

Chapter 4

Research Findings

4.1 Introduction

The purpose of this study is to gauge the level of job satisfaction of air defence operators in the RMAF and to examine whether Herzberg's motivation and hygiene factors are related to job satisfaction. This chapter highlights the results of the research. It commences with the general profile of the respondents and the results of the analysis of personal characteristics. This is followed by the finding of reliability and normality test prior to the findings on overall job satisfaction of air defence operators as well as analyses of the variables that affect job satisfaction. The various methods used to test the hypotheses that have been developed are also discussed. Finally, multiple regression analyses are conducted to obtain the predictive power of the determinants of job satisfaction among the air defence operators.

4.2 Profile of Respondents

A total of 400 questionnaires were distributed to six designated air defence units but only 348 questionnaires were returned, out of which 340 were usable after data screening test and missing value were replaced with the mean value. Only eight returned questionnaires were discarded due to unacceptable incompleteness, giving the response rate of 85 percent. The number of respondents from respective unit and detail breakdown are shown in Table 4.2(a) and 4.2(b) respectively. Sqn 310, Sqn 320 and Sqn 340 had more respondents as they are the Sector Operation Center.

Table 4.2(a):
Respondents from Respective Air Defence Units.

SQN	Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
310	75	22.1	22.1	22.1
320	75	22.1	22.1	44.2
321	40	11.8	11.8	56
322	40	11.8	11.8	67.8
323	40	11.8	11.8	79.6
340	70	20.5	20.5	100.0
Total	340	100.0	100.0	

Table 4.2(b):
Respondents from Respective Air Defence Units According to Rank

RANK	SQUADRON						Total
	310	320	321	322	323	340	
Corporal and below	40	48	23	28	25	52	216
Sergeant/ Flight Sergeant	17	10	9	5	9	11	57
Warrant Officer	6	5	3	1	2	2	19
2Lt/Lt.Capt	9	8	3	3	4	4	31
Maj/Lt. Col	3	4	2	3	0	1	13
Total	75	75	40	40	40	70	340

4.3 Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 4.3 depicts the summary of the personal characteristic of the respondents. 12.9% of the respondents were from the officer category. The 2Lt/ Lt/ Capt constituted the majority at 9.1%, followed by the Major/Lieutenant Colonel at 3.8 %, and the other rank make up the remainder of 89.1%. Corporal and below comprised of the majority at 63.5%, Sergeant/Flight Sergeant and Warrant officer at 7.9% and 5.6% respectively.

The distribution of sample is well represented as it is consistent with air defense unit organization structure.

Majority of the respondents were in the age group of 21 to 30 at 71.1% while 20.9% were within the age group of 31 to 40, only 7.6% of the respondents were above the age of 41 to 50. There was only one officer above the age group of 51.

The majority of the respondents were male at 89%, female respondents were at 11% but considered to be well represented as a maximum of 8% of female are only allowed in air defence units total strength.

In term of time horizon, two characteristics were requested from the respondents: the number of years in the service and length of service in current appointment. The majority of respondents had served less than 10 years in service at 65.3%, followed by between 10 to 15 years at 22.9%. Those served 16 to 20 years constituted of 8.5% and a small proportion of the respondents served more than 21 years. Majority of respondents had served less than a year in current appointment at 67.9%. While 25.3% served between 1 to 2 years in current appointment, 5.9% had served between 2 to 3 years and only a small portion of the respondents served more than 4 years in current appointment.

The most common reported level of academic qualification at 76.8% was SPM holders. Next in line at 14.4% were those with STPM qualification. Only a small portion of respondents had Diploma's, while those with a degree / master qualifications were reported to be at 4.1% and 4.7% respectively.

Table 4.3:
Summary of Respondents Demographic Characteristics

		Frequency	Percentage
Rank	Corporal and below	216	63.5%
	Sergeant/Flight Sergeant	61	17.9%
	Warrant Officer	19	5.6%
	2Lt/Lt/Capt	31	9.1 %
	Maj/Lt Col	13	3.8%
Age Group	21-30	242	71.1%
	31-40	71	20.9%
	41-50	26	7.6%
	Above 50	1	0.3%
Gender	Male	301	89%
	Female	39	11%
Years of service	Less than 10 years	222	65.3%
	10-15 years	78	22.9%
	16-20 years	29	8.5%
	Above 21 years	11	3.2%
Highest Academic Qualification	SPM	261	76.8%
	STPM	49	14.4%
	Diploma	14	4.1%
	Degree/Master	16	4.7%
Length of Service in Current Appointment	Less than a year	231	67.9%
	1 to 2 years	86	25.3%
	2 to 3 years	20	5.9%
	3 to 4 years	2	.6%
	4 to 5 years	1	.3%
	More than 5 years	0	0%

4.4 Result of Reliability Test

The result obtained from Cronbach's Alpha test for various factors is tabulated in table 4.4. Since the results indicated the coefficient Alpha is more than 0.70, the instruments used to measure the dimensions were reliable. The overall value reliability at 0.969 indicated that the instrument used could be applied in future job satisfaction study in military setting.

