CHAPTER-V

JOB SATISFACTION AMONG THE WOMEN WORKERS IN
FISHING INDUSTRY

Job satisfaction is the degree to which one’s important need for health, security, nourishment, affiliation; esteem and so on are fulfilled on the job or as a result of the job. In the context of the development and maintenance good human relations in business and industry, Job satisfaction is sentimentally related to the feelings and emotional aspects; as different from intellectual aspects, and rational aspects of an individual’s experience in his/her job.

DEFINITION OF JOB SATISFACTION

Amoran et al., (2005)\textsuperscript{1} Job satisfaction is a pleasurable feeling that results from the perception that one’s job fulfills or allows for the fulfillment of one’s important job values. A review of several studies in the area of job satisfaction leads one to conclude that job satisfaction is the only thing that anybody intends to measure when he/she thinks that he/she is measuring job satisfaction.

Cheung, (1999)\textsuperscript{2} “Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes that the worker holds towards his job, towards related factors and towards life in general.”

Ishawara and Laxmana (2008)\textsuperscript{3} “Job satisfaction is the result of various attitudes possessed by an employee. In a narrow sense, these attitudes are related to

---

the job and are concerned with such specific factors as wages, supervision, steadiness of employment, conditions of work, advancement opportunities, recognition of ability, fair evaluation of work, social relations on the job, prompt settlement of grievances, fair-treatment by employer and similar items”.

Knerr (2006)\(^4\) reviewed 32 studies on job satisfaction conducted prior to 1933 and observed that job satisfaction is a combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person to say, “I am satisfied with my job”. Such a description indicates the variety of variables that influence the satisfaction of the individual, but tell nothing about the nature of job satisfaction.

Sharma and Jyoti (2006)\(^5\) defined job satisfaction as an important topic for managers and management students. Most adults spend about half their working hours in job related activities and it probably would not be an exaggeration to state that the job satisfaction derived from their job is an important consequence of coming to work as well as a major determinant of their behaviour on and off the job.

Kevin, et al., (1998)\(^6\) defined job satisfaction as the amount of pleasure or contentment associated with a job. Ront U. and Runt, K., (1994)\(^7\) said that it is a set of favourable or unfavourable feelings with which workers view their work.


Components of Job Satisfaction among Women Workers

Job satisfaction can be interpreted in different ways. There is no strict rule to follow for measurement of job satisfaction. The instruments used to measure the job satisfaction among the workers vary from industry to industry and from one group to other groups. The included dimensions of job satisfaction identified by Cooper et al., (1989)\(^8\); Sutherland and Cooper (1992)\(^9\) and Randhawa (2004)\(^{10}\) one hour of work, recognition of good work, rate of pay, freedom to choose method of working, physical working condition, opportunity to use abilities, colleagues and fellow workers, amount of variety in job and amount of responsibility given.

In the present study, these above said nine variables one used to measure the job satisfaction among the women workers. These are given in Table 5.1.

**TABLE 5.1**

Variables Related to Job Satisfaction among the Women Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables in job satisfaction</th>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables in job satisfaction</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Amount of responsibility given</td>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Opportunity to use abilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Freedom to choose own methods of working</td>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Rate of pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Amount of variety in work</td>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Recognition for good work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Colleagues and fellow workers</td>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Hours of work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Physical working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

---


**Job Satisfaction among the Workers**

Job satisfaction among the workers has been measured by many variables. The number of variables differs from industry to industry and also from one researcher to another. Even though, the number of variables related to job satisfaction is too many, the present study is confined to only nine variables. The workers are asked to rate these nine variables at five point scale, from highly satisfied to highly dissatisfied. The assigned marks on these scales are from 5 to 1 respectively. The mean score of each variable among the workers in all three classes has been computed separately. The one way analysis of variance has been administered to examine the significant difference among the four classes of workers regarding their attitude towards each variable.

**TABLE 5.2**

Employee’s Perception in Variables in Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables in Job satisfaction</th>
<th>Mean score among workers in</th>
<th>‘t’ statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Amount of responsibility given</td>
<td>3.0411</td>
<td>3.6084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Freedom to choose own method of working</td>
<td>2.6409</td>
<td>3.4142</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amount of variety in work</td>
<td>2.5082</td>
<td>3.2408</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Colleagues and fellow workers attitude</td>
<td>2.9483</td>
<td>3.6517</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Physical working condition</td>
<td>2.5086</td>
<td>3.4083</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Opportunity to use abilities</td>
<td>2.7335</td>
<td>3.5403</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Rate of pay</td>
<td>3.0092</td>
<td>3.7665</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Recognition for good work</td>
<td>2.7173</td>
<td>3.5644</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Hours of work</td>
<td>3.0565</td>
<td>3.6817</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2.7959</td>
<td>3.3754</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at five percent level
Table 5.2 shows the mean scores of each job satisfaction variable among the LE and HE workers and its ‘t’ statistics. The highly perceived variables among the HE workers are rate offering and hour of work since their mean scores are 3.7665 and 3.6817 respectively. Among the LE workers, these are hours of work and amount of responsibility given since their mean scores are 3.0565 and 3.0411 respectively. Regarding the perception on job satisfaction variables, a significant difference among the two groups of workers has been identified in the perception on all variables since the ‘t’ statistics is not significant at five percent level.

Reliability and Validity of Variables in Job Satisfaction among the Workers

Job satisfaction has been measured with the help of nine variables. Before summarizing the value of all the nine variables, it is imperative to test the reliability and validity of variables in job satisfaction. The Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA) has been applied to test it. It results in standardized factor loading of the variables with, its ‘F’ statistics, composite reliability and average variance extracted. The overall reliability has been examined with the help of cronbach alpha. The results are given in Table 5.3.
### TABLE 5.3

Reliability and Validity of Variables in Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables in job satisfaction</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Physical working conditions</td>
<td>0.9008</td>
<td>4.2565*</td>
<td>0.7908</td>
<td>57.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Rate of pay</td>
<td>0.8717</td>
<td>3.9614*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Amount of responsibility given</td>
<td>0.8604</td>
<td>3.8901*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Opportunity to use abilities</td>
<td>0.7965</td>
<td>3.2943*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Freedom to choose own method of working</td>
<td>0.7508</td>
<td>3.1468*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Recognition for good work</td>
<td>0.7173</td>
<td>2.9694*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Amount of variety in work</td>
<td>0.6884</td>
<td>2.8665*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8</td>
<td>Hours of work</td>
<td>0.6546</td>
<td>2.6884*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9</td>
<td>Colleagues and fellow workers</td>
<td>0.6257</td>
<td>2.4517*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.8044

*Significant at five percent level

The standardized factor loading of the variables ranges from 0.9008 and 0.6357. Since the entire standardized factor loading are greater than 0.60, its content validity has been confirmed. The ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loadings is significant at five percent level. It conveys the congruent validity of the constant. The composite reliability and average variance extracted are greater than the minimum
threshold of 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively. It also supports the convergent validity. The included nine variables in job satisfaction explain it to the extent of 82.03 percent.

