CHAPTER 4

RESEARCH RESULTS

4.0 Chapter Overview

This chapter prepared the research results and findings from the survey. This chapter was divided to four sections. The analyses begin by describing the general demographic characteristics of the respondents. Subsequently, factor analysis was conducted prior testing the entire variable in this study. This was followed by Normality Test for distribution, Cronbach's Alpha for reliability coefficient, T-test, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), Pearson correlation analysis and Multiple Regression Analysis on variables. The result of the study will be discussed in accordance to the research objectives and the hypotheses of the study.

4.1 Response Rate

A total of 515 questionnaires were distributed to targeted respondents who were working in different departments/units/levels under Kuala Lumpur Police Contingent Headquarters administration. Only 452 questionnaires were returned up to March 2012, with the response rate of 88%. However, the number was then reduced to 423 after the data had been screened, checked and cleaned. Sekaran (2009) suggested for a population of 7,858, the recommended sampling size is 364 respondents. Therefore, the number of respondents for this study is sufficient for further analysis. Table 4.1 showed the summary of response rate.

Table 4.1: Summary of data collection

Data			
Distributed	**Collected**	**Response Rate (%)**	**Usable**
515	452	88%	423

4.2 Demographic Characteristics of Respondents

Table 4.2 presented the respondent demographic characteristics. The respondents consisted of 80% males and 20% females employees. This figure indicates that there are fewer female employees in the RMP compared to male employees, a fact that can be attributed to the nature of police work. As for the age groups, most of the respondents were in age between 20 to 29 years old with 33.1%, followed by those aged between 30 to 39 years old (31.2%) and aged above than 50 years old (18.2%). Another 17.5% respondents were aged between 40 to 49 years old.

In term of ethnics group, majority of the respondents were Malay (84%), followed by others (8%), Indian (5%) and Chinese (3%) with majority of them were married (72.8%) and single (23.9%).

In term of education level, more than half of the respondents owned a SPM/MCE certificate, which was 64.5%. This was followed by the respondents from STPM/HSC or Diploma holder (18.7%), degree/professional certificate (8.3%), and SRP/LCE/PMR (7.8%).

The table also shown that, 31.7% of the respondents have been working in the organization more than 20 years. This was followed by respondents have been working

less than 5 years (27.4%), 6-10 years experiences (18.9%), 11-15 years experiences (15.6%) and remaining 6.4% have 16-20 years working experience in the organization.

Majority of respondents were from rank and file (lower rank) of 367 (87%) respondents, whereas remaining 13% from senior police officers (Inspector and above). The majority of the participants come from Department of Management with 151 (35%) respondents, whereas 29% of the sample occupied position in department related to investigation such as JSJ, JSJK and JSJN. The rest respondents were from Department of Internal Security and Public Order Department (KDNKA) and Special Branch (SB) with 12% and 11% respectively.

A frequency and proportions of the respondents among 3 department hierarchy were slightly equal with Contingent level (36%), District level (35%) and police station (25%). Majority of the respondent type of work were working as general duty task (58%), followed by 32% were from specific or specialist duty such as investigation, detective, technical etc.

Respondents were asked to indicate whether their job involved with the NKRA programs or not. Result shows that 49% of respondents stated that they frequently or always involved with the NKRA programs, while 51% of respondents indicated that they had never or sometimes involved in the NKRA programs. Since the proportion of sample had involved and not involved were slightly equal, it is very important to determine whether employees' satisfaction is influenced by the NKRA programs.