Table 4.4:
Result of Reliability Test

Variable	Cronbach's Alpha	No of items
Overall Job Satisfaction	0.847	20
Salary	0.974	4
Superior-Subordinate	0.837	6
Peer relationship	0.841	6
Policy	0.882	5
Work conditions	0.798	4
Work itself	0.700	4
Promotion	0.892	4
Recognition	0.810	4
Achievement	0.851	4
Responsibility	0.741	4

4.5 Result of Normality Test

Table 4.5 shows the summary result of normality test obtained in this study. The test results confirm similarity range of value exist between the mean, median and mode, thus it fulfills the criteria of the normality test. In addition, the Skewness and Kurtosis value are within the range +/- 1.96 at significant level of 0.05. It further confirmed the data collected are normally distributed in this study; hence the other analyses of inferential statistical techniques can be explored.

Table 4.5:
Results of Normality Test

	Mean	Median	Mode	Skewness	Kurtosis
J. Satisfaction	2.9647	3.0000	3.00	.296	218
Salary	2.5007	2.7500	3.00	.203	-.533
Superior-Subordinate	2.8088	3.0000	3.00	-.004	-.480
Peer	2.8147	3.0000	3.00	.023	-.458
Policy	3.1500	3.0000	3.00	-.188	-.969
Work conditions	2.8044	3.0000	2.50	.080	-.366
Work itself	2.8463	3.0000	3.00	.003	-.377
Promotion	3.1074	3.0000	3.00	-.074	-.925
Recognition	2.8029	3.0000	2.50	.066	-.428
Achievement	2.8029	3.0000	2.50	.066	-.428
Responsibility	2.7985	2.5000	2.50	.283	-.434

4.6 Overall Job Satisfaction

This section determines the air defense operators perceived job satisfaction level. As explained in chapter 3, the satisfaction level is categorized into 3 levels: a mean score of 2.5 or below represented a low level of satisfaction; a mean scores which ranged from 2.5 and above to 3.5 and below indicated average satisfaction and a mean score of 3.5 or higher indicated a high degree of satisfaction (Weiss et al,1967). Table 4.6(a) shows the air defence operators' job satisfaction level.

Table 4.6(a):
Air Defence Operators' Job Satisfaction Level.

Satisfaction Level	Frequency	Percentage
Low Level of satisfaction	121	35.6
Average Satisfaction	130	38.2
High Degree of Satisfaction	89	26.1

The result indicated that 35.6 % of the respondents have low level of job satisfaction, 38.2 % have average job satisfaction, whereas, 26.1 % comprised of those who have high degree of job satisfaction. The number of respondents on low level of job satisfaction was relatively high; the results did not augur well for air defence operation as they are the vanguard's responsible to maintain the sovereignty and integrity of Malaysian airspace. However, the number of respondents with high degree of job satisfaction was also comparatively high; this could negate the negative effect on those with low level of job satisfaction on overall performance of air defence.

The cross tabulation data in Table 4.6(b) shows the relationship between job satisfaction and rank of air defence operators. The results indicated that Corporal and below had the highest figure of low level job satisfaction at 38.4%, whereas Warrant Officers had the highest figure of average level of job satisfaction at 52.6% and the highest figure obtained for high level of job satisfaction was from 2Lt/Lt/Capt at 83.9%. Overall, the rank and file has higher figure of low satisfaction level than officers.

Table 4.6(b):
Cross Tabulation Job Satisfaction and Rank

Satisfaction Level	Other Ranks			Officers		
	Cpl and below	Sgn/Flt Sgn	Warrant Officer	2Lt/Lt.Capt	Maj/Lt. Col	Total
Low	83(38.4%)	22(36%)	6(31.6%)	7(22.6%)	3(23%)	121(35.6%)
Average	86(39.8%)	22(36.1%)	10(52.6%)	8(25.8%)	4(31%)	130(38.2%)
High	47(21.8%)	17(27.9%)	3(15.8%)	16(83.9%)	6(46%)	89(26.1%)
Total	216	61	19	31	13	340

Table 4.6(c) shows that there was a slight variation of perception on job satisfaction level based on the gender of respondents. The female

respondents had higher low job satisfaction level than male respondent at 44.7% and 34.4 % respectively. Where by in the average job satisfaction level, the male respondents were higher at 38.7% and the female respondents were at 34.2%. The male respondents had 5.9% higher than female in high job satisfaction level than the female respondents.