**Score on Job Satisfaction (SOJS) among the Workers**

The score on job satisfaction among the workers has been computed by the mean scores of the variables included in job satisfaction. It is calculated to represent the overall job satisfaction among the workers. It is denoted by SOJS. It is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SOJS is illustrated in Table 5.4.

**TABLE 5.4**

**Score on Job Satisfaction (SOJS) among the Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SOJS</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>38</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>101</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common SOJS among the workers are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 34.97 and 25.16 percent of the total respectively. The most common SOJS among the LC workers are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 is 3.01 and 4.00
which constitute 47.72 and 29.51 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers, these are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 41.06 and 36.99 percent of its total respectively. The analysis reveals that the level of job satisfaction among the HE workers is higher than among the LE workers.

**Determinants of Job Satisfaction**

The factors determining job satisfaction among the workers are too many at various dimensions. These are related to job factors Leong (1992)\(^{11}\), Work factor (Groesewagen et al., 1991\(^{12}\)), job characteristics (Locke 1976\(^{13}\)), work characteristics (Greyson, 1990\(^{14}\)); job components (Hackman and Oldham, 1975\(^{15}\)); work components (Fried, 1991\(^{16}\)); job elements (Coyle et al., 1999\(^{17}\)); work elements (Pierce et al., 1996\(^{18}\)); job related variables (Lloyd et al., 1998\(^{19}\)); job demand (Buiser, 2000\(^{20}\)); work demand (Ng, 1993\(^{21}\)); job facets (Irvine, et al., 1989\(^{22}\)); work

---


facets (Miller, 1993\textsuperscript{23}); occupational factors (Sailter \textit{et al.}, 1997\textsuperscript{24}) and vocational factors (Buckley \textit{et al.}, 1992\textsuperscript{25}). The variables leading to job satisfaction have been identified by different authors Kumar \textit{et al.}, (1981)\textsuperscript{26}, Griffin \textit{et al.}, 2001\textsuperscript{27}; and Rajagopal (1996\textsuperscript{28}).

In the present study the included determinants of job satisfaction are presented in Table 5.5.

---

## TABLE 5.5

**Determinants of Job Satisfaction**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My physical working conditions is good</td>
<td>24.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my vocation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Reasonable work load</td>
<td>25.</td>
<td>Enough authority is given</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fair salary</td>
<td>26.</td>
<td>Minimum politics at work place</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Opportunities to learn and grow</td>
<td>27.</td>
<td>Adequate planning for all activities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My supervisor treats me well</td>
<td>28.</td>
<td>Satisfied with interpersonal relationship</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Deadlines at my company are realistic</td>
<td>29.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with the sick leave</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Confidence in leadership</td>
<td>30.</td>
<td>Authority to take decisions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with health care</td>
<td>31.</td>
<td>Balance between work and life easily</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>My leader is always helping me</td>
<td>32.</td>
<td>Supply of materials as I needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>I believe my employment is secured</td>
<td>33.</td>
<td>Proper promotion</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>No favouritism by management</td>
<td>34.</td>
<td>I feel I can trust what my company tells me</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Continuously upgrading my skills</td>
<td>35.</td>
<td>Proper delegation of authority</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Established career path at my company</td>
<td>36.</td>
<td>Adequate communication between Supervisors</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>My supervisor treats me fairly</td>
<td>37.</td>
<td>I am satisfied with my earned leaves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Salary is based on talent</td>
<td>38.</td>
<td>Proper increment in salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>16.</td>
<td>Enough communication to me</td>
<td>39.</td>
<td>My supervisor asks me for my fair import</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17.</td>
<td>Proper training given by my leader</td>
<td>40.</td>
<td>Balance between present and future</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18.</td>
<td>I am proud to be the part of my organisation</td>
<td>41.</td>
<td>Participative management</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19.</td>
<td>Realistic target fixed by management</td>
<td>42.</td>
<td>I feel I am valued at my company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20.</td>
<td>There is adequate communication between the departments</td>
<td>43.</td>
<td>Company provided training as I needed</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21.</td>
<td>Supportive management</td>
<td>44.</td>
<td>Enrichment of knowledge</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>22.</td>
<td>I feel I am contributing to my company’s mission</td>
<td>45.</td>
<td>Flexible working hours</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>23.</td>
<td>Better scope for promotion</td>
<td>46.</td>
<td>Good environment to work</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The workers are asked to rate the above said 46 variables leading to job satisfaction at five point scale.

The assigned scores on these scales are from 5 to 1 respectively. The score of 46 variables have been used for Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) in order to narrate the variables in Important Determinants of Job Satisfaction (IDJS).

Initially, the validity and reliability of data for EFA have been tested with the help of Kaiser – Meyer – Ohlin measure (KMO) of sampling adequacy and Bartletts test of sphericity. Both the KMO measure and chi – square value satisfy the validity and reliability of data for factor analysis.
TABLE 5.6

Important Determinants of Job Satisfaction (IDJS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>IDJS</th>
<th>Number of variables</th>
<th>Eigen value</th>
<th>Per cent of variation explained</th>
<th>Cumulative per cent of variation explained</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>4.6368</td>
<td>10.08</td>
<td>25.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4.1906</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>34.33</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Work – life balance</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.7950</td>
<td>8.25</td>
<td>42.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.3718</td>
<td>7.33</td>
<td>49.98</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Growth prospects</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.9624</td>
<td>6.44</td>
<td>56.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.7232</td>
<td>5.92</td>
<td>62.27</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.3368</td>
<td>5.08</td>
<td>67.35</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9964</td>
<td>4.34</td>
<td>71.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.9366</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>75.90</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1.5088</td>
<td>3.28</td>
<td>79.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>46</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

KMO measure of sampling adequacy: 0.8128

Bartlett’s test of sphericity:
Chi-Square value: 102.93*

* Significant at zero percent level.