Table 4.2: Demographic characteristics of respondents

Demographic Variable		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	340	80.4
	Female	83	19.6
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Age	20 – 29	140	33.1
	30 – 39	132	31.2
	40 – 49	74	17.5
	50 and above	77	18.2
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Ethnicity	Malay	356	84.2
	Chinese	13	3.1
	Indian	21	5.0
	Others	33	7.8
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Marital Status	Single	101	23.9
	Married	308	72.8
	Widowed	9	2.1
	Divorced	2	.5
	Separated	3	.7
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Highest Level of Education	SRP/PMR/LCE	33	7.8
	SPM/MCE	273	64.5
	STPM/HSC/Diploma	79	18.7
	First Degree/Master/PhD	35	8.3
	Others	3	.7
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Years of Experience	5 years and below	116	27.4
	6 - 10 years	80	18.9
	11 - 15 years	66	15.6
	16 - 20 years	27	6.4
	21 years and above	134	31.7
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Rank	Constable/Lans Corporal	153	36.2
	Corporal	138	32.6
	Sergeant	52	12.3
	Sergeant Major	15	3.5
	Sub Inspector	9	2.1
	Inspector	36	8.5
	Assistant Superintendent Police (ASP) and above	20	4.7
	Total	**423**	**100.0**

Table 4.2: Demographic characteristics of respondents (cont.)

Demographic Variable		Frequency	Percentage (%)
Current Department	Criminal Investigation Department (JSJ)	58	13.7
	Commercial Crime (JSJK)	25	5.9
	Narcotic (JSJN)	38	9.0
	Special Branch (SB)	47	11.1
	Logistic	37	8.7
	Internal Security and Public Order Department (KDN/KA)	51	12.1
	Management	151	35.7
	Others	16	3.8
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Department Hierarchy Levels	Contingent Head Quarters	153	36.2
	District Head Quarters	147	34.8
	Police Station	105	24.8
	Others	18	4.3
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
Job Duty	General Duty (GD)	246	58.2
	Specific / Specialist Duty	137	32.4
	Others	40	9.5
	Total	**423**	**100.0**
NKRA Programs Involvement	Never	59	13.9
	Sometimes	157	37.1
	Frequently	93	22.0
	Always	114	27.0
	Total	**423**	**100.0**

4.3 Analysis of Measures

4.3.1 Factor Analysis

According to Coakes et al. (2010, p. 133), factor analysis is a data reduction technique used to reduce a large number of variables to a smaller set of underlying factors that summarise the essential information contained in the variables. To produce the number

of items for all variables, principle component factor analysis with a varimax rotation was used. Besides that, to determine the appropriateness of factor-analytic model, computation of the correlation matrix is necessary in factor analysis.

The purpose of factor analysis is to further examine the inter-relationship among selected variables that are studied in this research, which normally represents a common variation; however, in some cases, results of factor analysis will lead to having a fewer numbers of variables than the original set of variables. Moreover, this factorability is assumed and considered appropriate if the coefficient value of the correlation matrix is above 0.3, and if Bartlett's Test of Sphericity is large and significant, and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin's (KMO) Measure of Sampling Adequacy is greater than 0.6 (Coakes et al., 2007). Only factors that have eigenvalues more than 1.0 (in Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings) is considered significant (Hair et al., 1998). In this study, the use of a minimum factor loading of 0.4 was used as the acceptance level (Field, 2005). Therefore, items that did not load with any other item or loaded below 0.4 were removed. Exploratory Factor Analysis (EFA) was run with 60 items on the independent variables, 8 items on the mediating variable, and 15 items on the dependent variable following Field's guidelines (Field, 2005).

Factor analysis result showed that thirteen factors can be extracted as they have eigenvalues greater than 1. If thirteen factors were extracted, then approximately 65.13% of the variance would be explained. Furthermore, the Kaiser-Meyer-Oklin (KMO) value was .907, exceeding the recommended value of 0.6 (Coakes et al., 2007) and Bartlett's Test of Sphericity (Bartlett, 1954) was large which is 14185.455 and

reached statistical significance ($p < 0.001$ at 0.000), supporting the factorability of the correlation matrix. Therefore factor analysis was appropriate.

