

# Factors Affecting Overall Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intention

Nazim Ali \*

## Abstract

*This study was conducted to measure the level of job satisfaction and its impact on turnover intention. Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) questionnaire containing nine facets of job satisfaction and a questionnaire containing three items for measuring job satisfaction and turnover intention respectively were used for data collection from private sector colleges' lecturers of NWFP. 212 questionnaires were completed and returned. Pearson Correlation and Multiple Regression tests were used to test the hypothesis. Result shows that Lecturers of private sector colleges of NWFP are very much dissatisfied with promotion chances. They are moderately dissatisfied with three facets of job satisfaction: Pay, Fringe benefits and contingent rewards while moderately satisfied with operating condition, coworkers, nature of work and communication. Overall job satisfaction of private sector colleges' lecturers is 3.36 with standard deviation of .71 that can be interpreted as slightly dissatisfied. Besides this, all facets of job satisfaction were found to be significantly associated with turnover intention. The highest correlation with turnover intention was of Pay, Promotion, Fringe benefits and contingent rewards. Overall job satisfaction was found to have a significant negative association with turnover intention.*

## Introduction

Private sector colleges disseminate education to hundreds of thousands of students of NWFP, Pakistan. Without education no country can prosper. It is education that enables a country to stand on her feet. I personally met more than twenty principals of private colleges in order to know about actual lecturers' turnover that was more than sixty percent on average. Dissatisfied employees create many problems for their organization in spite of solving its problems. For instance, they may not

---

\* Nazim Ali, PhD Research Scholar, Dept. of Management Science, Qurtuba University of Science & IT, D.I.Khan, Pakistan

want to teach in a way that is understandable to all students or they may dawdle way most time in immoral discussion or they may not motivate them or they may come to class late and leave the class earlier. Such behaviors definitely lead to poor results and the college may lose new admissions. Researchers have rightly observed that dissatisfied employees if remained in the organization may involve in counter-productive activities such as theft, poor service, destructive rumors and sabotage of equipment.<sup>1</sup> It has also been found that when employees are not satisfied, they report physical disturbances such as tension, depression, lassitude, apprehension and sleeplessness.<sup>2</sup> Dissatisfied employees also complain of stiffness in muscles and joints.<sup>3</sup> Besides these problems, employees' dissatisfaction gives rise to high level of turnover intention<sup>4</sup> which ultimately leads to actual turnover.<sup>5</sup> If the factors with which the employees are not satisfied, are not identified, they can give rise to severe problems for the organization i.e., the employees will show physical disturbances as mentioned above, they may complain of stiffness in muscles and joints or they may leave the organization which is very detrimental for the organization in form of direct and indirect cost. So these factors must be identified so as to overcome the problem of dissatisfaction because it is harmful for the smooth operation of organization.

High turnover brings destruction to the organization in the form of direct and indirect cost. According to Staw (1980) Expenditures incurred on the selection, recruitment, induction and training of new employees are direct cost.<sup>6</sup> According to Des & Shaw (2001) Cost of learning, reduced morale, pressure on the existing employees and the loss of social capital are the indirect cost incurred by an organization due to high turnover.<sup>7</sup>

## Literature Review

### Job satisfaction

Graham (1982, p. 68) defined Job satisfaction as "the measurement of one's total feelings and attitudes towards one's job".<sup>8</sup> Job satisfaction is the constellation of attitudes about job. Job satisfaction is how employees feel about different aspect of their job. Hoppock (1935, p. 47) defined job satisfaction as "any combination of psychological, physiological, and environmental circumstances that causes a person truthfully to say, 'I am satisfied with my job'".<sup>9</sup> Many scholars have measured the level of job satisfaction. For example Steven and John after collecting data through job satisfaction survey (JSS) concluded that the overall level of job satisfaction of software developers was 4.05 which can be interpreted as slightly satisfied.<sup>10</sup> Supervision, benefits, coworkers, nature of work had a high mean value of 4.827 (SD 1.214), 4.323 (SD 1.123), 4.641 (SD 0.958), 4.769 (SD 0.993) respectively which can be interpreted that software developers were moderately satisfied with supervision, benefits, coworkers and nature of work. They were slightly agree with pay (mean=3.629, SD= 1.301), contingent rewards (mean=3.850, SD= 1.259), working condition (mean=3.718, SD= 0.978), and communication (mean=3.722, SD= 1.128) while they were slightly dissatisfied with promotion (mean=2.951, SD= 1.263).