The narrated eleven IDJS by the EFA are cordial relationship and congenial environment, leadership, fringe benefits, work–life balance, empowerment, growth prospects, autonomy, work load compensation, career development and management.

The most important IDJS is cordial relationship and congenial environment since its eigen value and the percent of variation explained by it are 6.9644 and 15.14 percent respectively. It conveys that the above said IDJS explains all the variables related to
IDJS to the extent of 15.14 percent. The second and third IDJS are leadership and fringe benefits since their Eigen values are 4.6368 and 4.1906 respectively. The percent of variation explained by these two IDJS are 90.08 and 9.11 percent respectively. The next two IDJS are work life balance and empowerment since its Eigen values are 3.7950 and 3.3718 respectively. The percent of variation explained by these variables of IDJS are 8.25 and 7.33 percent respectively.

The next two IDJS are growth prospectus and autonomy since the Eigen values are 2.9624 and 2.7232 respectively. It is followed by work load and compensation since the Eigen values are 2.3368 and 1.9964 respectively. The percent of variation explained by these IDJS are 5.08 and 4.34 per cent respectively. The last two IDJS are career development and management decision since the Eigen values are 1.9366 and 1.5088 respectively. These 11 important determinants of job satisfaction have been included for further in depth study.

**Reliability and validity of variables in cordial relationship and congenial environment**

In total, there are nine variables that have been included in this IDJS as the factor loading of the variables are higher in this IDJS than in other IDJS. Before summarizing the scores of the nine variables to find out the level of satisfaction on these IDJS, it is imperative to analyze the reliability and validity of the variables in this IDJS with the help of Confirmatory Factor Analysis (CFA). It results in standardized factor loading of the variables, its ‘t’ statistics, composite reliability and average variance extracted. The overall reliability coefficient of the IDJS has been computed by Cronbach alpha. The results are given in Table 5.7.
### TABLE 5.7

Reliability and validity of variables in Cordial Relationship and Congenial Environment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My superior ask for my fair input</td>
<td>0.8961</td>
<td>3.8088*</td>
<td>0.7543</td>
<td>54.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>My superiors treat me fairly</td>
<td>0.8408</td>
<td>3.6089*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>I feel I am valued at my company</td>
<td>0.7991</td>
<td>3.4308*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>I feel I am contributing to my company’s vision</td>
<td>0.7802</td>
<td>3.3144*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>My physical working condition is good</td>
<td>0.7644</td>
<td>3.2069*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>I believe my employment is secured</td>
<td>0.7361</td>
<td>3.1443*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>I feel I can trust what company tells me</td>
<td>0.6968</td>
<td>2.9032*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Adequate communication between the departments</td>
<td>0.6407</td>
<td>2.6133*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Deadlines at my companies are realistic</td>
<td>0.6371</td>
<td>2.2469*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability co-efficient: 0.7797

* Significant at five percent level

The included nine variables in cordial relationship and congenial environment (CRCE) have explained it to the extent of 77.97 percent since its reliability coefficient
is 0.7797. The standardized factor loading of the variables in CRCE is ranging from 0.8961 to 0.6271. Since these are greater than 0.60, it conveys content validity of CRCE. The significance of ‘t’ statistics of standardized factor loading of the variables convey the convergent validity of the construct. It is also supported by composite reliability and arranges variance extracted since these are greater than its minimum threshold of 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively.

Score on CRCE among the Workers

The score on CRCE among the workers have been derived by the mean score of the variables included in CRCE. It is devoted by SCRCE. It is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their CRCE is illustrated in Table 5.8.

**TABLE 5.8**

Score on Cordial Relationship and Congenial Environment (SCRCE) among the Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SCRCE</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>21.31</td>
<td>58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>6.02</td>
<td>129</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The common SCRCE among the workers are 3.01 to 4.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitutes 22.01 and 37.99 percent of the total respectively. The most common SCRCE among the LE workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and less than 2.00 which constitute 47.72 and 24.95 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers, these are above 4.00 and 3.01 to 4.00 which constitute 52.44 and 23.58 percent of the total respectively. The analysis reveals that the level of perception on CRCE is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and Validity of Variables in Leadership Factor**

In total, five variables related to leadership factor have a higher factor loading in this IOJS compared to other IOJSs. Hence, it is named ‘Leadership’ factor. It is imperative to analyze the reliability and validity of variables in leadership factor with the help of CFA. The overall reliability has been examined with the help of Cronbach alpha. These results are given Table 5.9.
### TABLE 5.9

**Reliability and Validity of Variables in Leadership Factor Environment**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables in leadership factor</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>'t' – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>My leader is always helping me</td>
<td>0.8417</td>
<td>3.2445*</td>
<td>0.7172</td>
<td>51.32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Confidence in leadership</td>
<td>0.8044</td>
<td>2.9096*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Satisfied with inter – personal relationship</td>
<td>0.7662</td>
<td>2.7334*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Proper training is given by my leader</td>
<td>0.7149</td>
<td>2.5114*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Proper delegation of authority</td>
<td>0.6068</td>
<td>2.0308*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7341

* Significant at five per cent level.

The standardized factor loading of the variables in leadership range from 0.8417 to 0.6068 which reveals its content validity as the standardized factor loadings are greater than 0.60. The ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading are significant at five percent level. The results indicate the convergent validity of leadership factor. As the composite reliability is greater than 0.60 and the average variance extracted by the leadership is greater than 50.00 per cent, the convergent validity has been confirmed. The overall reliability coefficient reveals that the included five variables explain the leadership to the extent of 73.41 percent. Hence, the present analysis reveals the reliability of the variables in leadership factor.
Score on Leadership (SOL) among the Workers

The score on leadership (SOL) among the workers has been derived by the mean score of the variables in leadership factor since the variables in leadership factor reveals the reliability. The score on leadership factor among the workers is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SOL is given in Table 5.10.

