

Analysis and Interpretation

CHAPTER III

ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

This chapter deals with the analysis and interpretation of the data collected. The study focuses on Occupational stress, Job satisfaction, and Organizational commitment among IT employees in Coimbatore. The goal of the research was achieved by using the appropriate statistical tools applicable to the research. Data analysis and interpretation helps in providing meaningful insights in understanding the objectives of the research study. The following statistical tools namely Mean, Standard Deviation, ANOVA, Correlation, and Regression were applied for analysing and interpreting survey data.

Descriptives: Frequencies are calculated and shown in the distribution of the demographic profile of the respondents. The respondents' Age, Gender, Education, Years of Experience, Marital Status, and Monthly Income, were studied. Descriptive and inferential statistics such as mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, regression, and correlation were used to identify relationship or possible association between socio-demographic variables and Job satisfaction, Commitment and Stress.

Table -3.1
Demographic Profile of the Respondents

| S.No | Demographic Variables | Group | No. Of Respondents | Percentage |
|------|-------------------------------|----------------|--------------------|------------|
| 1. | Age (in years) | Below 30 | 140 | 26.4 |
| | | 30-40 | 161 | 30.3 |
| | | Above 40 | 230 | 43.3 |
| 2. | Gender | Male | 236 | 44.4 |
| | | Female | 295 | 55.6 |
| 3. | Education | Under Graduate | 325 | 61.2 |
| | | Post Graduate | 180 | 33.9 |
| | | Diploma/others | 26 | 4.9 |
| 4. | Experience (in years) | Below 5 | 126 | 23.7 |
| | | 5-10 | 161 | 30.3 |
| | | Above 10 | 244 | 46.0 |
| 5. | Monthly income (in rupees) | Below 20000 | 129 | 24.3 |
| | | 20000-30000 | 157 | 29.6 |
| | | Above 30000 | 245 | 46.1 |
| | Total | | 531 | |

Source: Primary Data

The demographic profile of the respondents in the study showed that out of the total 531 respondents taken for the study, 43.3 percentage of the respondents belong to the age group of above 40 years; 55.6 percentage of the respondents are female; 61.2 percentage of the respondents are under graduates; 46.0 percentage of the respondents belong to above 10 years' experience group; 46.1 percentage of the respondents belong to the income group of above 30000 rupees.

OCCUPATIONAL STRESS

Hypothesis:

H1- Occupational stress will vary significantly with demographic factors like age (H1a), gender (H1b), education (H1c), experience (H1d), and monthly income (H1e) among the employees of IT industry.

Table 3.2

Occupational Stress among different age groups

| Age (in years) | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Below 30 | 37.01 | 140 | 3.125 | 727.556 P=(.000) |
| 30-40 | 42.59 | 161 | 2.558 | |
| Above 40 | 51.07 | 230 | 4.306 | |
| Total | 44.79 | 531 | 6.865 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.2 shows that the overall mean score for occupational stress ranges from 37.01 to 51.07. The 40 & above age group had a higher mean score (51.07) for occupational stress than the below 30 age group (37.01). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in occupational stress among different age groups. The obtained F-value is 727.556 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H1a was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in occupational stress among different age groups.

Table 3.3

Occupational Stress among different gender groups

| Gender | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Male | 50.87 | 236 | 3.893 | 897.024 P=(.000) |
| Female | 39.93 | 295 | 4.405 | |
| Total | 44.79 | 531 | 6.865 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.3 shows that the overall mean score for occupational stress ranges from 39.93 to 50.87. The male respondents had a higher mean score (50.87) for occupational stress than the female respondents (39.93). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in occupational stress among different gender groups. The obtained F-value is 897.024 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H1b was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in occupational stress among different gender groups.

Table 3.4

Occupational Stress among different education groups

| Education | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Graduate | 43.34 | 325 | 6.787 | 25.719 P=(.000) |
| Post Graduate | 47.64 | 180 | 6.581 | |
| Diploma/others | 43.23 | 26 | 1.883 | |
| Total | 44.79 | 531 | 6.865 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.4 shows that the overall mean score for occupational stress ranges from 43.23 to 47.64. The post graduate respondents had a higher mean score (47.64) for occupational stress than the other respondents. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in occupational stress among

different education groups. The obtained F-value is 25.719 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H1c was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in occupational stress among different education groups.