The entire items were rotated and a factor that loads in Rotated Component Matrix was adopted as it is widely practiced in much research. There were thirteen factors load for the entire Independent Variables items, and most components represent one independent variable each except Components 2 which consists of two independent variables, namely, professional development and promotion opportunity. On the other hand, we also found that three of the components, i.e. Component 10, Component 12 and Component 13 were not included in the original set of independent variables. However, some items loaded in different component such one of salary and incentives items (SI2), one of promotion opportunity items (PO2), six of organizational policy and strategy items (OPS1, OPS2, OPS3, OPS4, OPS7 and OPS8), two of relationship with co-workers items (RWC4 and RWC5), and one of communication items (COM3). The total of items loaded in different component was nine items. Further investigation found that one item (SUP2) not included in the Rotated Component Matrix Table because loading less than 0.4 and Component 12 loaded with only one items. Thus, items that did not load in its component, items that have no factor loading, single factor loading, cross factor loading and new components did not included in the original set of independent variables were removed or dropped for further analysis in this study. Reliability test was performed for SI, PO, OPS, RWC and COM (as some of its items were removed) on the remaining items. The result of factor loading and reliability for each independent variable is attached in Appendix B.

The factor analysis also used to evaluate the items of mediating variables and dependent variables. The same procedure was applied. The result showed that KMO for mediating variables which was general job satisfaction (GJS) was 0.711, significant at 0.000. Each component was loaded with four items and reliability for Component 1 and Component 2 were 0.788 and 0.538 respectively. Further investigated found that the Cronbach's alpha value for Component 2 is below than minimum requirement 0.60 (Nunally's, 1978), whereas Cronbach's alpha value for Component 1 is exceeding 0.60. Therefore, for further analysis in this study we makes a decision to used items loads in Component 1 as a measurement for mediating variable (GJS). The factor loading and reliability for each mediating variable is as Table 4.3.

Table 4.3: Factor analysis for mediating variable (general job satisfaction)

Items		**Component**	
		1	**2**
GJS1	I am satisfied with being a police officer.	.783	
GJS2	If I had the opportunity to go back to the day I have to decide to become a police officer, I would not choose to become a police officer again. (R)		.542
GJS3	Overall, I like working here.	.808	
GJS4	I am never bored at work since I have many different things to do.	.736	
GJS5	If I were to transfer to other police departments without losing my seniority, I would. (R)		.594
GJS6	If I received an offer for a better salary outside of policing, I would immediately accept it. (R)		.766
GJS7	If I received an offer for a better position outside of policing with slightly equal salary what I earn now, I would immediately accept it. (R)		.661
GJS8	Overall, I am satisfied with my job.	.775	
	% Total Variance Explained	33.054	19.366
	Total	2.644	1.549
	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability (α)	0.788	0.538
	Overall Cronbach Alpha Reliability (α)	0.662	
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.711	
	Significant of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	0.000	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

Result factor analysis for dependent variable (DV) showed that KMO for dependent variables (IR and ER) was 0.906, significant at 0.000 levels. There were two factors load for the entire dependent variables items, and most components represent one dependent variable each. However, one item of extra-role performance (ER2) loaded in different component and two items (ER1 and ER3) that have no factor loading because the value of factor loading below than the cutoff point of 0.4. Thus, items that did not load in its component and no factor loading were removed. The factor loading and reliability for each dependent variable is as Table 4.4.

Table 4.4: Factor analysis for dependent variable (job performance)

Items		**Component**	
		In-role (IR)	**Extra-role (ER)**
IR1	I achieve the objectives of the job.	.635	
IR2	I meet criteria for performance.	.817	
IR3	I demonstrate expertise in all job-related tasks.	.797	
IR4	I fulfills all the requirements of the job.	.658	.422
IR5	I could manage more responsibility than typically assigned.	.641	.457
IR6	I appears suitable for a higher level role.	.740	
IR7	Is competent in all areas of the job, I handles tasks with proficiency.	.648	
IR8	I perform well in the overall job by carrying out tasks as expected.	.648	.421
IR9	I plans and organizes to achieve objectives of the job and meet deadlines.	.626	.415
ER1	I does not take extra breaks.		
ER2	I consume a lot of time complaining about trivial matters. (R)	*.511	
ER3	I take steps to try to prevent problems with other workers.		
ER4	Willingly attends functions that not required by the organization, but helps the organization image.		.711
ER5	Helps others who have heavy workloads.		.707
ER6	I offer innovative suggestions to improve the department/organization.		.696
	% Total Variance Explained	42.713	8.933
	Total	6.407	1.340
	Cronbach's Alpha Reliability (α)	0.909	0.689
	Overall Cronbach Alpha Reliability (α)	0.904	
	Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.	0.906	
	Significant of Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	0.000	