Table 4.6(c):
Cross Tabulation Job Satisfaction and Gender

Satisfaction Level	Gender		Total
	Male (%)	Female (%)	
Low	104(34.4%)	17(44.7%)	121
Average	117(38.7%)	13(34.2%)	130
High	81(26.9%)	8(21%)	89
Total	302	38	340

The data in Table 4.6(d) shows that those in the age group of 21-30 at 38.4% have the lowest job level of satisfaction. Instead, the highest number for average level of job satisfaction was age group 41-50 at 50%. The age group of 31-40 at 30.1% recorded the second highest level of job satisfaction.

Table 4.6(d):
Cross Tabulation Job Satisfaction and Age Group

Satisfaction Level	Age of Group				Total
	21-30	31-40	41-50	above 50	
Low	93(38.4%)	22(30.1%)	6(23.1%)	0	121
Average	95(39.2%)	27(38%)	7(26.9%)	1	130
High	54(22.3%)	22(30.1%)	13(50 %)	0	89
Total	242	71	26	1	340

Table 4.6(e) indicates there was a distinct difference in between job satisfaction with academic qualifications. The results indicated that the highest number of low and average level of job satisfaction came from the group of SPM holders at 38.3% and 39.5% respectively. Diploma holders had a high job satisfaction level at their workplace at 50%. The finding may be related to the complexity and sophistication of current software driven and high technological equipment used in air defence system.

Table 4.6(e):
Cross Tabulation Job Satisfaction and Academic Qualification

Satisfaction Level	Academic Qualification				Total
	SPM	STPM	Diploma	Degree/Master	
Low	100(38.3%)	14(28.6%)	3(21.4%)	4(25%)	121
Average	103(39.5%)	18(36.7%)	4(28.6%)	5(31.3%)	130
High	58(22.2%)	17(34.7%)	7(50%)	7(43.7%)	89
Total	261	49	14	16	340

4.6.1 Descriptive Statistic Job Satisfaction and Independent Variables

Based on the five (5) points Likert type scale, with responses ranging from strongly disagree (1) to strongly agree (5), the following mean satisfaction score with hygiene and motivation factor obtained as indicated in table 4.6.1.

Table 4.6.1:
Mean and Standard Deviation for Hygiene and Motivation Factor

Variable	Mean	SD	Variable	Mean	SD
Hygiene Factor			Motivation Factor		
Salary	2.5	1.06	Work itself	2.85	.644
Subordinate- superior	2.81	.658	Promotion	3.11	.698
Peer	2.81	.655	Achievement	2.80	.653
Policy	3.15	.698	Recognition	2.81	.653
Work Condition	2.80	.645	Responsibility	2.79	.628

The results indicated that the air defence operators have average level of satisfaction with policy and promotion in hygiene and motivation factor respectively as the means obtained were more than 3. Overall the air defense operators have lower than average level of satisfaction with other factors as listed above. Salary was the lowest mean obtained with only 2.5.

4.7 Hypotheses Testing

This section describes the various methods used to test the hypotheses that have been developed. Pearson product-moment correlation was used to test these hypotheses developed for Hygiene and Motivation factors as stated below:

H1: There is a positive relationship between salary and overall job satisfaction.

H2: There is a positive relationship between superior-subordinate relationship and overall job satisfaction.

H3: There is a positive relationship between relationship with peers and overall job satisfaction.

H4a: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of adequate work equipment and resources and overall job satisfaction.

H4b: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of a safe work environment and overall job satisfaction.

H4c: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of sufficient physical work space and overall job satisfaction.

H5a: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions on the importance of work itself and overall job satisfaction.

H5b: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of the sense of achievement and overall job satisfaction.

H5c: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of being recognized for a good job achieved and overall job satisfaction.

H5d: There is a positive relationship between operators' perceptions of promotion opportunities and overall job satisfaction.

H5e: There is a positive relationship between operators' perceptions of their responsibility and overall job satisfaction.