Table 3.5
Occupational Stress among different experience groups

| Experience | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|-------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Below 5 | 36.49 | 126 | 2.157 | 646.647 (p=0.000) |
| 5-10 | 41.99 | 161 | 2.117 | |
| Above 10 | 50.92 | 244 | 4.337 | |
| Total | 44.79 | 531 | 6.865 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.5 shows that the overall mean score for occupational stress ranges from 36.49 to 50.92. The above10 year experience group had a higher mean score (50.92) for occupational stress than the other groups. Analysis of Variance ANOVA was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in occupational stress among different education groups. The obtained F-value is 646.647 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H1d was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in occupational stress among different experience groups.

Table 3.6
Occupational Stress among different income groups

| Income (in rupees) | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Below 20000 | 36.78 | 129 | 2.696 | 646.647 (p=0.000) |
| 20000-30000 | 42.23 | 157 | 1.552 | |
| Above 30000 | 50.65 | 245 | 4.932 | |
| Total | 44.79 | 531 | 6.865 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.6 shows that the overall mean score for occupational stress ranges from 36.78 to 50.65. The above 20000 income group had a higher mean score (50.65) for occupational stress than the other groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in occupational stress among different income groups. The obtained F-value is 646.647 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H1e was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in occupational stress among different income groups.

AFFECTIVE COMMITMENT

Hypothesis:

H2- Affective commitment will vary significantly with demographic factors like age (H2a), gender (H2b), education (H2c), experience (H2d), and monthly income (H2e) among the employees of IT industry.

Table 3.7

Affective Commitment among different age groups

| Age | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Below 30 | 21.03 | 140 | 2.438 | 153.020 (P=.000) |
| 30-40 | 16.98 | 161 | 2.192 | |
| Above 40 | 17.33 | 230 | 2.138 | |
| Total | 18.20 | 531 | 2.806 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.7 shows that the overall mean score for Affective Commitment ranges from 16.98 to 21.03. The below 30 age group had a higher mean score (21.03) for Affective Commitment than the other age groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Affective Commitment among different age groups. The obtained F-value is 153.020 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H2a was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Affective Commitment among different age groups.

Table 3.8

Affective Commitment among different gender groups

| Gender | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Male | 17.44 | 236 | 2.077 | 33.514 (P=.000) |
| Female | 18.81 | 295 | 3.147 | |
| Total | 18.20 | 531 | 2.806 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.8 shows that the overall mean score for Affective Commitment ranges from 17.44 to 18.81. The Female respondents had a higher mean score 18.81 for Affective Commitment than the male respondents (17.44). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Affective Commitment among different gender groups. The obtained F-value is 33.514 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H2b was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Affective Commitment among different gender groups.

Table 3.9

Affective Commitment among different education groups

| Education | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Graduate | 18.27 | 325 | 2.802 | 1.669 (P=0.189) |
| Post Graduate | 18.21 | 180 | 2.877 | |
| Diploma/others | 17.23 | 26 | 2.197 | |
| Total | 18.20 | 531 | 2.806 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.9 shows that the overall mean score for Affective Commitment ranges from 17.23 to 18.27. The Graduate respondents had a higher mean score (18.27) for Affective Commitment than the other respondents. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Affective Commitment among

different education groups. The obtained F-value is 1.669 and it is not significant. Hence, hypothesis H2c was rejected and it was concluded that there no statistically significant difference in Affective Commitment among different education groups.

