals, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition do not find significant difference between Sector Employed respondents. Hence, the hypothesis accepted for these factors. There is no much difference in job satisfaction among IT and ITES employees except career prospects. In this factor ITES employees are more satisfied when compare to IT employees.

Job Satisfaction Vs Experience

The following table shows the mean values for Job Satisfaction compared with experience of the employees.

Table 5.24

Job Satisfaction Vs Experience

	Experience											
	1-2 yrs			3-4 yrs			5-6 yrs			7 yrs & above		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Obscured Organisation Goals	19.95	4.90	128	19.09	4.73	140	16.44	6.16	82	19.04	3.74	50
Career prospects	27.75	5.94	128	27.10	6.33	140	28.12	6.14	82	26.82	5.15	50
Monetary benefits	20.79	4.97	128	20.63	4.17	140	17.68	5.12	82	20.36	3.90	50
Thankless job	17.77	3.99	128	16.64	4.27	140	16.73	3.95	82	17.52	3.63	50
Job Contentment	14.27	3.16	128	13.87	3.25	140	14.77	3.05	82	12.46	3.61	50
Problematic Supervisor	10.05	2.66	128	9.61	2.78	140	8.78	3.03	82	9.62	1.88	50
Heavy Work load	10.93	2.34	128	10.35	1.95	140	10.80	2.63	82	9.66	2.46	50
Job recognition	10.36	2.21	128	10.14	2.31	140	10.80	1.77	82	10.42	2.96	50

It is found from the above table that mean score of Obscured Organisation Goals (19.95), Monetary benefits (20.79), Thankless job (17.77), Problematic Supervisor (10.05), Heavy Work load (10.93) are found to be high for the respondents who are having an experience of 1-2 years. With respect to the factors such as, Career prospects

(28.12), Job Contentment (14.77) and Job recognition(10.80) the score are high for the employees having an experience of 5-6 years.

Ho. The Job satisfaction factors have no significant difference among the employees classified based on experience.

Table 5.24(1)

MANOVA for Job Satisfaction Factors Vs Experience

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.020	2426.213	8.000	389.000	**	2.557
Experience	Wilks' Lambda	.795	3.864	24.000	1128.820	**	1.808

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (3.864) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2426.213) “The perception factors of job satisfaction namely, Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition have no significant difference among Sector Employed of respondents.” (no significant effect of Sector Employed on Job Satisfaction) is rejected.

Table 5.24(2)

Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Experience)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Experience	Obscured Organisation Goals	642.051	3	214.017	8.542	**	3.831
	Career prospects	85.117	3	28.372	.780	Ns	2.627
	Monetary benefits	581.011	3	193.670	9.103	**	3.831
	Thankless job	105.551	3	35.184	2.152	Ns	2.627
	Job Contentment	178.845	3	59.615	5.719	**	3.831
	Problematic Supervisor	80.559	3	26.853	3.689	*	2.627
	Heavy Work load	68.962	3	22.987	4.372	**	3.831
	Job recognition	22.808	3	7.603	1.475	Ns	2.627

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Error	Obscured Organisation Goals	9921.627	396	25.055			
	Career prospects	14406.760	396	36.381			
	Monetary benefits	8425.266	396	21.276			
	Thankless job	6475.689	396	16.353			
	Job Contentment	4128.133	396	10.425			
	Problematic Supervisor	2882.719	396	7.280			
	Heavy Work load	2082.315	396	5.258			
	Job recognition	2041.670	396	5.156			
Total	Obscured Organisation Goals	10563.678	399				
	Career prospects	14491.878	399				
	Monetary benefits	9006.277	399				
	Thankless job	6581.240	399				
	Job Contentment	4306.978	399				
	Problematic Supervisor	2963.278	399				
	Heavy Work load	2151.277	399				
	Job recognition	2064.478	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that, Obscured Organisation Goals, Monetary benefits, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load has a significant difference among the employees Experience at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other three factors namely, Career prospects, Thankless job, Job recognition do not find any significant difference between the experience of the respondents. The employees who have 1-2 years of experience are satisfied when compare to other experience groups.