**TABLE 5.10**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SCRCE</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>43.17</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>150</td>
<td>27.32</td>
<td>56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>83</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>9.11</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common SOL among the workers are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitutes 32.45 and 25.91 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SOL of above 4.00 constitute 17.11 percent of the total. The important SOL among the LE workers are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 43.17 and 27.32 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers these SOL are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 33.74 and 34.96 percent of its total respectively.
The analysis infers that the workers perception on leadership factor is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and validity of variables in fringe benefits**

The EFA has identified four variables in fringe benefits since their factor loadings are higher in fringe benefits than in other IDJS. The reliability and validity of variables included in fringe benefits have been tested with the help of EFA. It results in standardized factor loading, ‘t’ statistics, composite reliability and average variance extracted. These are summarized in Table 5.11.

**TABLE 5.11**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in fringe benefits</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my vocation</td>
<td>0.8608</td>
<td>3.7321*</td>
<td>0.6917</td>
<td>51.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with my earned leaves</td>
<td>0.7345</td>
<td>3.0411*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with health care provided to me</td>
<td>0.6508</td>
<td>2.5669*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am satisfied with the sick leaves</td>
<td>0.6162</td>
<td>2.0544*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7143

* Significant at five percent level.

The included four variables in fringe benefits explain it to the extent of 74.13 percent since the reliability coefficient is 0.7413. The standardized factor loading of the variables in fringe benefits ranges from 0.8608 to 0.6162. As the standardized
factor loading of the variables are greater than 0.60, its content validity has been confirmed. The ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading of the variables are significant at five per cent level. It reveals the convergent validity. It is also confirmed by the composite reliability and average variance extracted since these greater than 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively. Hence, the analysis reveals the reliability of the variables in fringe benefits.

**Score on Fringe Benefits (SOFB) among the Workers**

The score on fringe benefits have been computed by the mean score of the variables included in fringe benefits. It is denoted by SOFB. In the present study, the SOFB is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SOFB is shown in Table 5.12.

**TABLE 5.12**

**Score on Fringe Benefits (SOFB) among the Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SOFB</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>249</td>
<td>45.36</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.21</td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>84</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The common SOFB among the workers in the present study are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 21.51 and 38.87 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SOFB of above 4.00 constitute 18.49 percent of the total. The most common SOFB among the LE workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and less than 2.00 which constitute 45.36 and 24.95 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers, these are above 4.00 and 3.01 to 4.00 since the constitute 34.15 and 27.64 percent of its total respectively. The analysis reveals that the level of perception on fringe benefits is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and Validity of Variables in Work–Life Balance (WLB)**

The variables related to WLB have a higher factor loading with this factor than in other IDJS. Hence it is named work life balance (WLB). The workers perception on WLB has been summated by the score of the four related variables. Before summarizing the score, it is imperative to analyze the reliability and validity of variables included in WLB with the help of CFA. The overall reliability coefficient has been computed by the Cronbach alpha. The results are given in Table 5.13.
The standardized factor loading of the variables in WLB is ranges from 0.9083 to 0.6733 which indicates the content validity. The ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading of the variables are significant at five percent level which indicates its convergent validity. It is also confirmed by its composite reliability and average variance extracted since these are greater than 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively. The included four variables in WLB explain it to the extent of 81.17 percent since its reliability coefficient is 0.8117. The analysis infers that the variables in WLB explain it to a reliable extent.

**Score on Work Life Balance (SWLB) among the Workers**

The score on SWLB among the workers has been derived by the mean score of the variables in WLB. It is computed to exhibit the level of perception on WLB among the workers in the industries. In the present study, the SWLB are confined to...
less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SWLB is illustrated in Table 5.14.

**TABLE 5.14**

**Score on Work–Life Balance (SWLB) among the Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SCRCE</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE %</td>
<td>HE %</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>137</td>
<td>24.95</td>
<td>36</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>275</td>
<td>50.09</td>
<td>51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>18.22</td>
<td>95</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common SWLB among the workers is 3.00 to 4.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 24.53 and 41.01 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SWLB of above 4.00 constitute 12.70 percent of its total. The most common SWLB among the LE workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and less than 2.00 which constitute 50.09 and 24.95 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers, these are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 38.62 and 26.02 percent of its total respectively. The analysis reveals that the work life balance is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.
Reliability and Validity of Variables in “Empowerment”

In total, there are four variables included in empowerment factor as their respective factor loadings are higher in empowerment factor than in other factors (IDJS). The reliability and validity of the variables in empowerment have been examined with the help of confirmatory factor analysis (CFA). It results in standardized factor loading, it ‘t’ statistics, composite reliability and average variance extracted. The overall reliability of the empowerment has been examined with the help of Cronbach alpha. The results are shown in Table 5.15.

**TABLE 5.15**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S.No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>I am proud to be a part of the organization</td>
<td>0.8245</td>
<td>3.3422*</td>
<td>0.7011</td>
<td>50.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Participative management</td>
<td>0.7633</td>
<td>2.7334</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Enough communication to me</td>
<td>0.7142</td>
<td>2.5996*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Adequate planning for all activities</td>
<td>0.6244</td>
<td>2.2509*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7241

* Significant at five percent level

The included four variables in empowerment explain it to the extent of 72.41 per cent since its reliability coefficient is 0.7241. The standardized factor loading of
the variables in empowerment are significant at five per cent level which indicates its convergent validity. The standardized factor loading of the variables in empowerment are greater than 0.60 which indicates its content validity. The convergent validity has been confirmed since the composite reliability and average variance extracted by the factor are greater than 0.50 and 50.00 per cent respectively. The analysis reveals the reliability of the variables in empowerment.

**Score on Empowerment (SOE) among the Workers**

The score on empowerment among the workers have been derived by the mean score of the variables included in empowerment. It is denoted by SOE. In the present study, the SOE are confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SOE is illustrated in Table 5.16.

**TABLE 5.16**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SOE</th>
<th>Number of workers in Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE %</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27.14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>244</td>
<td>44.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>16.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11.66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The common SOE among the workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 35.85 and 23.27 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SOE of less than 2.00 constitute 21.51 percent of the total. The most frequent SOE among the LE workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and less than 2.00 which constitute 44.44 and 27.14 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers these are above 4.00 and 3.01 to 4.00 which constitute 49.19 and 23.20 percent of its total respectively. The analysis reveals that the level of perception on empowerment is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and Validity of Variables in Growth Prospects**

In total, four variables are included in growth prospects as their respective factor loadings are higher in growth prospects than in other IDJS. The workers’ level of perception on growth prospects in their job have been measured with the help of the four variables. Before summarizing the score of the four variables, it is imperative to test the reliability and validity of variables in growth prospects. It is examined with the help of confirmatory factor analysis. The results are shown in Table 5.17.
TABLE 5.17
Reliability and Validity of Variables in Growth Prospects

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Better scope for promotion</td>
<td>0.9196</td>
<td>4.2664*</td>
<td>0.7965</td>
<td>58.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Enrichment of knowledge</td>
<td>0.8044</td>
<td>3.1406*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Balance between present and future</td>
<td>0.7562</td>
<td>2.9092*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Proper promotion</td>
<td>0.6963</td>
<td>2.7449*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.8133.