Table 3.10

Affective Commitment among different experience groups

| Experience | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|-------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Below 5 | 21.45 | 126 | 2.069 | 191.447 (P=.000) |
| 5-10 | 17.01 | 161 | 2.191 | |
| Above 10 | 17.31 | 244 | 2.143 | |
| Total | 18.20 | 531 | 2.806 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.10 shows that the overall mean score for Affective Commitment ranges from 17.31 to 21.45. The below 5 year experience group had a higher mean score (21.45) for Affective Commitment than the other groups. Analysis of Variance ANOVA was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Affective Commitment among different education groups. The obtained F-value is 191.447 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H2d was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Affective Commitment among different experience groups.

Table 3.11

Affective Commitment among different income groups

| Income | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Below 20000 | 21.40 | 129 | 2.067 | 190.297 (P=.000) |
| 20000-30000 | 17.10 | 157 | 2.166 | |
| Above 30000 | 17.22 | 245 | 2.168 | |
| Total | 18.20 | 531 | 2.806 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.11 shows that the overall mean score for Affective Commitment ranges from 17.10 to 21.40. The below 20000 income group had a higher mean score (21.40) for Affective Commitment than the other groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Affective Commitment among different income groups. The obtained F-value is 190.297 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H2e was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Affective Commitment among different income groups.

CONTINUANCE COMMITMENT

Hypothesis:

H3- Continuance Commitment will vary significantly with demographic factors like age (H3a), gender (H3b), education (H3c), experience (H3d), and monthly income (H3e) among the employees of IT industry.

Table 3.12
Continuance Commitment among different age groups

| Age | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|----------|-------|-----|----------------|---------------------|
| Below 30 | 14.14 | 140 | 2.858 | 341.487 (P=.000) |
| 30-40 | 15.50 | 161 | 1.966 | |
| Above 40 | 19.83 | 230 | 1.903 | |
| Total | 17.02 | 531 | 3.343 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.12 shows that the overall mean score for Continuance Commitment ranges from 14.14 to 19.83. The above 40 age group had a higher mean score (19.83) for Continuance Commitment than the other age groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different age groups. The obtained F-value is 341.487 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H3a was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different age groups.

Table 3.13

Continuance Commitment among different gender groups

| Gender | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Male | 19.78 | 236 | 1.948 | 644.225 (P=.000) |
| Female | 14.80 | 295 | 2.460 | |
| Total | 17.02 | 531 | 3.343 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.13 shows that the overall mean score for Continuance Commitment ranges from 14.80 to 19.78. The male respondents had a higher mean score (19.78) for Continuance Commitment than the female respondents (14.80). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different gender groups. The obtained F-value is 644.225 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H3b was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different gender groups.

Table 3.14

Continuance Commitment among different education groups

| Education | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|--------------------|
| Graduate | 16.32 | 325 | 3.256 | 23.550 (P=.000) |
| Post Graduate | 18.35 | 180 | 3.283 | |
| Diploma/others | 16.54 | 26 | 1.726 | |
| Total | 17.02 | 531 | 3.343 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.14 shows that the overall mean score for Continuance Commitment ranges from 16.32 to 18.35. The Post Graduate respondents had a higher mean score (18.35) for Continuance Commitment than the other respondents. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different education groups. The obtained F-value is 23.550 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H3c was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different education groups.

Table 3.15

Continuance Commitment among different experience groups

| Experience | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|-------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Below 5 | 13.46 | 126 | 2.050 | 595.072 (P=.000) |
| 5-10 | 15.38 | 161 | 1.533 | |
| Above 10 | 19.93 | 244 | 1.945 | |
| Total | 17.02 | 531 | 3.343 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.15 shows that the overall mean score for Continuance Commitment ranges from 13.46 to 19.93. The above 10 year experience group had a higher mean score (19.93) for Continuance Commitment than the other groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different education groups. The obtained F-value is 595.072 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H3d was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different experience groups.

Table 3.16

Continuance Commitment among different income groups

| Income | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|---------------------|
| Below 20000 | 13.71 | 129 | 2.409 | 529.425 (P=.000) |
| 20000-30000 | 15.24 | 157 | 1.256 | |
| Above 30000 | 19.90 | 245 | 2.006 | |
| Total | 17.02 | 531 | 3.343 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.16 shows that the overall mean score for Continuance Commitment ranges from 13.71 to 19.90. The above 30000 income group had a higher mean score

(19.90) for Continuance Commitment than the other groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different income groups. The obtained F-value is 529.425 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H3e was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Continuance Commitment among different income groups.