Job Satisfaction Vs Monthly Salary

The job satisfaction factors are simultaneously compared with monthly salary of the employees. The mean scores are depicted in the following table.

Table 5.25

Job Satisfaction Vs Monthly Salary

	Salary																	
	Less than 10000			10001–20000			21001– 30000			30001–40000			40001-50000			Above 50000		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Obsured Organisation Goals	20.22	4.31	36	18.72	5.06	134	19.46	4.85	103	19.75	4.04	72	15.35	6.86	46	17.67	3.16	9
Career prospects	27.00	5.80	36	27.84	4.85	134	28.65	5.97	103	24.61	7.38	72	28.96	6.17	46	26.11	3.22	9
Monetary benefits	19.72	3.45	36	20.32	4.59	134	20.96	5.04	103	20.15	4.73	72	16.98	4.74	46	21.44	2.51	9
Thankless job	18.14	3.52	36	16.74	4.25	134	17.93	3.78	103	17.42	4.09	72	15.61	4.19	46	15.22	2.39	9
Job Contentment	12.17	3.03	36	13.95	3.36	134	14.78	3.07	103	13.79	3.25	72	14.96	2.68	46	10.33	3.46	9
Problematic Supervisor	9.36	2.74	36	9.50	2.55	134	9.93	2.68	103	10.79	2.03	72	7.57	3.21	46	8.33	1.87	9
Heavy Work load	9.94	2.45	36	10.56	2.34	134	10.39	2.44	103	11.00	1.69	72	10.78	2.60	46	9.56	2.70	9
Job recognition	10.08	2.14	36	9.99	2.10	134	10.71	2.19	103	10.26	2.81	72	10.85	1.59	46	12.22	3.19	9

It has been observed from the above table that the mean score for Obscured Organisation Goals (20.22) and thank less job (18.14) the scores are found to be high for the employees earning monthly salary of less than Rs. 10000. With respect to Career prospects (28.96) and job Contentment (14.96) the scores are high for the employees earning Rs. 40001- Rs. 50000. For the factors Problematic Supervisor (10.79) and Heavy Work load (11.00) the scores are high for the earning members of Rs. 21001-Rs. 30000. Regarding Monetary benefits (21.44) and Job recognition (12.22) the scores are comparatively high for the employees earning an income above Rs. 50000.

Ho. The Job satisfaction factors have no significant difference among the employees classified based of monthly salary.

Table 5.25(1)**MANOVA for Job Satisfaction Factors Vs Monthly Salary**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.020	2424.586	8.000	387.000	**	2.557
Salary	Wilks' Lambda	.595	5.335	40.000	1689.688	**	1.604

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (5.335) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2424.586). Since the effect of Salary is tested upon the linear combination of the eight perception factors of Job Satisfaction, the constant term, Intercept is given above however it has no particular importance here. In the MANOVA table, since the F-value for the experience effect is significant the hypothesis that “The job satisfaction factor namely, Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load, Job recognition have no significant difference among Salary of respondents.” (no significant effect of Salary on Job Satisfaction) is rejected.

Table 5.25(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Monthly Salary)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Salary	Obscured Organisation Goals	742.743	5	148.549	5.960	**	3.064
	Career prospects	876.838	5	175.368	5.075	**	3.064
	Monetary benefits	551.489	5	110.298	5.140	**	3.064
	Thankless job	268.540	5	53.708	3.352	**	3.064
	Job Contentment	349.691	5	69.938	6.963	**	3.064
	Problematic Supervisor	321.768	5	64.354	9.599	**	3.064
	Heavy Work load	41.852	5	8.370	1.563	Ns	2.237
	Job recognition	75.996	5	15.199	3.012	*	2.237