* Significant at five percent level

The included four variables in growth prospects have explained it to the extent of 81.33 percent since its reliability coefficient is 0.8133. The standardized factor loading of the variables in growth prospects are ranging from 0.9196 to 0.6963 which shows its content validity. The ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading of the variables in growth prospects are significant at five percent which reveals the convergent validity. The composite reliability and average variance extracted are greater than the minimum threshold of 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively. It also supports the convergent validity. The included four variables in growth prospects explain it to the extent of 81.33 percent since its reliability coefficient is 0.8133.

**Score on Growth Prospects (SGP) among the Workers**

The workers view on growth prospects in the present job have been computed by the mean score of the variables included in growth prospects. It is denoted by SGP.
In the present study, the SGP is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SGP is illustrated in Table 5.18.

**TABLE 5.18**

**Score on Growth Prospects (SGP) among the Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SGP</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22.59</td>
<td>21</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>322</td>
<td>58.65</td>
<td>45</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>74</td>
<td>13.48</td>
<td>132</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common SGP among the workers are 3.01 to 4.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 25.91 and 46.16 percent of the total respectively. The most common SGP among the LE workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and less than 2.00 which constitute 58.65 and 22.59 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers, the SGP are 3.00 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 53.66 and 19.51 percent of the total respectively. The analysis reveals that the level of perception on growth prospects in the job is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and Validity of Variables in Autonomy**

The exploratory factor analysis has identified that four variables are included in the autonomy since their respective factor loadings are higher when compared to
other IDJS. It is imperative to test the reliability and validity of variables in autonomy before summarizing the score of the variables in autonomy. The confirmatory factor analysis has been administered to test the reliability and validity. The overall reliability of variables in autonomy has been tested with the help of cronbach alpha. The results are shown in Table 5.19.

### TABLE 5.19

Reliability and validity of variables in autonomy

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Authority to take decisions</td>
<td>0.8608</td>
<td>3.4261*</td>
<td>0.7239</td>
<td>51.09</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Opportunities to learn and grow</td>
<td>0.7312</td>
<td>2.8089*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supply of materials as I needed</td>
<td>0.6905</td>
<td>2.5661*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Continuous upgrading my skills</td>
<td>0.6244</td>
<td>2.2545*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7541

* Significant at five percent level.

The standardized factor loading of the variables are range from 0.8608 to 0.6244. It reveals the content validity of the construct. The ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading of the variables in autonomy are significant at five percent level which indicates the convergent validity. It is also supported by the composite validity and average variance extracted since these are greater than the minimum threshold of 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively. The included four variables in autonomy explain it to the extent of 75.41 percent since the reliability
coefficient is 0.7541. The analysis reveals that the included variables in autonomy explain it to a reliable extent.

**Score on Autonomy (SOA) among the Workers**

The score on autonomy among the workers has been derived by the mean score of the variables related to autonomy. It is denoted by SOA. The SOA has been computed among the workers in LE and HE in order to exhibit their level of perception on autonomy in their industries. The SOA in the present study is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SOA is given in Table 5.20.

**TABLE 5.20**

**Score on Autonomy (SOA) among the Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SOA</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>22.04</td>
<td>111</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>9.84</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common SOA among the workers are less than 2.00 and 3.01 to 4.00 which constitute 35.47 and 29.18 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SOA of above 4.00 constitute 15.47 percent of the total. The most common SOA
among the LE workers are less than 2.00; 3.01 to 4.00 which constitute 47.72 and 22.04 percent of its respectively. Among the HE workers, these are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 45.12 and 28.05 percent of its total respectively. The analysis infers that the level of perception on autonomy among the HE workers is higher than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and validity of Variables in Work Load**

The work load factor consists of three variables since their respective factor loadings are higher in this factor than in other factors. It is important to test whether the included variables in work load explain it to a reliable extent or not. Hence the CFA and Cronbach alpha have been applied. The results of CFA and the Cronbach alpha are given in Table 5.21.

**TABLE 5.21**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables in workload</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Reasonable work load</td>
<td>0.8544</td>
<td>3.4893*</td>
<td>0.7011</td>
<td>51.02</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Flexible working hours</td>
<td>0.7342</td>
<td>3.0617*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Company provided training as I needed</td>
<td>0.6266</td>
<td>2.2374*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7249.

* Significant at five percent level

The included three variables in work load explain it to the extent of 72.49 percent since its reliability coefficient is 0.7249. The standardized factor loading of
The variables in work load is greater than 0.6 which conveys its content validity. The significance of ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading of the variables in work load conveys its convergent validity. It is also supported by its composite reliability and average variance extracted since these are greater than 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively. Hence the analysis reveals that the included variables in work load explain it to a reliable extent.

**Score on Work Load (SWL) among the Workers**

The score on work load among the workers has been derived by the mean score on the perception on three variables included in workload. It has been computed to show the level of perception on workload among the LE and HE workers. It is denoted by SWL. It is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of SWL is illustrated in Table 5.22.

**TABLE 5.22**  
*Score on Work Load (SWL) among the Workers*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SWL</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>237</td>
<td>43.18</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>187</td>
<td>34.06</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>20.40</td>
<td>118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>89</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The common SWL among the workers is 3.00 to 4.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 28.93 and 26.67 percent of the total 12.13 percent of the total. The most common SWL among the LE workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and less than 2.00 which constitute 34.06 and 43.17 percent of it’s respectively. Among the HE workers, these are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 47.97 and 36.18 percent of its total respectively. The analysis infers that the level of perception on workload among the class III and IV workers is lesser than among the HE workers are higher than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and validity of variables in compensation**

The variables related to compensation are clustered into one factor called as compensation since then factor loadings are higher in this factor compared to other factors (IDJS). It is imperative to analyze the reliability and validity of variables in compensation before summarizing the score on the variables related to compensation. Hence, the confirmatory factor analysis (CFA) has been applied. The reliability coefficient has been computed by Cronbach alpha. The results are presented in Table 5.23.