ANOVA was used to test the hypotheses on personal characteristics as stated below:

H6a: There is a positive relationship between operator's age and overall job satisfaction.

H6b: There is no relationship between operator's gender and overall job satisfaction.

H6c: There is a positive relationship between operator's academic qualification and overall job satisfaction.

H6d: There is a positive relationship operator's rank and overall job satisfaction.

4.7.1 Pearson Correlation

Pearson correlation was used for hypotheses testing on Hygiene and Motivation factors. In addition this test could also be used to indicate the relationship between the dependent variable and independent variables. Table 4.7.1(a) depicts the results of the correlation.

Table 4.7.1(a):
Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Independent Variables

Dependent Variable		Independent Variables: Hygiene Factors				
Job Satisfaction		Salary	Superior	Peer	Policy	Condition
	Pearson Correlation	.449(**)	.356(**)	.353(**)	-.062	.361(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.251	.000
	N	340	340	340	340	340

Table 4.7.1(a): continue

Dependent Variable		Independent Variables: Motivation				
Job Satisfaction		Promotion	Itself	Recognition	Achievement	Responsibility
	Pearson Correlation	-.080	.309(**)	.351(**)	.351(**)	.368(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.142	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	340	340	340	340	340

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results revealed that the correlations between job satisfaction and independent variables were moderate and positively related with significant level of 99% except for policy and promotion variables. The policy and

promotion independent variables could not be used as the significant level ($p > 0.05$) and the coefficient correlation values were also below 0.3 (Sekaran, 2003).

In order to test the hypotheses developed under the work condition, Pearson correlation were conducted using the respective single sub scale of work condition's instruments as attached in Part II, Section E Work Conditions of Appendix 1. Table 4.7.1(b) indicates the result of correlation between availability of equipment and resources, safe work environment, sufficient work space and job satisfaction. The result indicated correlation between job satisfaction and equipment and resources availability were moderate ($r = .374$) and positively related with significant level of 99%. Whereas, the correlation between job satisfaction and safe work environment were moderate ($r=.455$) and positively related with significant level of 99%. The amount of physical work space in the work environment did not reach the expected level of statistical significance of $p < 0.05$ ($p = .284$) and the coefficient correlation values -0.58 was very low.

Table 4.7.1(b):
Correlation between Availability of Equipment and Resources, Safe Work Environment, Sufficient Work Space and Job Satisfaction.

		Satisfaction	Availability of Eqpt & Resources	Safe work environment	Sufficient Work Space
Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1	.374(**)	.455(**)	-.058
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.284
	N		340	340	340

** : Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

In addition to the above, Pearson correlation was also conducted to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and hygiene and motivation factors. However, policy and promotion variables were omitted, since both

the variables have no significant relationship with job satisfaction. The results obtained are shown in Table 4.7.1(c).

Table 4.7.1(c):
Correlation between Job Satisfaction, Hygiene and Motivation Factors

		SATISFACTION	HYGIENE	MOTIVATION
satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1	.361**	.317**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000
	N	340	340	340

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The results indicated the correlation coefficients were .361 for job Satisfaction -hygiene factors and for .317 job Satisfaction- motivation factors. There are both statistically significant with the level set at .01

4.7.2 ANOVA

ANOVA was used to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and the person characteristics of air defence operators as the control variables. The control variables used in this study were age, gender, academic qualification and rank. Table 4.7.2 indicates the result of ANOVA between job satisfaction and personal characteristics.

Table 4.7.2:
ANOVA between Job Satisfaction and Personal Characteristics.

ANOVA					
	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Satisfaction and age					
Between Groups	1.726	3	.575	1.573	.196
Within Groups	122.851	336	.366		
Total	124.576	339			
Satisfaction & gender					
Between Groups	.209	1	.209	.569	.451
Within Groups	124.367	338	.368		
Total	124.576	339			
Satisfaction & academic qualification					
Between Groups	2.654	3	.885	2.438	.064
Within Groups	121.923	336	.363		
Total	124.576	339			
Satisfaction and operator's rank					
Between Groups	2.820	4	.705	1.940	.103
Within Groups	121.756	335	.363		
Total	124.576	339			

The results indicated there was no significant difference between job satisfaction with age, gender, academic qualification and operator's rank of personal characteristics since the significant level of these factors $p > 0.05$ and the F ratio (F) obtained from the respective personal characteristics factor was less than the value of Degree of freedom (Df) (Healey, 2005).