Similarly Sharaf at al (2008) measured the level of job satisfaction among primary care physicians.<sup>11</sup> They used JSS for collecting data. Overall physicians were slightly satisfied (Mean = 3.46, SD 0.67). They also found that physicians were moderately satisfied with supervision (Mean = 4.62, SD 1.20), coworkers (Mean = 4.58, SD .86) and nature of work (Mean = 4.69, SD 1.06) while slightly satisfied with communication (Mean = 3.80, SD 1.09). Physicians were slightly

dissatisfied with pay (Mean = 2.76, SD 1.26), promotion (Mean = 2.56, SD 1.12), fringe benefits (Mean = 2.65, SD 1.09), contingent rewards (Mean = 2.61, SD 1.15), and operating condition (Mean = 2.85, SD .71).

### **Turnover intention**

Turnover intention may be defined as the intention of employees to quit their organization. Price (1977) has defined “turnover” as the ratio of the number of organizational members who have left during the period being considered divided by the average number of people in that organization during the period.<sup>12</sup>

### **Job satisfaction and turnover intention**

Many studies conducted in different settings found a significant negative correlation between the facets of job satisfaction and turnover intention. Rahman et al (2008) found that job satisfaction had negative effect on turnover intentions of IT professional.<sup>13</sup> Khatri and Fern (2001) concluded that there was a modest relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions.<sup>14</sup> Sarminah (2006) found a moderate relationship between job satisfaction and turnover intentions.<sup>15</sup> Korunka et al (2005) also found a significant negative association between job satisfaction and turnover intentions.<sup>16</sup> According to Brough and Frame (2004) job satisfaction is a strong predictor of turnover intentions.<sup>17</sup> Steven and John conducted a study to assess job satisfaction facets and turnover intention of software developers.<sup>18</sup> They took nine facets of job satisfaction in order to see its impact on turnover intention. Turnover intention showed a significant negative correlation with all job satisfaction facets: pay ( $r = -.486, P < 0.001$ ), promotion ( $r = -.463, P < 0.001$ ), supervision ( $r = -.512, P < 0.000$ ), benefits ( $r = -.231, P < 0.01$ ), rewards ( $r = -.529, P < 0.000$ ), working condition ( $r = -.265, P < 0.003$ ),

workers ( $r = -.311, P < 0.000$ ), nature of work ( $r = -.375, P < 0.000$ ), communication ( $r = -.526, P < 0.000$ ).

### **Hypotheses**

Keeping in view the above discussion the following hypotheses are developed.

H1: There is a significant positive association between overall job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction.

H2: There is a significant negative association between facets of job satisfaction and turnover intention.

H3: There is a significant negative association between overall job satisfaction and turnover intention.

### **Methodology**

Data was collected through questionnaires from lecturers of private sector colleges of NWFP in the months of January and February 2009. I met lecturers personally in staff rooms during tea break and apprised them of the purpose for which the questionnaire would be used prior to administering questionnaires. So they completed it hardly within ten minutes and returned on the spot. Colleges were selected randomly and conveniently. 212 questionnaires were administered and collected.

### **Measures**

Job Satisfaction Survey (JSS) questionnaire developed by Spector<sup>19</sup> was used to measure the level of overall job satisfaction and satisfaction with its nine facets: pay, promotion, supervision, fringe benefits, contingent rewards, working condition, coworkers, nature of work and communication. It contains 36 items. JSS uses 6 likert scale containing six choices from 1 (disagree very much) to 6 (agree very much).

Questionnaire adapted from the Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire Cammann1979 was used for measuring the level of turnover intentions.<sup>20</sup> It uses 5 likert scale containing five choices from 1 (strongly disagree) to 5 (strongly agree).

Cronbach's Alfa for this sample is as follows:

Items	Cronbach's Alfa
Pay	0.924
promotion	0.964
supervision	0.981
Fringe Benefits	0.977
Contingent rewards	0.960
Operating Condition	0.970
Coworkers	0.945
Nature of Work	0.909
Communication	0.934
Turnover Intention	0.989

## Results

### Satisfaction with various facets:

Table 1 shows that lecturers of private sector colleges of NWFP are very much dissatisfied with promotion chances (Mean = 1.49, SD .55). They are moderately dissatisfied with three facets of job satisfaction: Pay (Mean = 2.04, SD .69), Fringe benefits (Mean = 1.87, SD .78) and contingent rewards (Mean = 1.68, SD .62) while moderately satisfied with operating condition (Mean = 4.66, SD .83), coworkers (Mean = 4.85, SD .74), nature of work (Mean = 4.678, SD .64) and communication (Mean = 4.97, SD .69).