**TABLE 5.23**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables in compensation</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Fair salary</td>
<td>0.8244</td>
<td>3.3517*</td>
<td>0.7444</td>
<td>52.91</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Proper increment in salary</td>
<td>0.7065</td>
<td>2.8808*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Salary is based on bank</td>
<td>0.6408</td>
<td>2.4091*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7602.

* Significant at five percent level
The standardized factor loading of the variables are range from 0.8244 to 0.6408 which reveals the content validity of the factor. The ‘t’ statistics of the variables in compensation are significant at five percent level which reveals the convergent validity. Since the composite reliability and average variance extracted of this factor are greater than 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively and its convergent validity is also supported. The included three variables in this factor explain it to the extent of 76.02 percent since its reliability coefficient is 0.7602. The analysis reveals the reliability of the variables in compensation for further analysis.

**Score on Compensation (SOC) among the Workers**

The workers perception on ‘compensation’ has been derived by the mean score of the variables in compensation. It is denoted by SOC. The SOC among the workers has been computed to exhibit the level of perception on compensation among the two groups of workers. The SOC in the present study are confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SOC is given in Table 5.24.
TABLE 5.24

Score on Compensation (SOC) among the Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SOC</th>
<th>Number of workers in LE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>HE</th>
<th>%</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>13.82</td>
<td>296</td>
<td>37.23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>162</td>
<td>29.51</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>15.45</td>
<td>200</td>
<td>25.16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>51.22</td>
<td>213</td>
<td>26.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>6.92</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>19.51</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>10.82</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>795</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The common SOC among the workers are less than 2.00 to 3.00 and 3.00 to 4.00 which constitute 37.23 and 26.79 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SOC of above 4.00 constitute 10.82 percent of the total. The most common SOC among the LE workers are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 since it constitute 47.72 and 29.51 percent of its total respectively. Among the HE workers these are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 51.32 and 19.51 percent of its total respectively. The analysis infers that the level of perception on compensation is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.

Reliability and Validity of Variables in Career Development

In total, there are three variables included in the career development and their factor loadings are higher in career development than in other IDJS. The present study has made an attempt to analyze the reliability and validity of the variables in career
development before summarizing the level of perception on three variables in career development. The CFA has been applied to test the reliability and validity. The results are presented in Table 5.25.

**TABLE 5.25**

**Reliability and Validity of Variables in Career Development**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Enough authority is given</td>
<td>0.9023</td>
<td>4.0846*</td>
<td>0.7628</td>
<td>54.11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Established career path at my company</td>
<td>0.7517</td>
<td>3.2665*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Adequate communication between departments</td>
<td>0.6344</td>
<td>2.3144*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7836

* Significant at five percent level.

The included three variables in career development explain it to the extent of 78.36 percent since its reliability coefficient is 0.7836. The standardized factor loading of the variables in career development are higher than 0.6 which indicates it content validity. The convergent validity has been confirmed since the ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading of the variables are significant at five percent level. It is also supported by the composite reliability and average variance extracted. Hence, the present study reveals that the variables in career development explain it to a reliable extent.
Score on Career Development (SCD) among the Workers

The level of perception on career development among the workers has been derived by the mean score of the variables included in it and is denoted by the mean score of the variables included in it. It is denoted by SCD. In the present study, the SCD is classified into less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The SCD among the two groups of workers have been computed separately. The distribution of workers on the basis of SCD is illustrated in Table 5.26.

**TABLE 5.26**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SCD</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>301</td>
<td>54.83</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>22.58</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>15.85</td>
<td>128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>6.74</td>
<td>69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The frequent SCD among the workers are less than 2.00 and above 3.01 to 4.00 which constitute 40.00 and 27.04 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SCD of above 4.00 constitute 13.33 percent of the total. The most frequent SCD among the class LE workers are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 54.83 and 22.59 percent of the total respectively. Among the HE workers these are
3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 52.03 and 28.04 percent of its total respectively. The analysis reveals that the level of perception on career development among the HE workers is higher than among the LE workers.

**Reliability and Validity of variables in Management Decision**

The EFA has identified three variables in management decision as their respective factor loadings are higher in management decision than in other IDJS. The level of perception on management decision among the workers has been calculated by the mean score and so it is imperative to examine the reliability and validity of variables in it. The CFA has been applied to test it. The overall reliability of the variables in management support has been computed by Cronbach alpha. The results are shown in Table 5.27.

**TABLE 5.27**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Standardized factor loading</th>
<th>‘t’ – statistics</th>
<th>Composite reliability</th>
<th>Average variance extracted</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Realistic target fixed by management</td>
<td>0.8502</td>
<td>3.4046*</td>
<td>0.6508</td>
<td>50.08</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>No favouritism by management</td>
<td>0.7009</td>
<td>2.9339*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Supportive management</td>
<td>0.6401</td>
<td>2.3441*</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Overall reliability coefficient: 0.7069

* Significant at five percent level.

The included three variables in management decision explain it to the extent of 70.69 percent since the reliability coefficient is 0.7069. The standardized factor
loading of the variables in management support is greater than 0.60 which reveals the content validity. The convergent validity of the construct have been confirmed since the ‘t’ statistics of the standardized factor loading of the variables in this factor are significant at five percent level. It is also supported by the composite reliability and average variance extracted since these are greater than 0.50 and 50.00 percent respectively. The analysis infers that the included variables in management decision explain it to a reliable extent.

**Score on Management Decision (SMD) among the Workers**

The workers’ views on management decision have been computed by the mean score of the variables in it. It is denoted by SMD. In the present study, the SMD is confined to less than 2.00; 2.00 to 3.00; 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00. The distribution of workers on the basis of their SMD is illustrated in Table 5.28.

