

# ***THE INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF BUSINESS & MANAGEMENT***

## **The Effect of Distress on Job Satisfaction and Intention to Quit by It Professionals in India**

**V. Sreecharan**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, RIIMS, Tirupati, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, India

**S. Gautami**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, RIIMS, Tirupati, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, India

**V. Satish Kumar**

Assistant Professor, Department of Management Studies, RIIMS, Tirupati, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, India

**Dr. K. Tirumalaiah**

Associate Professor, Department of Management Studies, RIIMS, Tirupati, Chittoor District, Andhra Pradesh, India

### ***Abstract:***

*Employees in any organization face changing demands within the dynamic environments of business and technology development. Due to the competitive nature of the job environment most of the people in the world are spending their time for job related work purposes, resulting ignore the stressor those are influencing their work and life. Such constant changes create stressful working situations, as a result, the job satisfaction of employees is usually low and their job turnovers are high. Previous studies focused on job stress and job satisfaction of employees revealed that high levels of work stress are associated with low levels of job satisfaction and job stressors are predictive of job dissatisfaction and a greater propensity to leave the organization (Cummins, 1990). This study examined the relationship between organizational role stress and job satisfaction levels of employees. It covers the impact of different dimensions of organizational role stress, i.e. self-role distance, role ambiguity, role isolation & role inadequacy on the job satisfaction of the employees.*

**Keywords:** *Job stress, job satisfaction, self-role distance, role ambiguity, role isolation & role inadequacy*

### **1. Introduction**

Job-satisfaction has been defined as the positive orientation of an individual towards the work role which he / she is presently occupying (Vroom, 1964). The dissatisfaction of employee will lead to less work commitment and high turnover from the organization, as well as physical withdrawal. On the other hand, job dissatisfaction not only increases intention to quit but also reduce the contribution of the employee to the organization growth.

Employee turnover is a major issue for companies in many Asian countries such as Singapore, Hong Kong, South Korea, Malaysia and India (Khatri et al. 2001). Employee is a valuable asset for the organization.

Kriti et al. (2012) conducted a study to find out the role of stressors on mental well-being of the lawyers. Further, they examined the relationship between occupational stress and job satisfaction. A cross sectional study was conducted in Dist. Court Sangli (Maharashtra, India), which involved the collection of data using predesigned proforma. By using a Systematic Random sampling technique, a total of 120 lawyers out of 240 consisting of 76 males and 44 females were interviewed. Presumptive Stress Life Event Scale (PSLES) was used as a validated screening tool to calculate their Mental Stress Score. The study found that 88.3% lawyers had experienced stress. The results showed that the female lawyers were experiencing significantly greater stress and burnouts as compared to males. Finally, they found job satisfaction was significantly and negatively correlated with stress.

Seema and Vishal (2013) analyzed the various dimensions of Organizational Role Stress like role stagnation, role overload; inter role distance, role ambiguity and role expectation conflict in relation to job satisfaction on employees of different organizations in Surat region (India). The data & Information have been collected from 250 employees selected by simple random sampling and by using a structured questionnaire using Likert five point scales. Using ANOVA, correlation and regression study found the correlation and causal effect between stress dimension and job satisfaction in addition variance with demographic factors.

### **2. Objectives**

1. To test the effect of occupational stress on job satisfaction and intention to quit.
2. To suggest suitable measures for reducing occupational stress to the IT companies.

- H01: Each organizational stressor is not significantly related to respondents' job satisfaction.

This hypothesis was framed to empirically test the effect of organizational stressors considered in the present study on the respondents' job satisfaction. The linear regression analysis was performed to examine the model assumed between organizational stressors and job satisfaction. The linear regression was calculated based on the 'Enter' method.

Table 1 shows that 47.7 % of variance in job satisfaction is explained by the model, which is quite a worthy result when compared with some of the previous studies. The table also displays the "Durbin-Watson test for autocorrelation" which is a statistic that indicates the likelihood that the deviation (error) values for the regression. The Durbin-Watson value represents no autocorrelation which means the values are independent.