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Error	Obsured Organisation Goals	9820.934	394	24.926			
	Career prospects	13615.039	394	34.556			
	Monetary benefits	8454.788	394	21.459			
	Thankless job	6312.700	394	16.022			
	Job Contentment	3957.286	394	10.044			
	Problematic Supervisor	2641.509	394	6.704			
	Heavy Work load	2109.426	394	5.354			
	Job recognition	1988.481	394	5.047			
Total	Obsured Organisation Goals	10563.678	399				
	Career prospects	14491.878	399				
	Monetary benefits	9006.277	399				
	Thankless job	6581.240	399				
	Job Contentment	4306.978	399				
	Problematic Supervisor	2963.278	399				
	Heavy Work load	2151.277	399				
	Job recognition	2064.478	399				

Ns- Not significant

* - Significant at 5% level

** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results for each factor shows that Obsured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Job recognition, has significant difference among the employees based on their monthly salary at 1% and 5% level of significance respectively. The other factor namely, Heavy Work load do not find significant difference between monthly salary of the respondents.

Job Satisfaction Vs Education

The mean scores for job satisfaction and education of the employees are explained in the following table.

Table 5.26
Job Satisfaction Vs Education

	Education														
	Graduate			Post Graduate			Engineering			Professional Degree			Others		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Obscured Organisation Goals	17.39	5.75	150	20.23	5.07	110	19.82	3.91	105	17.96	4.21	26	16.22	3.53	9
Career prospects	28.09	5.66	150	29.25	4.96	110	26.39	5.98	105	22.15	8.29	26	23.89	5.33	9
Monetary benefits	19.23	4.51	150	21.30	5.01	110	20.68	4.27	105	17.35	5.03	26	18.56	4.77	9
Thankless job	17.21	4.42	150	17.45	3.86	110	16.46	3.86	105	18.58	3.07	26	15.56	3.78	9
Job Contentment	13.88	3.28	150	14.16	3.45	110	14.17	3.23	105	14.12	2.83	26	12.00	3.00	9
Problematic Supervisor	8.78	2.71	150	10.17	2.72	110	10.34	2.54	105	8.92	2.26	26	8.78	2.64	9
Heavy Work load	10.71	2.26	150	10.59	2.35	110	10.50	2.31	105	9.50	2.57	26	10.67	2.06	9
Job recognition	9.99	1.88	150	11.56	2.32	110	9.90	2.34	105	10.19	2.33	26	8.78	1.64	9

The table gives the mean scores of job satisfaction factor and education among IT and ITES employees. The job satisfaction scores such as, Obscured Organisation Goals (20.23), Career prospects (29.25), Monetary benefits (21.30) and job recognition (11.56) the scores are found to be high for the employees who have Post graduate degree. Similarly it could be observed that the job satisfaction scores for Heavy Work load (10.71) are high for Graduate employees. For Job Contentment (14.17) and Problematic Supervisor (10.34) the scores are high for the employees having engineering degree. With respect to Thankless job (18.58) the scores are high for the employees having Professional Degree.

Ho. The Job satisfaction factor has no significant difference among the employees classified based on education.

Table 5.26(1)
MANOVA for Job Satisfaction Factors Vs Education

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.019	2476.486	8.000	388.000	**	2.557
Education	Wilks' Lambda	.628	6.026	32.000	1432.468	**	1.685

** - Significant at 1% level.

* - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (6.026) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2476.486). Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal oneway ANOVA) among the education groups to find which perception factor differs significantly among the these two groups. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant. It is found from the above table that the MANOVA scores are significant for all the job satisfaction factors. Hence, the hypothesis is rejected.