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.
Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.
**Note: Items that was removed, do not load in its component*

4.3.2 Normality Test

The next step in analyzing the data for this study is to examine the normality of the data by assessing the shape of the distribution. According to Coaked et al., (2010), "….the assumption of normality is a prerequisite for many inferential statistical techniques…." and Hair et al. (1998) highlighted that data distribution for the sample is considered normal if the skewness and kurtosis values for all variables were within the range ±2.00 and ±3.00 respectively. Thus, the study meets this criterion if all sub-scale of independent, mediating and dependent variables are within the predetermined range.

Table 4.5 shows the summary result of normality test obtained in this study. Findings showed that the skewness and kurtosis value are within the range +/- 1.00 and +/- 2.00 respectively. It confirmed that 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 for independent, mediating and dependent variables

Details	Mean	Std. Deviation	Skewness	Kurtosis
			Statistic	Statistic
Public Perception (PP)	3.834	.693	-.503	.459
Professional Development (PD)	3.411	.781	-.642	.809
Salary and Incentives (SI)	3.328	.756	-.659	.315
Nature of Work (NOW)	3.682	.729	-.902	1.599
Supervision (SUP)	3.757	.645	-.756	1.365
Communication (COM)	3.358	.960	-.565	.046
Job Stress (JS)	3.069	.903	.403	-.466
Organizational Policy and Strategy (OPS)	3.465	.945	-.727	.155
Relationship with Co-workers (RWC)	3.743	.727	-.818	1.572
Promotion Opportunity (PO)	3.271	.864	-.360	-.062
Performance Appraisal (PA)	3.570	.855	-.832	.915
General Job Satisfaction (GJS)	3.830	.739	-.858	.783
Job Performance (JP)	3.743	.558	-.161	.699

4.3.3 Cronbach's Alpha Reliability Test

Cronbach's alpha was used to analyze the reliability of each construct. According to Nunnaly (1978), a construct can be categorized as reliable when the alpha value is more than 0.6. The analysis was conducted on all 65 items remained for internal consistency purposes. The results of the reliability test in Table 4.6 showed that the Cronbach's Alpha value for the entire scale of independent variables ranged from 0.690 to 0.899 and the overall alpha value for the eleven dimensions were 0.932. Meanwhile the scale reliability of the mediating variable (GJS) is 0.788. The reliability of job performance is 0.904. It is evident that the for all items including independent, mediating and dependent variables exceeded Nunally's (1978) minimum requirement 0.60.

Table 4.6: Results of the reliability test for independent, mediating and dependent variables

Variables	No. of items	Cronbach's Alpha (α)
Public Perception (PP)	7	0.899
Professional Development (PD)	5	0.851
Salary and Incentives (SI)	8	0.869
Nature of Work (NOW)	6	0.846
Supervision (SUP)	5	0.816
Communication (COM)	2	0.690
Job Stress (JS)	3	0.699
Organizational Policy and Strategy (OPS)	2	0.780
Relationship with Co-workers (RWC)	3	0.754
Promotion Opportunity (PO)	4	0.829
Performance Appraisal (PA)	3	0.862
Overall Independent variables	49	0.932
General Job Satisfaction (GJS)	4	0.788
Job Performance (JP)	12	0.904

4.4 General Job Satisfaction Measures

This section determines the police officers' overall job satisfaction level. Total score for all the mediating items will be considered as general job satisfaction. A total score of the mediating variable was derived by summing the points for each of the four items. Then a total score will be recoded into 3 levels as recommended by Weiss et al. (1967). These three levels of job satisfaction classifications are (1) a mean score of 2.5 or below represented a low level of satisfaction; (2) a mean score which ranges from 2.5 to 3.49 represents average satisfaction and (3) a mean score of 3.5 or higher indicated a high degree of satisfaction. Table 4.8 shows the level of overall job satisfaction among the police officers.