Model Summary <sup>b</sup>					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.690 <sup>a</sup>	.477	.465	.25322	1.526

Table 1: Regression Model Testing between Organizational Stressors and Job Satisfaction – Model Summary

a. Predictors: (Constant), RIN, RE, IRD, PI, RS, RI, REC, RA, SRD, RO

b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Table 2 displays the ANOVA Test results of the model tested by using the linear regression analysis. The analysis of variance conducted by considering job satisfaction as dependent variable (a) and all the organizational stressors considered as independent variable (b) displayed significance value less than 0.05 (p=0.000) with F value as 42.889. This shows that the model displayed statistical significant relationship between the predictors' i.e. independent variables and the job satisfaction i.e. dependent variable.

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	27.500	10	2.750	42.889	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	30.200	471	.064		
	Total	57.701	481			

Table 2: Regression Model Testing – ANOVA Results on Job Satisfaction

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), RIN, RE, IRD, PI, RS, RI, REC, RA, SRD, RO

- H02: Each organizational stressor is not significantly related to respondents' intention to quit their job

This hypothesis was framed to test the effect of organizational stressors on the intention to quit the job among the IT professionals. Similar to the previous hypothesis testing, the linear regression analysis was performed to examine the statistical significant relationship between the stressors considered and intention to quit by 'Enter' method.

Table 3 shows that 45.6 % of variance in the intention to quit job is explained by the model. The "Durbin-Watson test for autocorrelation" is 2.383. As the Durbin-Watson value is close to '2' which represents no autocorrelation i.e. the values are independent.

Model Summary <sup>b</sup>					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.676 <sup>a</sup>	.456	.445	.48764	2.383

Table 3: Regression Model Testing between Organizational Stressors and Intention to quit – Model Summary

a. Predictors: (Constant), Overall Stressors, IRD, RE, RI, RS, RA, PI, REC, RO, RIN b. Dependent Variable: Intention to Quit

Table 4 displays the ANOVA Test results of the model tested by using the linear regression analysis. The analysis of variance conducted by considering intention to quit as dependent variable (a) and all the organizational stressors considered as independent variable (b) displayed significance value less than 0.000 (p<0.05) with F value as 39.548. This shows that the model displayed statistical significant relationship between the predictors' i.e. independent variables and the intention to quit i.e. dependent variable.

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	94.041	10	9.404	39.548	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	112.000	471	.238		
	Total	206.041	481			

Table 4: Regression Model Testing – ANOVA Results on Intention to quit ANOVA

a. Dependent Variable: Intention to Quit

b. Predictors: (Constant), Overall Stressors, IRD, RE, RI, RS, RA, PI, REC, RO, RIN

- H03: There is no significant relationship between occupational stress levels and job satisfaction

One of the major objectives of the present study was to analyse the effects of occupational stress on the job satisfaction. This hypothesis was to test and analyse the effects of occupational stress on the job satisfaction. A linear regression was employed to examine this hypothesis framed.

Table 5 displays the regression test results conducted. From the table, it can be observed that 60.2 % of variance in job satisfaction can be explained by the occupational stress level, which was quite noteworthy (R<sup>2</sup>=0.602).

Model Summary <sup>b</sup>					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.776 <sup>a</sup>	.602	.599	.21943	1.537

Table 5: Regression Model Testing between Occupational Stress and Job Satisfaction

Table 6 displays the ANOVA Test results of the model tested by using the linear regression analysis. The analysis of variance conducted by considering job satisfaction as dependent variable (a) and the occupational stress level considered as independent variable (b) displayed significance value is 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ) with F value as 180.331. This shows that the model displayed statistical significant relationship between the predictors' i.e. independent variables and the job satisfaction i.e. dependent variable.

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
	Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	34.733	4	8.683	180.331	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	22.968	477	.048		
	Total	57.701	481			

Table 6: Regression Model Testing – ANOVA Results on Job Satisfaction

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

b. Predictors: Routine Hassles at Work, Stress Related Behaviour, Self-Analysis & Habitual Changes

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
	Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.376	.077		17.787	.000
	Self-Analysis	.206	.020	.358	10.190	.000
	Stress Related Behaviour	.210	.020	.424	10.259	.000
	Habitual Changes	-.023	.025	-.046	-.951	.342
	Routine Hassles at Work	.191	.025	.266	7.619	.000

Table 7: Regression Model Testing – t test Results on Job Satisfaction Coefficients

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Hence, H03 (i.e. null hypothesis) is rejected

Table 7 displays the t test results conducted at Regression model testing. From the table it can be noted that all the considered occupational stress factors have shown significant values of p ( $p < 0.05$ ) except the habitual changes. The overall model tested has shown a good amount of variance and significant p values in ANOVA test employed. Thus, it can be stated that there is a significant effect of occupational stress on the job satisfaction among the IT professionals.