Table 5.26(2)
Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Education)

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Education	Obsured Organisation Goals	710.707	4	177.677	7.123	**	3.367
	Career prospects	1377.547	4	344.387	10.373	**	3.367
	Monetary benefits	523.247	4	130.812	6.091	**	3.367
	Thankless job	136.268	4	34.067	2.088	Ns	2.395
	Job Contentment	44.515	4	11.129	1.031	Ns	2.395
	Problematic Supervisor	212.760	4	53.190	7.639	**	3.367
	Heavy Work load	33.266	4	8.316	1.551	Ns	2.395
	Job recognition	226.008	4	56.502	12.140	**	3.367
Error	Obsured Organisation Goals	9852.971	395	24.944			
	Career prospects	13114.330	395	33.201			
	Monetary benefits	8483.031	395	21.476			
	Thankless job	6444.972	395	16.316			
	Job Contentment	4262.463	395	10.791			
	Problematic Supervisor	2750.517	395	6.963			
	Heavy Work load	2118.012	395	5.362			
	Job recognition	1838.470	395	4.654			
Total	Obsured Organisation Goals	10563.678	399				
	Career prospects	14491.878	399				
	Monetary benefits	9006.277	399				
	Thankless job	6581.240	399				
	Job Contentment	4306.978	399				
	Problematic Supervisor	2963.278	399				
	Heavy Work load	2151.277	399				
	Job recognition	2064.478	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

With respect to the educational qualification of the employees, the job satisfaction factors such Obsured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Problematic Supervisor and Job recognition are found to be significant at 1% level. Regarding thankless job, Job contentment and Heavy work load, the scores are not significant. Hence, the hypothesis is accepted.

Job Satisfaction Vs Working Shift

The 8 Job Satisfaction factors are simultaneously compared with working shift of the employees. The results are given in the following table.

Table 5.27

Job Satisfaction Vs Shift

	Shift								
	Day			Night			Both		
	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.	Mean	S.D	No.
Obsured Organisation Goals	17.15	5.21	166	21.54	4.24	70	19.34	4.84	164
Career prospects	26.21	6.55	166	29.86	4.73	70	27.76	5.65	164
Monetary benefits	18.92	4.68	166	23.04	3.12	70	19.90	4.88	164
Thankless job	15.82	3.89	166	18.59	3.36	70	17.84	4.14	164
Job Contentment	14.16	3.14	166	15.10	3.05	70	13.39	3.41	164
Problematic Supervisor	9.10	2.99	166	10.69	2.29	70	9.60	2.48	164
Heavy Work load	10.63	2.26	166	10.87	2.56	70	10.32	2.27	164
Job recognition	9.95	2.09	166	11.07	2.46	70	10.53	2.29	164

It is observed from the above tables that the mean scores of job satisfaction among employees working in different shift. With respect to Obscured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Monetary benefits, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Problematic Supervisor, Heavy Work load and Job recognition the scores are found to be high for the employees working in night shift.

Ho. The Job satisfaction factor have no significant difference among the employees classified based on working shifts.

Table 5.27(1)**MANOVA for Job Satisfaction Factors Vs Shift**

Effect		Value	F	Hypothesis df	Error df	Sig.	Table Value
Intercept	Wilks' Lambda	.019	2575.755	8.000	390.000	**	2.557
Shift	Wilks' Lambda	.788	6.152	16.000	780.000	**	2.023

** - Significant at 1% level. * - Significant at 5% level.

The F-value (6.152) is found to be significant at 1% level (Table F- value: 2575.755). Since the MANOVA result gave significant result, as a follow-up of MANOVA the following table is produced, wherein each factor is tested (normal one-way ANOVA) among the Shift to find which satisfaction factor differs significantly among the working shifts of the employees. This test is conducted if MANOVA result is found to be significant.

Table 5.27(2)**Tests of between-Subjects Effects (Between Shift)**

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Shift	Obsured Organisation Goals	1026.193	2	513.097	21.358	**	4.659
	Career prospects	675.442	2	337.721	9.704	**	4.659
	Monetary benefits	842.186	2	421.093	20.477	**	4.659
	Thankless job	515.121	2	257.561	16.856	**	4.659
	Job Contentment	149.725	2	74.863	7.149	**	4.659
	Problematic Supervisor	123.494	2	61.747	8.632	**	4.659
	Heavy Work load	17.079	2	8.540	1.589	Ns	3.018
	Job recognition	68.475	2	34.238	6.810	**	4.659