Overall job satisfaction of private sector colleges' lecturers is 3.36 with standard deviation of .71 that can be interpreted as slightly dissatisfied.

**Table 1**  
**Descriptive Statistics**

	Mean	SD	N	Minimum	Maximum
Pay	2.0401	.69540	212	1	6
promotion	1.4965	.55528	212	1	6
supervision	3.8715	.79635	212	1	6
Fringe Benefits	1.8738	.77906	212	1	6
Contingent rewards	1.6863	.61917	212	1	6
Operating Condition	4.6592	.83521	212	1	6
Coworkers	4.8455	.74027	212	1	6
Nature of Work	4.7818	.63506	212	1	6
Communication	4.9735	.69423	211	1	6
Overall job satisfaction	3.3586	0.7055			

**Association of nine facets of job satisfaction with overall satisfaction (Correlation):**

Table 2 shows that overall job satisfaction has a strong positive association with all facets of job satisfaction: Pay ( $r = .72$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Promotion ( $r = .56$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Supervision ( $r = .45$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Fringe Benefits ( $r = .57$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Contingent Rewards ( $r = .55$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Operating Condition ( $r = .45$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Coworkers ( $r = .52$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Nature of Work ( $r = .47$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ), Communication ( $r = .50$ ,  $P < 0.001$ ). So the first hypothesis (H1) that there is a significant positive association between overall job satisfaction and facets of job satisfaction is accepted.

**Table 2**

		PAY	PR	SUP	FB	CR	OC	CW	NW	COM	OJS
OJS	P C	.72**	.56**	.45**	.57**	.55**	.45**	.520**	.466**	.504**	1
	S 2-t	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212

PC= Pearson Correlation; N= Number; S 2-t= Sig. (2-tailed); CW= Coworkers; Pay = Pay; OC= Operating Condition; PR= Promotion; SUP= Supervision; CR = Contingent Rewards; FB = Fringe benefits; NW= Nature of Work; COM= Communication; OJS = Overall job satisfaction

**Association of nine facets of Job Satisfaction with Turnover Intention (Correlation):**

Table 3 indicates the correlation between all facets of job satisfaction and turnover intention. A significant negative relationship was found between turnover intention and two facets of job satisfaction: Pay and (r = -.74, P < 0.001) and Promotion (r = -.57, P < 0.01) followed by Contingent rewards (r = -.42, P < 0.001) and Fringe benefits (r = -.41, P < 0.001). Other facets of job satisfaction also had a significant negative relationship with turnover intention. Thus the hypothesis (H2) that there is a significant negative association between facets of job satisfaction and turnover intention is accepted.

**Table 3**  
**Correlation**

		PAY	PR	SUP	FB	CR	OC	CW	NW	CM	TI
PAY	P C	1	.413**	.33**	.409**	.353**	.174*	.161*	.345**	.324**	-.74**
	S2-t		.000	.000	.000	.000	.011	.019	.000	.000	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212

PR	PC	.41**	1	.287**	.197**	.262**	.117	.226**	.204**	.172*	-.574**
	S2-t	.000		.000	.004	.000	.088	.001	.003	.012	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212
SUP	PC	.330**	.287**	1	.106	.076	.006	.066	.104	.149*	-.302**
	S2-t	.000	.000		.122	.268	.926	.342	.133	.031	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212
FB	PC	.409**	.197**	.106	1	.238**	.100	.194**	.214**	.233**	-.409**
	S2-t	.000	.004	.122		.000	.148	.005	.002	.001	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212
CR	PC	.353**	.262**	.076	.238**	1	.175*	.298**	.254**	.115	-.422**
	S2-t	.000	.000	.268	.000		.010	.000	.000	.096	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212
OC	PC	.174*	.117	.006	.100	.175*	1	.233**	.017	.186**	-.248**
	S 2-	.011	.088	.926	.148	.010		.001	.810	.007	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212
CW	P C	.161*	.226**	.066	.194**	.298**	.233**	1	.145*	.136*	-.313**
	S2-t	.019	.001	.342	.005	.000	.001		.035	.048	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212
NW	P C	.345**	.204**	.104	.214**	.254**	.017	.145*	1	.100	-.409**
	S2-t	.000	.003	.133	.002	.000	.810	.035		.147	.000
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212
CM	PC	.324**	.172*	.149*	.233**	.115	.186**	.136*	.100	1	-.354**
	S2-t	.000	.012	.031	.001	.096	.007	.048	.147		.000
	N	211	211	211	211	211	211	211	211	211	211
TI	P C	-.74**	-.57**	-.30**	-.41**	-.42**	-.25**	-.31**	-.41**	-.35**	1
	S 2-t	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212