**TABLE 5.28**

**Score on Management Decision (SMD) among the Workers**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>SMD</th>
<th>Number of workers in</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>%</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Less than 2.00</td>
<td>149</td>
<td>27.14</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>2.00-3.00</td>
<td>262</td>
<td>47.72</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.01-4.00</td>
<td>75</td>
<td>13.66</td>
<td>141</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Above 4.00</td>
<td>63</td>
<td>11.48</td>
<td>65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>549</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>246</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The common SMD among the workers are 2.00 to 3.00 and 3.01 to 4.00 which constitute 35.72 and 27.17 percent of the total respectively. The workers with the SMD of above 4.00 constitute 16.10 percent of the total. The most common SMD among the LE workers are less than 2.00 and 2.00 to 3.00 which constitute 27.14 and 47.72 percent of its total. Among the HE workers, these are 3.01 to 4.00 and above 4.00 which constitute 40.81 and 57.50 percent of the total respectively. The analysis reveals that the level of perception on management decision is higher among the HE workers than among the LE workers.

Workers View on IDJS

The workers' perception on important determinants on job satisfaction has been analyzed with the help of the mean score of each IDJS among two groups of workers separately. Regarding the perception on each IDJS, the significant difference among two group of workers' have been examined with the help of ‘t’ test. The mean score of workers views on each IDJS and its respective ‘t’ statistics are given in Table 5.29.
### TABLE 5.29

Worker’s View on Important Determinants of Job Satisfaction (IDJS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>IDJS</th>
<th>Mean scores among workers in</th>
<th>‘t’ statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>HE</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cordial relationship and congenial</td>
<td>3.0865</td>
<td>3.6865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>environment</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.0911</td>
<td>3.6514</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>3.2565</td>
<td>3.8245</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Work – life balance</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>3.2673</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>2.7038</td>
<td>3.7308</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Growth prospects</td>
<td>2.8446</td>
<td>3.2456</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.6865</td>
<td>3.8809</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Work load</td>
<td>2.6062</td>
<td>3.7097</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>2.6932</td>
<td>3.9084</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>2.8244</td>
<td>3.6007</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
<td>2.4548</td>
<td>3.5088</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* Significant at five percent level

Among the HE workers, the highly perceived IDJS are fringe benefits and leadership since their respective mean scores are 3.9691 and 3.7042. Among the group LE workers, these are fringe benefits and leadership since the mean scores are 3.2565 and 3.0911 respectively. Regarding the workers’ view on IDJS, a significant difference among the two group of workers has been noticed in the case of all IDJS except since the ‘t’ statistics is significant at five percent level.
Association between the Profile of Workers and their View on IDJS

Since the profile of the workers may be associated with their level of view on IDJS, the present study has made an attempt to examine it with the help of one-way analysis of variance. All the fifteen profile variables are included for the analysis. The results of one-way analysis of variance are summed in Table 5.30.
### TABLE 5.30
Association between Profile of Workers and their View on Determinants of Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Profile variables</th>
<th>Cordial relationship and congenial environment</th>
<th>Leadership</th>
<th>Fringe benefits</th>
<th>Work-life balance</th>
<th>Empowerment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Age</td>
<td>2.7884*</td>
<td>2.5884*</td>
<td>2.1774</td>
<td>2.8086*</td>
<td>2.4544*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Level of education</td>
<td>2.6081*</td>
<td>2.6551*</td>
<td>2.0884</td>
<td>2.5884*</td>
<td>2.1179</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Marital status</td>
<td>2.1732</td>
<td>2.0896</td>
<td>1.8485</td>
<td>2.0996</td>
<td>1.7345</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Family size</td>
<td>2.1084</td>
<td>2.2011</td>
<td>2.4546*</td>
<td>2.7144*</td>
<td>1.9969</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Social class</td>
<td>2.5081</td>
<td>2.1179</td>
<td>2.3084</td>
<td>2.2676</td>
<td>2.5737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Number of earning members per family</td>
<td>2.4542*</td>
<td>2.8868*</td>
<td>2.9149*</td>
<td>2.5084</td>
<td>2.3996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Number of industries worked so far</td>
<td>3.1788*</td>
<td>3.4546*</td>
<td>3.0994*</td>
<td>3.4591*</td>
<td>3.2617*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Type of work</td>
<td>2.1188</td>
<td>2.2646</td>
<td>2.3444</td>
<td>2.5886</td>
<td>2.3997</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Type of wage payment</td>
<td>2.4542</td>
<td>2.1173</td>
<td>2.2773</td>
<td>2.7689*</td>
<td>2.8188*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12.</td>
<td>Working hours</td>
<td>2.8184*</td>
<td>2.0886</td>
<td>2.5117</td>
<td>2.8448*</td>
<td>2.7676*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13.</td>
<td>Monthly income</td>
<td>2.5658*</td>
<td>2.8646*</td>
<td>2.9086*</td>
<td>2.7174*</td>
<td>2.6979*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>14.</td>
<td>Family income</td>
<td>2.8104*</td>
<td>2.6626*</td>
<td>2.3141</td>
<td>2.8646*</td>
<td>2.9141*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>15.</td>
<td>Monthly saving</td>
<td>2.4997*</td>
<td>2.8586*</td>
<td>2.7133*</td>
<td>2.9039*</td>
<td>2.8184*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at five percent level.
Regarding the view on cordial relationship and congenial environment, the significantly associating profile variables are age, level of education, number of industries worked so far, nature of workers, working hours, monthly income, family income and monthly saving as their respective ‘F’ statistics are significant at five percent level.

The significantly associating profile variables regarding the view on leadership are age, level of education, number of earning member per family, number of industries worked so far, monthly income, family income and monthly saving, whereas regarding the view on fringe benefits, the significantly associating profile variables are family size, number of earning numbers per family, number of industries worked so far, nature of workers, monthly income and monthly saving. Regarding the view on work life balance, the significant associating profile variables are age, level of education, family size, number of industries worked so far, nature of workers, type of wage payment, working hours, monthly income, family income and monthly saving.

Regarding the view on empowerment, the significantly associating profile variables are age, number of industries worked so far, nature of workers, and type of wage payment, working hours, monthly income, family income and monthly saving.

The association between the profile of workers and their view on growth prospects, autonomy, compensation, career development and management decision has been examined with the help of one-way analysis of variance. The results are shown in Table 5.31.
TABLE 5.31
Association between Profile of Workers and their View on IDBS

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>Profile variables</th>
<th>F-statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Number of industries worked so far</td>
<td>Growth prospects: 3.1788*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Type of wage payment</td>
<td>Growth prospects: 2.4541</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at five percent level.
The significantly associating profile variables regarding the view on growth prospects are age, level of education, number of industries worked so far, monthly income, family income and monthly saving, whereas regarding the view on autonomy, the significantly associating profile variables are age, level of education, number of earning members per family, number of industries worked so far, type of wage payment, working hours, monthly income, family income and monthly saving.