Table 4.7: General job satisfaction * rank category crosstabulation

	Satisfaction Level	**Rank Category**		**Total (%)**
		Rank & File	**Senior Police Officer**	
General Job Satisfaction	Low Level of Satisfaction	134	28	162 (38.3%)
	Average Satisfaction	61	4	65 (15.4%)
	High Degree of Satisfaction	172	24	196 (46.3%)
	Total	367	56	423

Table 4.7 indicated that more than one third of the police officers in this sample have low level of satisfaction of 38.3%, whereas, 46.3% comprised of those who have high degree of satisfaction with their job. Therefore, the remaining 15.4% had a moderate level of satisfaction. According to the senior police officer rank category indicates that 50% of them under low level of satisfaction with their job. However, for rank and file category shows that only 36.5% of them under low satisfaction.

4.5 Testing of Hypotheses

4.5.1 T-test

In this section, independent-samples t-test was appropriate technique when to compare the mean scores of two different groups of people such gender, ethnic groups and marital status. The original four groups of ethnicity were recoded into two groups (that is, 'Malay' and 'Non-Malay'), whereas five groups of marital status were recoded also into two groups (that is, 'single' and 'married'). The variables were individually tested and the summaries of results are in Table 4.8.

Table 4.8 shows that ethnicity group of respondents ($p = 0.023$) were significant difference in the means of job satisfaction level since sig. value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). However, gender and marital status were not significant difference in the means of job satisfaction level ($p > 0.05$). **Thus, hypotheses H1c was accepted, whereas, hypothesis H1a and H1d were rejected.** Further observation revealed that mean scores for Non-Malay is higher than mean score for Malay employee with 4.019 and 3.795 respectively. Therefore, we can conclude that Non-Malay employees most satisfied than Malay employees.

Table 4.8: Impact of gender, ethnicity and marital status of respondents on general job satisfaction (T-test)

Variables	Characteristics	Mean	T-value	df	Sig.
Gender	Male	3.851	1.147	421	.252
	Female	3.747			
Ethnicity	Malay	3.795	-2.284	421	.023
	Non-Malay	4.019			
Marital status	Single	3.839	.149	421	.882
	Married	3.827			

4.5.2 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

In this section, analysis of variance (ANOVA) was used to compare the means of more than two groups or levels of an independent variables such education level, officers rank, current department, department hierarchy, job duty and NKRA involvement on general job satisfaction. The variables were individually tested and the summary of ANOVA results was in Table 4.9.

Table 4.9 shows that current department served ($p = 0.005$), department hierarchy level ($p = 0.002$), job duty ($p = 0.007$) and NKRA programs involvement ($p = 0.007$) have a significant difference in the means of job satisfaction level since sig. value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). However, educational level and rank level were not significant difference in the means of job satisfaction level ($p > 0.05$). **Thus, hypotheses H1h, H1i, H1j and H3 were accepted, whereas, hypothesis H1e and H1g were rejected.**

It can also be observed from the Table 4.9 that employees served at logistic department are least satisfied than others department. Level of job satisfaction of employee working at police station level is most satisfied than contingent and district level of the respondents. Result also indicate that police officers served in a specific or specialist task such investigation, traffic, narcotics, detective and technical are the most satisfied than those who served in general duty task. Employee always involved with the NKRA programs were most satisfied than those who not involved in NKRA programs. Therefore, we can conclude that employees who always involved with the NKRA programs or community policing and those who do not involved has a significant difference on job satisfaction level.