NORMATIVE COMMITMENT

Hypothesis:

H4- Normative commitment will vary significantly with demographic factors like age (H4a), gender (H4b), education (H4c), experience (H4d), and monthly income (H4e) among the employees of IT industry.

Table 3.17

Normative Commitment among different age groups

| Age | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|----------|-------|-----|----------------|-------------------|
| Below 30 | 12.95 | 140 | 3.873 | 5.669 (P=.004) |
| 30-40 | 14.24 | 161 | 4.026 | |
| Above 40 | 13.03 | 230 | 3.832 | |
| Total | 13.37 | 531 | 3.936 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.17 shows that the overall mean score for Normative Commitment ranges from 12.95 to 14.24. The age group 30 - 40 had a higher mean score (14.24) for Normative Commitment than the other age groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Normative Commitment among different age groups. The obtained F-value is 5.669 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H4a was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Normative Commitment among different age groups.

Table 3.18

Normative Commitment among different gender groups

| Gender | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Male | 13.52 | 236 | 4.195 | .569 (P=.451) |
| Female | 13.26 | 295 | 3.720 | |
| Total | 13.37 | 531 | 3.936 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.18 shows that the overall mean score for Normative Commitment ranges from 13.26 to 13.52. The male respondents had a higher mean score (13.52) for Normative Commitment than the female respondents (13.26). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Normative Commitment among different gender groups. The obtained F-value is 0.569 and it is not significant. Hence, hypothesis H4b was rejected and it was concluded that there is no statistically significant difference in Normative Commitment among different gender groups.

Table 3.19

Normative Commitment among different education groups

| Education | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|------------------|
| Graduate | 13.24 | 325 | 3.791 | .503 (P=.605) |
| Post Graduate | 13.58 | 180 | 3.982 | |
| Diploma/others | 13.65 | 26 | 5.299 | |
| Total | 13.37 | 531 | 3.936 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.19 shows that the overall mean score for Normative Commitment ranges from 13.24 to 13.65. The Diploma holder respondents had a higher mean score (13.65) for Normative Commitment than the other respondents. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was

applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Normative Commitment among different education groups. The obtained F-value is 0.503 and it is not significant. Hence, hypothesis H4c was rejected and it was concluded that there is no statistically significant difference in Normative Commitment among different education groups.

Table 3.20
Normative Commitment among different experience groups

| Experience | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|-------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Below 5 | 12.30 | 126 | 3.364 | 7.305 (P=.001) |
| 5-10 | 14.05 | 161 | 3.842 | |
| Above 10 | 13.48 | 244 | 4.165 | |
| Total | 13.37 | 531 | 3.936 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.20 shows that the overall mean score for Normative Commitment ranges from 12.30 to 14.05. The 5-10 year experience group had a higher mean score (14.05) for Normative Commitment than the other groups. Analysis of Variance ANOVA was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Normative Commitment among different education groups. The obtained F-value is 7.305 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H4d was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Normative Commitment among different experience groups.

Table 3.21
Normative Commitment among different income groups

| Income | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Below 20000 | 12.55 | 129 | 3.685 | 4.968 (P=.007) |
| 20000-30000 | 14.01 | 157 | 3.838 | |
| Above 30000 | 13.40 | 245 | 4.061 | |
| Total | 13.37 | 531 | 3.936 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.21 shows that the overall mean score for Normative Commitment ranges from 12.55 to 14.01. The 20000 to 30000 income groups had a higher mean score (14.01) for Normative Commitment than the other groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Normative Commitment among different income groups. The obtained F-value is 4.968 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H4e was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Normative Commitment among different income groups.

JOB SATISFACTION

Hypothesis:

H5- Job Satisfaction will vary significantly with demographic factors like age (H5a), gender (H5b), education (H5c), experience (H5d), and monthly income (H1d) among the employees of IT industry.