4.7.3 Discussion of Results.

The relationship between job satisfaction and independent variables as in table 4.7.1(a) indicated policy and promotion independent variables have no effect on job satisfaction among the air defence operators. Hence, the

hypotheses developed under these factors were accepted except **H5d**: there is a positive relationship between operators' perceptions of promotion opportunities and overall job satisfaction was rejected. The results may reflect that the policies and standard operating procedures adopted by air defence squadrons were well laid down as well as the operator were trained to strictly follow order. With regard to promotion for the rank and file, air defence has well structured career progression chart as compared to other branches, this inevitable lead to high satisfaction in this expect. However, the result was not consistent with Tahir (2000) and Ellickson et al. (2002) finding, where they found that promotion opportunities were positively related to job satisfaction.

The correlation results between job satisfaction and sub scale of work conditions as in table 4.7.1(b) indicated that there was no correlation between job satisfaction and sufficient work space. As such, **H4c**: there is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of sufficient physical work space and overall job satisfaction was not substantiated. The outcome of this result could be due to indoctrination of earlier training where airmen were trained to work under adverse and difficult environment. Conversely, the correlation between job satisfaction and equipment and resources availability and safe work environment were moderate and positively related with significant level of 99%. Hence hypotheses **H4a** and **H4b** developed under these sub scale were accepted.

The correlation results between job satisfactions, hygiene and motivation factors as in Table 4.7.1(c) were moderate and positively related with significant level of 99%. This is consistent to Castillo and Cano (2004) findings. Since hygiene factors and motivation factors correlate almost

equally with job satisfaction, air defence operators must be satisfied with both types of factors to be overall satisfied with their job.

The ANOVA results as in table 4.7.2 indicated there was no significant difference between job satisfaction with age, gender, academic qualification and operator's rank of personal characteristics. Hence, the hypotheses of **H6a**, **H6c** and **H6d** were rejected. H6b was accepted as it stated there is no relationship between air defence operator's gender and overall job satisfaction.

The finding of no relationship between job satisfaction and operator's age was consistent with Scott et al (2005) finding. However it was not consistent to Brush, Mock, and Pooyan (1987), where they found that an increase in the employee age is likely to be associated with enhanced positions of organizational authority, prestige, status, and confidence, which lead to job satisfaction.

The finding of no relationship between academic qualification and overall job satisfaction was not consistent to Jayaratne (1993) study, which stated that employees with higher academic qualification would tend to experience greater job satisfaction compared to those who has lower academic qualification.

The finding of no relationship between job satisfaction and positive relationship operator's rank and overall job satisfaction may reflect that the promotion system adopted in air defence organization is wisely accepted and the duties and responsibilities are appropriate and corresponding with the rank structure.

Table 4.7.3 summarizes the results of Pearson Correlation and ANOVA test for hypotheses testing

Table 4.7.3:
Summary Results of Pearson Correlation and ANOVA Test

S/no	Description	Result
Hypothesis		
1	H1: There is a positive relationship between salary and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
2	H2: There is a positive relationship between superior-subordinate relationship and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
3	H3: There is a positive relationship between relationship with peers and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
4	H4a: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of adequate work equipment and resources and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
5	H4b: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of a safe work environment and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
6	H4c: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of sufficient physical work space and overall job satisfaction.	Rejected
7	H5a: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions on the importance of work itself and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
8	H5b: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of the sense of achievement and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
9	H5c: There is a positive relationship between operator's perceptions of being recognized for a good job achieved and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
10	H5d: There is a positive relationship between operators' perceptions of promotion opportunities and overall job satisfaction.	Rejected
11	H5e: There is a positive relationship between operators' perceptions of their responsibility and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
12	H6a: There is a positive relationship between operator's age and overall job satisfaction.	Rejected

	Table 4.7.3:continue	
13	H6b: There is no relationship between operator's gender and overall job satisfaction.	Accepted
14	H6c: There is a positive relationship between operator's academic qualification and overall job satisfaction.	Rejected
15	H6d: There is a positive relationship operator's rank and overall job satisfaction.	Rejected
Objective		
1	Examine the relationship of hygiene factors (which includes monetary rewards, supervisor-subordinate relationship, relationship with peer, policy and administration, working conditions) and job satisfaction.	Yes
2	Examine the relationship of motivation factors (which includes achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, and advancement) and job satisfaction.	Yes
3	Examine the relationship between person characteristics of air defence operators and their job satisfaction	No

4.8 Multiple Regressions

The correlation has determined the relationship between independent variables and job satisfaction. However, there is no result of the predictive power of the determinants. In this study, multiple regression analyses were conducted to further explore the underlying factors. It should be noted that inter-correlations between the job satisfaction, motivation factors and hygiene factors as in table 4.7.1(a) indicated that collinearity was not a problem when the factors were entered into a regression equation model.