PC= Pearson Correlation; N= Number; S 2-t= Sig. (2-tailed); CW= Coworkers; Pay = Pay; OC= Operating Condition; PR= Promotion; SUP= Supervision; CR = Contingent Rewards; FB = Fringe benefits; NW= Nature of Work; CM= Communication; TI= Turnover Intention

**Association of Turnover Intention with overall Job Satisfaction (Correlation):**

Table 4 indicates that overall job satisfaction has a significant negative correlation with turnover intention ( $r = -.77, P < 0.001$ ) of private sector colleges' lecturers. So the hypothesis that there is a significant negative association between overall job satisfaction and turnover intention is accepted.

**Table 4**

		PAY	PR	SUP	FB	CR	OC	CW	NW	COM	OJS	TI
OJS	P	.72**	.56**	.45**	.57**	.55**	.45**	.520**	.466**	.504**	1	-
	C											.765**
	S											
	2-	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	t											
	N	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	212	211	212	212

**Multiple Regressions**

Table 5 includes the correlation coefficient R and the coefficient of determination R Square. This model is significant at .001. The coefficient of determination .69 tells us that 69% of turnover intention can be attributed to the variables in table 6.

**Table 5**

**Linear Regression Model Summary**

Modal	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	F	Significant
1	.833	.694	.680	.39880	50.62	.000

**Table 6**

	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error		B	Std. Error
(Constant)	7.778	.345		22.533	.000
Pay	-.454	.053	-.444	-8.590	.000
promotion	-.343	.056	-.271	-6.079	.000
supervision	-.028	.038	-.031	-.737	.462
Fringe Benefits	-.070	.040	-.077	-1.747	.082
Contingent rewards	-.100	.050	-.088	-2.003	.047
Operating Condition	-.064	.035	-.076	-1.841	.067
Coworkers	-.087	.041	-.091	-2.135	.034
Nature of Work	-.147	.047	-.132	-3.122	.002

### Conclusion and discussion

Overall lecturers of private sector colleges of NWFP are slightly dissatisfied (Mean = 3.36, SD .71). They are very much dissatisfied with promotion chances (Mean = 1.49, SD .55). They are moderately dissatisfied with three facets of job satisfaction: Pay (Mean = 2.04, SD .69), Fringe benefits (Mean = 1.87, SD .78) and contingent rewards (Mean = 1.68, SD .62) while moderately satisfied with operating condition (Mean = 4.66, SD .83), coworkers (Mean = 4.85, SD .74), nature of work (Mean = 4.678, SD .64) and communication (Mean = 4.97, SD .69).

The principals and owners of private sector colleges must give special attention to four facets of job satisfaction of employees so as to increase their level of satisfaction and decrease the level of turnover

intention for turnover is very dangerous to every organization. Lecturers at present show a high level of turnover intention (4.051), it can be interpreted as agree to leave their organization.

Correlation results indicate that four factors are very important for turnover intention: Pay and ( $r = -.74, P < 0.001$ ) and Promotion ( $r = -.57, P < 0.01$ ), Contingent rewards ( $r = -.42, P < 0.001$ ) and Fringe benefits ( $r = -.41, P < 0.001$ ). For these four facets of satisfaction have a strong correlation with turnover intention of lecturers. So special attention is required to be paid to these four factors in order to surmount the problem of turnover.