Table 3.22
Job Satisfaction among different age groups

| Age | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|----------|-------|-----|----------------|-------------------|
| Below 30 | 72.74 | 140 | 7.548 | 111.679 (.000) |
| 30-40 | 64.04 | 161 | 5.795 | |
| Above 40 | 60.95 | 230 | 8.313 | |
| Total | 65.00 | 531 | 8.842 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.22 shows that the overall mean score for Job Satisfaction ranges from 60.95 to 72.74. The age group below 30 years had a higher mean score (72.74) for Job Satisfaction than the other age groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different age groups. The obtained F-value is 111.679 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H5a was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different age groups.

Table 3.23

Job Satisfaction among different gender groups

| Gender | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Male | 60.78 | 236 | 8.644 | 117.923 (.000) |
| Female | 68.37 | 295 | 7.451 | |
| Total | 65.00 | 531 | 8.842 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.23 shows that the overall mean score for Job Satisfaction ranges from 60.78 to 68.37. The Female respondents had a higher mean score (68.37) for Job Satisfaction than the male respondents (60.78). Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different gender groups. The obtained F-value is 117.923 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H5b was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different gender groups.

Table 3.24

Job Satisfaction among different education groups

| Education | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|----------------|
| Graduate | 64.74 | 325 | 8.910 | .356 (.701) |
| Post Graduate | 65.39 | 180 | 8.973 | |
| Diploma/others | 65.46 | 26 | 7.061 | |
| Total | 65.00 | 531 | 8.842 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.24 shows that the overall mean score for Job Satisfaction ranges from 64.74 to 65.46. The Diploma holder respondents had a higher mean score (65.46) for Job Satisfaction than the other respondents. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to

ascertain if there was a significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different education groups. The obtained F-value is 0.356 and it is not significant. Hence, hypothesis H5c was rejected and it was concluded that there is no statistically significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different education groups.

Table 3.25
Job Satisfaction among different experience groups

| Experience | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|-------------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Below 5 | 74.32 | 126 | 4.637 | 111.621 (.000) |
| 5-10 | 63.90 | 161 | 5.909 | |
| Above 10 | 60.91 | 244 | 8.592 | |
| Total | 65.00 | 531 | 8.842 | |

The table 3.25 shows that the overall mean score for Job Satisfaction ranges from 60.91 to 74.32. Below 5 years experience group had a higher mean score (74.32) than the other experience groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different experience groups. The obtained F-value is 111.621 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H5d was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different experience groups.

Table 3.26
Job Satisfaction among different income groups

| Income | Mean | N | Std. Deviation | F-value |
|---------------|-------------|----------|-----------------------|-------------------|
| Below 20000 | 73.34 | 129 | 7.369 | 115.654 (.000) |
| 20000-30000 | 64.03 | 157 | 5.893 | |
| Above 30000 | 61.22 | 245 | 8.209 | |
| Total | 65.00 | 531 | 8.842 | |

Source: Primary Data

The table 3.26 shows that the overall mean score for Job Satisfaction ranges from 61.22 to 73.34. The below20000 income groups had a higher mean score (73.34) for Job Satisfaction than the other groups. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was applied to ascertain if there was a significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different income groups. The obtained F-value is 115.654 and it is significant at 1% level. Hence, hypothesis H5e was accepted and it was concluded that there is a statistically significant difference in Job Satisfaction among different income groups.

**JOB SATISFACTION, ORGANISATIONAL COMMITMENT, AND
OCCUPATIONAL STRESS
CORRELATION ANALYSIS**

Hypotheses:

H6- There will be a significant correlation between job satisfaction and normative commitment (H6a); job satisfaction and Continuance commitment (H6b); job satisfaction and affective commitment (H6c).

H7 – There will be a significant correlation between occupational stress and normative commitment (H7a); occupational stress and Continuance commitment (H7b); occupational stress and affective commitment (H7c).

H8 – There will be a significant correlation between occupational stress and job satisfaction.