Table 4.9: Impact of educational level, rank, current department, department hierarchy, job duty, NKRA programs involvement on general job satisfaction (ANOVA analysis)

Variables	**Characteristics**	**Mean**	**F-value**	**df**	**Sig.**
Educational level	SRP/PMR/ LCE	3.833	.489	4	0.744
	SPM/MCE	3.859			
	STPM/HSC/ Diploma	3.753			
	First Degree /Master/PhD	3.757			
	Others	4.083			
Officers Rank	Constable/Lans Corporal	3.884	.731	6	0.625
	Corporal	3.764			
	Sergeant	3.807			
	Sergeant Major	3.900			
	Sub Inspector	4.028			
	Inspector	3.722			
	ASP and above	3.988			
Department	JSJ	3.785	2.975	7	0.005
	JSJK	3.960			
	JSJN	3.862			
	Special Branch (SB)	3.745			
	Logistic	3.520			
	KDNKA	3.755			
	Management	3.988			
	Others	3.438			
Department Hierarchy	Contingent level	3.768	4.865	3	0.002
	District level	3.798			
	Police Station level	4.033			
	Others	3.444			
Job Duty	General Duty (GD)	3.827	5.011	2	0.007
	Specific / Specialist Duty	3.929			
	Others	3.513			
NKRA Programs Involvement	Never	3.678	4.095	3	0.007
	Sometimes	3.819			
	Frequently	3.718			
	Always	4.018			

4.5.3 Correlations Analysis

In this section, correlation analysis was used to examine the relationship between age, years of experience, eleven environmental factors, general job satisfaction and job performance. The aims is to determine whether there are any linear relationship amongst these independent variables on general job satisfaction (GJS) and between general job satisfaction (GJS) on job performance as a dependent variables. The summaries of the correlation output amongst these variables are shown in Table 4.10 and Table 4.11.

4.5.3.1 Correlation analysis between age and years of experiences on general job satisfaction (GJS)

According to Table 4.10, correlation analysis had been used to test the correlation between demographic factors such age and years of experience and employee perceptions towards general job satisfaction. The results shows that there was not significant relationship between employee perceptions towards general job satisfaction (GJS) and age of respondents (AGE) ($r = 0.040$, $p = 0.205$) and years of experience (YOE) ($r = 0.055$, $p = 0.129$) since a sig. value more than 0.05 ($p > 0.05$). **Thus, hypotheses H1b and H1f were rejected.**

Table 4.10: Impact of age and years of experience on general job satisfaction (GJS)

Mediating Variable		Independent Variables	
		Age	Years of Experience
General Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.040	.055
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.205	.129
	N	423	423

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).

4.5.3.2 Correlation analysis between environmental factors on general job satisfaction (GJS)

Refer to Table 4.11, correlation analysis had been used to test the correlation between environmental factors and employee perceptions towards general job satisfaction. The results showed that there were significant positive relationship between public perception (r = 0.363, p = 0.000), professional development (r = 0.510, p = 0.000), salary and incentives (r = 0.463, p = 0.000), nature of work (r = 0.401, p = 0.000), supervision (r = 0.487, p = 0.000), communication (r = 0.431, p = 0.000), organizational policy and strategy (r = 0.301, p = 0.000), relationship with co-workers (r = 0.533, p = 0.000), promotion opportunity (r = 0.370, p = 0.000), and performance appraisal (r = 0.561, p = 0.000) on general job satisfaction (GJS) since sig. value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$). Whereas, a significant negative relationship was found between job stress (r = -0.217, $p < 0.01$) on general job satisfaction since the sign of coefficient value is negative.