- H04: There is no significant relationship between occupational stress and Intention to quit

Similar to the previous hypothesis, the present hypothesis was framed to examine the effect of occupational stress on the intention to quit the job among IT professionals. A linear regression was employed to examine this hypothesis framed. Table 8 displays the regression test results conducted. From the table, it can be observed that 11.5 % of variance in intention to quit can be explained by the occupational stress level ( $R^2=0.115$ ). The Durbin Watson value also displayed no auto correlation.

Model Summary <sup>b</sup>					
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Durbin-Watson
1	.339 <sup>a</sup>	.115	.107	.61836	2.236

Table 8: Regression Model Testing between Occupational Stress and Intention to quit

Table 9 displays the ANOVA Test results of the model tested. The table displayed significance value less than 0.000 ( $p < 0.05$ ) with an F value as 15.464. This shows that the model displayed the statistical significant effect of occupational stress on the intention to quit the job.

ANOVA <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	23.652	4	5.913	15.464	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	182.390	477	.382		
	Total	206.041	481			

Table 9: Regression Model Testing – ANOVA Results on Intention to Quit ANOVA

a. Dependent Variable: Intention to Quit

b. Predictors: (Constant), Routine Hassles at Work, Stress Related Behaviour, Self-Analysis, Habitual Changes

Table 10 shows the t test results conducted in Regression model testing. From the table it can be noted that all the considered occupational stress variables has shown significant values of p ( $p < 0.05$ ) except the 'routine hassles at work' variable. As the overall model tested has shown statistical significance, it can be stated that there is an effect of occupational stress levels on the intention to quit.

Coefficients <sup>a</sup>						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.173	.218		9.966	.000
	Self-Analysis	.166	.057	.153	2.924	.004
	Stress Related Behaviour	.363	.058	.387	6.288	.000
	Habitual Changes	-.430	.069	-.451	-6.215	.000
	Routine Hassles at Work	-.046	.071	-.034	-.655	.513

Table 10: Regression Model Testing – t test Results on Intention to Quit Coefficients Model

a. Dependent Variable: Intention to Quit

Hence, H04 (i.e. null hypothesis) is rejected.

The present study examined the job satisfaction of IT professionals based on the job satisfaction scale (Spector, 1985). A total of sixteen statements were used with five point scale to measure the job satisfaction of the IT professionals in India. In this, eight statements were negatively worded and were reversed while coding. Proper care was taken to cover all the important factors of job satisfaction such as pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, communication, supervision, co-workers and organizational politics.

From the table, it can be observed that IT professionals are positive in response to their job satisfaction. The highest mean of all the statements was observed for the statement ‘I like the people I work with’ (mean=3.76) and the lowest mean was observed for the statement ‘My superior is unfair to me’ (mean=2.62). The overall mean is 3.14 for job satisfaction scale.