Multiple Regressions analysis was conducted between job satisfaction and the variables of hygiene factor and the results is as shown in table 4.8(a).

Table 4.8(a):
Standard Regression Results of Job Satisfaction and Hygiene Variables

Model	R Square	F Value	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T Value	Sig
Regression	.205	21.514			.000*
Salary			.458	5.482	.000
Superior			.304	.813	.417
Work condition			.176	.821	.412
Peer			-.490	-1.131	.259

The results indicates that the hygiene variables together explained 20.5% (R squared=.205) of job satisfaction among air defence operators. The F- value of 21.514 is significant at the 0.0001 level. Salary was the only significant predictor of job satisfaction in hygiene factor (B =.458, $p < 0.05$). When subordinate-superior relationship was also included in the regression equation, ($p =.417$, $p > 0.05$) was insignificant predictor of job satisfaction and Beta standardized coefficient reduced to .304. This suggested that subordinate-superior relationship was partially related to job satisfaction. The same explanation is applied to work condition and peer relationship variables as the both $p > 0.05$. Salary was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction in the hygiene factors.

When work itself, achievement, responsibility and recognition variables of motivation factor were regressed against job satisfaction and the results is as shown table 4.8(b).

Table 4.8(b):

Standard Regression Results of Job Satisfaction and Motivation Variables

Model	R Square	F Value	Standardized Coefficients Beta	T Value	Sig
Regression	.168	22.573			.000*
Work Itself			-.188	-1.522	.129
Achievement			.360	3.004	.003
Responsibility			.270	4.203	.000
Recognition	Excluded				

The results reveal that 16.8% of the variance (R squared=.0.168) of job satisfaction has been significant explained by the two variables in motivation factor. The achievement variable was the highest predictor of operators' job satisfaction in motivation factor (B =.360, p = 0.03). The responsibility variable was the other predictor of job satisfaction (B =.270, p = 0.0001). Work itself variable was partially related to job satisfaction. Based on the result of regression, it is essential to provide sufficient training and personal development to accomplish the operators' achievement in their undertaking. Similarly, the respondents' view their responsibilities were important contributions toward the defence of the nation, it augur well for the profession and every effort must continue to give each individual a chance to use the skill and knowledge to the maximum. These will inevitably increase the overall job satisfaction.

The results of the two Multiple Regression Analyses indicated that the multicollinearity was not a problem in this study as no pair of independent variables was correlated above .60, and regression of each independent variable on all remaining independent variables revealed no coefficient of determination R Square stronger than .43. (Lewis-Beck, 1980),

Finally, the selected variables salary, achievement and recognition were regressed against job satisfaction and the result is as shown in table 4.8(c).

Table 4.8(c):
Standard Regress of Job Satisfaction and Selected Variables

Model	R Square	F Value	Standardized Coefficient Beta	T Value	Sig
Regression	.202	28.375		11.769	.000*
Salary			.439	4.123	.000
Achievement			-.026	-.318	.750
Responsibility			.039	.501	.617

The multiple regressions revealed that salary was the only distinct factor that could explain the variability among overall job satisfaction and accounted for 20.2% of the variance in the level of overall job satisfaction. The achievement and responsibility were not the significant predictors since both the significant levels $p > 0.005$. In summary, the salary is the strongest predictor of job satisfaction among air defence operators and therefore salary factor must be increased in order to improve overall job satisfaction.

4.9 Summary

The finding of this study provided information about the air defence operators' level of job satisfaction and the relationship between Herzberg's Motivation and Hygiene Factors and overall job satisfaction. The results showed that air defence operators in this sample had a lower than average level of job satisfaction. It was also found that hygiene and motivation factors

correlated moderate and positively with job satisfaction, suggesting that job satisfaction among air defence operators are related to both types of factors. However, it was found that there was no relationship the between person characteristics of air defence operators and their job satisfaction. The analysis revealed that eight of the ten independent variables tested were statistically significant factors of job satisfaction. As such, five of the fifteen hypotheses developed in relation to these factors were rejected. Despite the ten variables were used in the hygiene and motivation factors, the finding reveal that only 21.4 % of the variance of job satisfaction has been significant explained by the ten variables. The study has identified that salary was the strongest predictor of job satisfaction among air defence operators.