Table 3.27

Correlation among Job satisfaction, Commitment and Occupational stress

| | | Job Satisfaction | Normative commitment | Continuance commitment | Affective commitment | Occupational stress |
|--|---------------------|-------------------------|-----------------------------|-------------------------------|-----------------------------|----------------------------|
| Job Satisfaction | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .060 | .569** | .782** | -.593** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .165 | .000 | .000 | .000 |
| | N | 531 | 531 | 531 | 531 | 531 |
| Normative commitment | Pearson Correlation | | 1 | .061 | .158** | .014 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | | .162 | .000 | .753 |
| | N | | 531 | 531 | 531 | 531 |
| Continuance commitment | Pearson Correlation | | | 1 | .481** | .826** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | .000 | .000 |
| | N | | | 531 | 531 | 531 |
| Affective commitment | Pearson Correlation | | | | 1 | -.484** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | .000 |
| | N | | | | 531 | 531 |
| Occupational stress | Pearson Correlation | | | | | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | | | | |
| | N | | | | | 531 |
| **. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed). | | | | | | |

Correlation test revealed that there is no significant correlation ($r=0.060$ & $p>.05$) between job satisfaction and Normative commitment. Hence hypothesis H6a is rejected.

There is a significant correlation ($r=0.569$ & $p>.01$) between job satisfaction and Continuance commitment. Hence hypothesis H6b is accepted.

There is a significant correlation ($r=0.782$ & $p>.01$) between job satisfaction and Affective commitment. Hence hypothesis H6c is accepted.

There is no significant correlation ($r=0.014$ & $p>.05$) between occupational stress and Normative commitment. Hence hypothesis H7a is rejected.

There is a significant correlation ($r=0.826$ & $p>.01$) between occupational stress and Continuance commitment. Hence hypothesis H7b is accepted.

There is a significant correlation ($r=0.484$ & $p>.01$) between occupational stress and affective commitment. Hence hypothesis H7c is accepted.

There is a significant correlation ($r=.000$ & $p<.01$) between occupational stress and job satisfaction. Hence hypothesis H8 is accepted.

REGRESSION ANALYSIS

Hypothesis:

H9 - Job satisfaction will affect normative commitment (H9a), continuance commitment (H9b), and affective commitment (H9c) among the employees of IT industry.

H10 – Occupational stress will affect normative commitment (H10a), continuance commitment (H10b), and affective commitment (H10c) among the employees of IT industry.

H11 - Occupational stress will affect job satisfaction among the employees of IT industry.

Table 3.28

Regression analysis with job satisfaction as predictor variable and normative commitment as the dependent variable.

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | .060 | .004 | .002 | 3.933 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| 1 | Regression | 29.911 | 1 | 29.911 | 1.934 | .165 |
| | Residual | 8182.258 | 529 | 15.467 | | |
| | Total | 8212.169 | 530 | | | |

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|--------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 15.119 | 1.267 | | 11.930 | .000 |
| | Job satisfaction | .027 | .019 | .060 | 1.391 | .165 |

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and normative commitment. F-Test was not statistically significant. The R-Squared is 0.004 and the adjusted R-Square was 0.002 which means that job satisfaction does not explain the variance in normative commitment. Hence hypothesis H9a was rejected.

Table 3.29

Regression analysis with job satisfaction as predictor variable and continuance commitment as the dependent variable.

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | .569 | .324 | .323 | 2.752 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| 1 | Regression | 1917.720 | 1 | 1917.720 | 253.294 | .000 |
| | Residual | 4005.128 | 529 | 7.571 | | |
| | Total | 5922.847 | 530 | | | |

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|--------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 31.000 | .887 | | 34.962 | .000 |
| | Job satisfaction | .215 | .014 | .569 | 15.915 | .000 |

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and continuance commitment. F-Test was statistically significant, which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Squared is 0.324 which means that approximately 32% of the variance of continuance commitment was explained by the predictor variable, that is, job satisfaction. Hence hypothesis H9b was accepted.

Table 3.30

Regression analysis with Job satisfaction as predictor variable and Affective commitment as the dependent variable.