## End Notes

- <sup>1</sup> Spector, P. E., (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences. London: Sage Publications.
- <sup>2</sup> Spector, P. E., (1997). Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences. London: Sage Publications.  
Frese, M., (1985). Stress at work and psychosomatic complaints: a causal interpretation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 70, 314-28.
- <sup>3</sup> O'Driscoll, M. P. & Beehr, T. A., (1994). Supervisor behaviors, role stressors and uncertainty as predictors of personal outcomes for subordinates. *Journal of Organisational Behavior*, 15, 141-155.
- <sup>4</sup> Vroom, V.H. (1964). Work and Motivation. New York: John Wiley & Sons.  
Rahman A, S. M. M. Raza Naqvi and M. Ismail Ramay (2008). Measuring Turnover Intention: A Study of IT Professionals in Pakistan, *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 4 (3), 45-55  
Sarminah Samad (2006). The Contribution of Demographic variables: Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intentions: *Journal of International Management Studies*, 1(1)  
Korunka, C., Hoonakker, P.L.T. & Carayon, P. 2005. 'A Universal Turnover Model for the IT Work Force - A Replication Study', Human Factors in Organizational Design and Management - VIII, edited by Carayon, Kleiner, Robertson and Hoonakker. Santa Monica, CA: IEA Press, pp. 467-472.
- <sup>5</sup> Griffeth, R. W., Hom, P. W. & Gaertner, S. 2000. A metaanalysis of antecedents and correlates of employee turnover: Update, moderator tests, and research implications for the next millennium. *Journal of Management*, 26, 463-488.  
Steers, R.M./Mowday, R.T. (1981). A Model of Voluntary Employee Turnover, in: Cummings, L./Staw, B. (eds.), Research in Organization Behavior, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press, 233-281.  
Mobley, W.H./Griffeth, R.W./Hand, H.H./Meglino, B.M. (1979). Review and Conceptual Analysis of the Employee Turnover Process, *Psychological Bulletin*, 86:493-522.  
Price, J.L./Mueller, C.W. (1986). Absenteeism and Turnover of Hospital Employees, Greenwich, CT: JAI Press.
- <sup>6</sup> Staw, B. M. (1980). The consequences of turnover. *Journal of Occupational Behavior*, 1, 253-273.
- <sup>7</sup> Dess GD, Shaw JD (2001). Voluntary turnover, social capital, and organizational performance, *Academy of Management Review*. 26 (3), 446-56.
- <sup>8</sup> Graham, G.H. (1982). Understanding human relations. The individual, organisations, and management. Science Research Associates, Chicago Inc.
- <sup>9</sup> Hoppock, R. (1935). Job satisfaction. New York: Harper and Brothers.

- 
- <sup>10</sup> Steven G. Westlund and John C. Hannon, retaining talent: assessing job satisfaction facets most significantly related to software developer turnover intentions: *Journal of Information Technology Management* ISSN #1042-1319
- <sup>11</sup> Sharaf E, Madan N and Sharaf A (2008). Physician Job Satisfaction in Primary Care, *Bahrain Medical Bulletin*, 30( 2)
- <sup>12</sup> Price, J.L (1977). *The study of turnover*, 1st edition, Iowa state university press, IA 10-25.
- <sup>13</sup> Rahman A, S. M. M. Raza Naqvi and M. Ismail Ramay (2008). Measuring Turnover Intention: A Study of IT Professionals in Pakistan: *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 4 (3):45-55
- <sup>14</sup> Khatri, N., & Fern, C. T. (2001). Explaining employee turnover in an Asian context', *Human Resource Management Journal*, 11(1):54-74.
- <sup>15</sup> Sarminah Samad (2006). The Contribution of Demographic variables: Job Characteristics and Job Satisfaction on Turnover Intentions: *Journal of International Management Studies*, 1(1)
- <sup>16</sup> Korunka, C., Hoonakker, P.L.T. & Carayon, P. 2005. 'A Universal Turnover Model for the IT Work Force - A Replication Study', *Human Factors in Organizational Design and Management - VIII*, edited by Carayon, Kleiner, Robertson and Hoonakker. Santa Monica, CA: IEA Press, pp. 467-472.
- <sup>17</sup> Brough, P. and Frame, P. (2004). Predicting Police Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions: The role of Social Support and Police Organizational Variables. *New Zealand Journal of Psychology*, 33(1):8-16.
- <sup>18</sup> Steven G. Westlund and John C. Hannon, retaining talent: assessing job satisfaction facets most significantly related to software developer turnover intentions: *Journal of Information Technology Management* ISSN #1042-1319
- <sup>19</sup> Spector PE. *Job Satisfaction, Application, Assessment, Causes and consequences*. 1st edition, Thousand Oaks, California: SAGE publications, 1997.
- <sup>20</sup> Cammann, C., Fichman, M., Jenkins, D. and Klesh, J. (1979). *The Michigan Organizational Assessment Questionnaire*. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, Michigan.