Sl. No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	S.D.
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	112 (23.2)	92 (19.1)	72 (14.9)	200 (41.5)	6 (1.2)	2.78	1.242
2*	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	36 (7.5)	45 (9.3)	155 (32.2)	234 (48.5)	12 (2.5)	3.29	0.945
3	My superior is quite competent in doing his/her job.	-	76 (15.8)	276 (57.3)	130 (27.0)	-	3.11	0.645
4*	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	-	63 (13.1)	296 (61.4)	87 (18.0)	36 (7.5)	3.20	0.756
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	6 (1.2)	99 (20.5)	87 (18.0)	278 (57.7)	12 (2.5)	3.40	0.881
6*	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	36 (7.5)	82 (17.0)	277 (57.5)	61 (12.7)	26 (5.4)	2.91	0.898
7	I like the people I work with.	-	58 (12.0)	127 (26.3)	171 (35.5)	126 (26.1)	3.76	0.974
8*	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	54 (11.2)	132 (27.4)	187 (38.8)	60 (12.4)	49 (10.2)	2.83	1.108
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	36 (7.5)	26 (5.4)	165 (34.2)	243 (50.4)	2 (2.5)	3.35	0.914
10	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	14 (2.9)	25 (5.2)	211 (43.8)	186 (38.6)	46 (9.5)	3.47	0.848
11*	My superior is unfair to me.	44 (9.1)	164 (34.0)	204 (42.3)	70 (14.5)	-	2.62	0.842
12	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	6 (1.2)	155 (32.2)	221 (45.9)	94 (19.5)	6 (1.2)	2.87	0.776
13*	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	-	97 (20.1)	195 (40.5)	184 (38.2)	6 (1.2)	3.21	0.769
14*	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	34 (7.1)	77 (16.0)	212 (44.0)	147 (30.5)	12 (2.5)	3.05	0.919
15	I like doing the things I do at work.	-	64 (13.3)	120 (24.9)	222 (46.1)	76 (15.8)	3.64	0.901
16*	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	18 (3.7)	203 (42.1)	192 (39.8)	63 (13.1)	6 (1.2)	2.66	0.798
<b>Overall ‘JOB SATISFACTION’</b>							<b>3.14</b>	<b>0.346</b>

Table 11: Job Satisfaction (N=482)

Notes: “-” indicates no response; “\*” indicates negatively scored items and Values in brackets represent percentages  
 Anchors: 1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree and 5 – Strongly agree

### 3. Intention to Quit

Intention to leave refers to conscious and deliberate willfulness to leave the organization. In order to examine the IT professionals' intention to quit their organizations, a self-construct three item scale was developed and was tested against its reliability. Table 1.12 shows the distribution of the responses of the sample respondents to the three itemed scale on a five point scale.

S No	Statement	1	2	3	4	5	Mean	S.D.
1	I often think about quitting because of stress in my current job	82 (17.0)	222 (46.1)	160 (33.2)	6 (1.2)	12 (2.5)	2.26	0.842
2	It is very likely that I will actively look for a new job in the next year due to stress in my current job	18 (3.7)	195 (40.5)	255 (52.9)	14 (2.9)	-	2.55	0.617
3	I will leave the company in the next year due to stress	89 (18.5)	205 (42.5)	168 (34.9)	20 (4.1)	-	2.25	0.800
Overall 'INTENTION TO QUIT'							2.35	0.655

Table 12: Intention to Quit (N=482)

Notes: Anchors: “-” indicates no response; and Values in brackets represent percentages  
1 – Strongly disagree, 2 – Disagree, 3 – Neutral, 4 – Agree and 5 – Strongly agree

From the table, it can be observed that the intention to quit the job is negative for the IT professionals. The means of all the statements are close to each other ranging from 2.25 to 2.55. The overall mean is 2.35 for the 'Intention to quit' scale. Thus, from the table 1.11 and 1.12, it can be inferred that for IT professionals, though the job satisfaction is slightly crossing the neutral mark, i.e. 3.14, the intention to quit is on the negative side. This might be because of the other factors such as recession in IT sector and limited job vacancies in the IT sector.

### 4. References

1. Seema A.S. and Vishal J.M. (2013), “A Study on Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Job Satisfaction”, Paripex – Indian Journal of Research, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 212 – 214.
2. Cummins, R. C. (1990), “Job Stress and the Buffering Effort of Supervisory Support”, Group and Organizational Studies, Vol. 15, No. 1, pp. 92 – 104.
3. Vroom, V. H. (1964), “Work and Motivation”, New York: Wiley
4. Kriti Patel, A., Shekhar R.S. & Jayashree N.D. (2012), “Occupational Stress and Burnouts as Predictors of Job Satisfaction amongst Lawyers in District Sangli”, National Journal of Medical Research, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 141 – 144.
5. Seema A.S. and Vishal J.M. (2013), “A Study on Relationship between Organizational Role Stress and Job Satisfaction”, Paripex – Indian Journal of Research, Vol. 2, No. 2, pp. 212 – 214.