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | .782 | .612 | .611 | 1.750 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 2554.199 | 1 | 2554.199 | 834.448 | .000 ^a |
| | Residual | 1619.240 | 529 | 3.061 | | |
| | Total | 4173.439 | 530 | | | |

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|--------------|------------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 2.064 | .564 | | 3.661 | .000 |
| | Job satisfaction | .248 | .009 | .782 | 28.887 | .000 |

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between job satisfaction and affective commitment. F-Test was statistically significant, which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Squared is 0.612 which means that approximately 61% of the variance of affective commitment was explained by the predictor variable, that is, job satisfaction. Hence hypothesis H9c was accepted.

Table 3.31

Regression analysis with occupational stress as predictor variable and normative commitment as the dependent variable.

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|--------------|----------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | .014 | .000 | .002 | 3.940 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), stress

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| 1 | Regression | 1.544 | 1 | 1.544 | .099 | .753 |
| | Residual | 8210.625 | 529 | 15.521 | | |
| | Total | 8212.169 | 530 | | | |

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 13.021 | 1.130 | | 11.528 | .000 |
| | Stress | .008 | .025 | .014 | .315 | .753 |

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between occupational stress and normative commitment. F-Test was not statistically significant. The R-Squared is 0.000 which means that occupational stress does not explain the variance in normative commitment. Hence hypothesis H10a was rejected.

Table 3.32

Regression analysis with occupational stress as predictor variable and Continuance commitment as the dependent variable.

| | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|---|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | .826 ^a | .682 | .681 | 1.888 |

ANOVA

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|------|
| 1 | Regression | 4037.642 | 1 | 4037.642 | 1.133E3 | .000 |
| | Residual | 1885.206 | 529 | 3.564 | | |
| | Total | 5922.847 | 530 | | | |

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | .991 | .541 | | -1.831 | .068 |
| | stress | .402 | .012 | .826 | 33.660 | .000 |

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between Occupational stress and continuance commitment. F-Test was statistically significant, which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Squared is 0.682 which means that approximately 68% of the variance of continuance commitment was explained by the predictor variable, that is, stress. Hence hypothesis H10b was accepted.

Table 3.33

Regression analysis with occupational stress as predictor variable and affective commitment as the dependent variable.

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | .484 ^a | .234 | .233 | 2.458 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|-----------------------|-----------|--------------------|----------|-------------|
| 1 | Regression | 977.579 | 1 | 977.579 | 161.815 | .000 |
| | Residual | 3195.859 | 529 | 6.041 | | |
| | Total | 4173.439 | 530 | | | |

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|--------------|------------|------------------------------------|-------------------|----------------------------------|----------|-------------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 27.062 | .705 | | 38.403 | .000 |
| | Stress | -.198 | .016 | -.484 | -12.721 | .000 |

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between Occupational stress and Affective commitment. F-Test was statistically significant, which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Squared is 0.234 which means that approximately 23% of the variance of affective commitment was explained by the predictor variable, that is, stress. Hence hypothesis H10c was accepted.

Table 3.34

Regression analysis with occupational stress as predictor variable and job satisfaction as the dependent variable.

Model Summary

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|--------------|-------------------|-----------------|--------------------------|-----------------------------------|
| 1 | .593 ^a | .351 | .350 | 7.129 |

ANOVA^b

| Model | | Sum of Squares | Df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|-----|-------------|---------|------|
| 1 | Regression | 14548.313 | 1 | 14548.313 | 286.251 | .000 |
| | Residual | 26885.679 | 529 | 50.824 | | |
| | Total | 41433.992 | 530 | | | |

Coefficients^a

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|---------|------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | 99.179 | 2.044 | | 48.524 | .000 |
| | Stress | -.763 | .045 | -.593 | -16.919 | .000 |

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between Occupational stress and job satisfaction. F-Test was statistically significant, which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Squared is 0.351 which means that approximately 35% of the variance of job satisfaction was explained by the predictor variable, that is, occupational stress. Hence hypothesis H11 was accepted.