Source	Dependent Variable	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.	Table Value
Error	Obsured Organisation Goals	9537.484	397	24.024			
	Career prospects	13816.436	397	34.802			
	Monetary benefits	8164.091	397	20.564			
	Thankless job	6066.119	397	15.280			
	Job Contentment	4157.252	397	10.472			
	Problematic Supervisor	2839.784	397	7.153			
	Heavy Work load	2134.198	397	5.376			
	Job recognition	1996.002	397	5.028			
Total	Obsured Organisation Goals	10563.678	399				
	Career prospects	14491.878	399				
	Monetary benefits	9006.277	399				
	Thankless job	6581.240	399				
	Job Contentment	4306.978	399				
	Problematic Supervisor	2963.278	399				
	Heavy Work load	2151.277	399				
	Job recognition	2064.478	399				

Ns- Not significant * - Significant at 5% level ** - Significant at 1% level

The ANOVA results shows that, Obsured Organisation Goals, Career prospects, Thankless job, Job Contentment, Monetary benefits, Problematic Supervisor, Job recognition, has a significant difference among the employees working Shift at 1% level of significance respectively. The factors, namely, Heavy Work load do not find significant difference between working shift of the respondents. The employees who are working in night shift are comparatively satisfied when compare to other employees.

5.8 REGRESSION ANALYSIS OF JOB SATISFACTION

The influence of socio-economic and employment related variables on the Job Satisfaction of the employees has been studied using Multiple Regression Analysis. The

scores found for Job Satisfaction have been used in this analysis and considered as the dependent variable. The results of the regression analysis are given below. Overall score on Job Satisfaction has been taken as dependent variable.

Table 5.28

Regression Analysis of Job Satisfaction

	B	Std. Error	Beta	t	Sig.
(Constant)	149.965	12.753		11.759	
Gender	.074	2.039	.002	.036	Ns
Age	-.294	.305	-.064	-.964	Ns
Sector Employed	.727	2.130	.017	.341	Ns
Experience	-.410	.556	-.050	-.737	Ns
Salary	1.647	.994	.103	1.657	Ns
Education	-.881	.955	-.047	-.922	Ns
English	-16.846	8.596	-.095	-1.960	*
Hindi	-4.927	2.471	-.113	-1.994	*
Any other	-10.335	1.982	-.261	-5.216	**
Shift	3.167	1.118	.145	2.832	**

R	R Square	F	Sig.
.374	.140	6.335	**

The table given above shows the results of regression analysis, giving details of multiple correlation coefficient (R), R², F-ratio value and significance. The R value indicates that a moderate correlation (0.374) exists between the dependent variable (Job Satisfaction score) and the set of predictor variables. The R square value explains that 14.0% of the variation in the dependent variable is due to the ten predictor variables in the equation. The F-ratio value (6.335) and the associated significance level show that R is significant at 1% level.

The regression table shows that, among the ten independent variables considered for the regression analysis, only four variables were found to be significant. Only the Languages known (English, Hindi and Any other language known) found to have a significant effect on Job Satisfaction at 1% level. Shift is another dummy variable found to have significant effect on job satisfaction at 1% level.

The regression coefficients of English, Hindi and Any other language known have negative regression coefficients. These variables are coded as 0-Yes 1-No which means that the employees who do not know English or Hindi or any other language are found to have less job satisfaction compared to those who know any of these languages.

Shift is a variable which should be considered based on the deprivation of the sleep of the employees. The codes have been assigned accordingly that the Jobs Satisfaction scores are higher for employees working day shift only, and less satisfied are those who work in both day and night shifts and least satisfied are those who work only in night shifts.

Standardized regression coefficients (Beta) are calculated for the variables included in the model. From the Beta coefficients it is seen that, in absolute terms, Any other language known is more influential on the dependent variable compared to other variables with a beta value of -0.261. Shift contributes next with a beta value of 0.145 followed by Hindi with a beta value of 0.113 among the significant predictors.