Regarding the view on compensation, the significantly associating profile variables are age, level of education, marital status, number of industries worked so far, monthly income, family income and monthly saving, whereas in the case of career development, these profile variables are age, level of education, family size, number of earning member per family, number of industries worked so far, type of work, working hours, monthly income, family income and monthly savings. Regarding the view on management decision, the significantly associating profile variables are level of education, marital status, nature of family, type of wage payment, monthly income, family income and monthly saving since their respective ‘F’ statistics are significant at five per cent level.

**Discriminant IDJS among LE and HE Workers**

The level of view on IDJS among the LE and HE workers are different. It is essential to analyse the important discriminant IDJS for some policy implications. The two group discriminant analysis has been administered for this purpose. Initially, the mean differences and their statistical significance have been estimated. The discriminant power of IDJS is estimated with the help of Wilks Lambda. The results are given in Table 5.32.
### TABLE 5.32

Mean Differences and Discriminant Power of IDJS among LE and HE Workers

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>IDJS</th>
<th>Mean scores among workers in</th>
<th>Mean differences</th>
<th>‘t’ statistics</th>
<th>Wilks Lambda</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>LE</td>
<td>HE</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cordial relationship and congenial environment</td>
<td>3.0862</td>
<td>3.6085</td>
<td>-0.5220</td>
<td>-2.7865*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>3.0911</td>
<td>3.7402</td>
<td>-0.6491</td>
<td>-2.7114*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
<td>3.2565</td>
<td>3.9691</td>
<td>-0.7126</td>
<td>-2.6669*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Work life balance</td>
<td>2.7143</td>
<td>3.4033</td>
<td>-0.6890</td>
<td>-2.6442*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>2.7038</td>
<td>3.4633</td>
<td>-0.7595</td>
<td>-3.0708*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Growth prospect</td>
<td>2.8446</td>
<td>3.4084</td>
<td>-0.5638</td>
<td>-2.0241*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>2.6865</td>
<td>3.5442</td>
<td>-0.8577</td>
<td>-3.1446*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>2.6062</td>
<td>3.5143</td>
<td>-0.9081</td>
<td>-3.4508*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>2.6932</td>
<td>3.6083</td>
<td>-0.9151</td>
<td>-3.6681*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>2.8244</td>
<td>3.3844</td>
<td>-0.5600</td>
<td>-3.3089*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
<td>2.4548</td>
<td>3.1244</td>
<td>-0.6696</td>
<td>-3.1773*</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*Significant at five percent level.

A significant mean differences has been noticed in the case of all IDJS since the respective mean differences are significant at five percent level. Higher mean differences are noticed in the case of compensation and workload since their mean differences are -0.9151 and -0.9081 respectively. Higher discriminant powers have been identified in the case of workload and compensation since their respective Wilks Lambda is 0.1038 and 0.1249. The significant IDJS are included for the estimation of
two group discriminant analysis. The non standardized procedure has been administered for this purpose. The estimated two group discriminant function is:

\[
Z = 0.8911 - 0.0774 X_1 - 0.1088 X_2 - 0.1779 X_3 - 0.1084 X_5 - 0.0417 X_5 - 0.0774 X_6 - 0.0899 X_7 - 0.1784 X_8 - 0.1889 X_9 - 0.1011 X_{10} - 0.0447 X_{11}
\]

The relative contribution of discriminant IDJS in total discriminant score is computed by the product of discriminant co-efficient and the mean differences of the respective IDJS. The results are shown in Table 5.33.

**TABLE 5.33**

Relative Contribution of IDJS in Total Discriminant Score (TDS)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>S. No.</th>
<th>IDJS</th>
<th>Discriminant co-efficient</th>
<th>Mean differences</th>
<th>Product</th>
<th>Relative contribution in TDS</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1.</td>
<td>Cordial relationship and congenial environment</td>
<td>-0.0774</td>
<td>-0.5220</td>
<td>0.0404</td>
<td>4.56</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2.</td>
<td>Leadership</td>
<td>-0.1088</td>
<td>-0.6491</td>
<td>0.0706</td>
<td>7.97</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.</td>
<td>Fringe balance</td>
<td>-0.1779</td>
<td>-0.7126</td>
<td>0.1268</td>
<td>14.30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.</td>
<td>Worklife balance</td>
<td>-0.1084</td>
<td>-0.6890</td>
<td>0.0747</td>
<td>8.43</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5.</td>
<td>Empowerment</td>
<td>-0.0417</td>
<td>-0.7595</td>
<td>0.0317</td>
<td>3.58</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6.</td>
<td>Growth prospects</td>
<td>-0.0774</td>
<td>-0.5638</td>
<td>0.0436</td>
<td>4.92</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7.</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>-0.0899</td>
<td>-0.8577</td>
<td>0.0771</td>
<td>8.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8.</td>
<td>Workload</td>
<td>-0.1784</td>
<td>-0.9081</td>
<td>0.1620</td>
<td>18.28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9.</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>-0.1889</td>
<td>-0.9151</td>
<td>0.1729</td>
<td>19.51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10.</td>
<td>Career development</td>
<td>-0.1011</td>
<td>-0.5600</td>
<td>0.0566</td>
<td>6.39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11.</td>
<td>Management decision</td>
<td>-0.0447</td>
<td>-0.6696</td>
<td>0.0299</td>
<td>3.37</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.0447</strong></td>
<td><strong>-0.6696</strong></td>
<td><strong>0.0299</strong></td>
<td><strong>3.37</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Percent of correctly classified: 72.97
Higher discriminant co-efficients are noticed in the case of compensation and workload since their co-efficient are -0.1889, -0.1784 respectively. It shows the higher influence of above said two IDJA in the discriminant function. The higher relative contribution of IDJS in TDS is noticed in the case of compensation and workload as their relative contributions are 14.51 and 18.28 per cent respectively. The estimated two group discriminant analysis correctly estimates the cases to an extent of 72.97 percent. The analysis reveals that the important discriminant IDJS among the LE and HE workers are compensation and workload but they are highly perceived by HE workers than by the LE workers.