Strength of the relationship between variables in the study can be measured follow rules of thumb developed by Saskin (2004). According to Saskin (2004), the correlation coefficient r that is equal or more than 0.70 showed a strong relationship between variables, if r coefficient is between the ranges of 0.30 to 0.69, the relationship is moderate and if r coefficient is less than 0.30, the relationship is considered weak. Therefore, based on correlation value (r) of all variable, it showed that all variables except for job stress were in moderate degree of correlation with general job satisfaction (GJS). However, between job stress and general job satisfaction is in weak correlation ($r < 0.30$). Amongst these variables showed that the strength of professional development (PD), relationship with co-workers (RWC) and performance appraisal

(PA) were greater compare to the other variables (r > 0.50). Therefore, we can conclude that all environmental variables were significant relationship on general job satisfaction. **Thus, all sub-hypotheses (H2a - H2k) were accepted.**

Table 4.11: Correlation between independent variables, general job satisfaction and job performance

Mediating Variable		Independent Variables					
		PP	PD	SI	NOW	SUP	COM
General Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.363**	.510**	.463**	.401**	.487**	.431**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	423	423	423	423	423	423

Table 4.11: Correlation between independent variables, general job satisfaction and job performance (cont.)

Mediating Variable		Independent Variables					Job Performance
		JS	OPS	RWC	PO	PA	
General Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	-.217**	.301**	.533**	.370**	.561**	.431**
	Sig. (1-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	423	423	423	423	423	423

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (1-tailed).
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (1-tailed).

Note: PP = Public Perception, PD = Professional Development, SI = Salary and Incentives, NOW = Nature of Work, SUP = Supervision, COM = Communication, JS = Job Stress, OPS = Organizational Policy and Strategy, RWC = Relationship with Co-Workers, PO = Promotion Opportunity, PA = Performance Appraisal

4.5.3.3 Correlation analysis between general job satisfactions (GJS) on job performance

Based on Table 4.11, correlation analysis had been used to test the correlation between general job satisfactions (GJS) on job performance as a dependent variable. The results indicated that there was a significant and positive moderate correlation between general job satisfaction and job performance ($r = 0.431$, $p = 0.000$) since sig. value less than 0.05 ($p < 0.05$) and coefficient (r) value was in range 0.30 – 0.69 (Saskin, 2004). **Thus, hypothesis H5 was accepted.**

4.5.4 Multiple Regression Analysis

Multiple regression analysis was conducted aimed to investigate the most influential predictor among independent variables such demographic variables and environmental variables to employees' perception toward job satisfaction (GJS). The strength of independent variables influences perception toward job satisfaction (GJS) will be examined as below.

4.5.4.1 Multiple regression analysis between demographic variables and GJS

Table 4.12 presented that only 4.3% of the variance in employee job satisfaction among police officers' was explained by ten demographic factors as predictors of job satisfaction ($R^2 = .043$). In other words, the remaining 95.7% of employee job satisfaction was influence by unexplained factors. This model is not significant, as indicated by the F-value of 1.676 ($p = 0.076 > 0.05$). **Thus, hypotheses H4a was rejected.**

Table 4.12: Regressions analysis between demographic variables and general job satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.611	.290		12.435	.000
Gender	-.022	.095	-.012	-.228	.819
Age	-.004	.072	-.007	-.062	.951
Ethnic Category	.101	.041	.123	2.493	.013
Marital Status	-.075	.074	-.056	-1.009	.313
Educational Level	-.039	.063	-.040	-.617	.537
Years of Experience	.048	.046	.104	1.036	.301
Officers Rank	.023	.031	.055	.742	.459
Current Department	-.014	.020	-.044	-.719	.473
Department Hierarchy	.055	.052	.066	1.052	.293
Job Duty	-.074	.059	-.066	-1.247	.213

a. Dependent Variable: General Job Satisfaction
R = 0.207; R Square = 0.043, F = 1.676, Sig = 0.076

4.5.4.2 Multiple regression analysis between environmental variables and GJS

Table 4.13 presented that 46.6% of the variance in employee job satisfaction among police officers' was explained by eleven environmental factors as predictors of job satisfaction (R^2 = .466). In other words, the remaining 53.4% of employee job satisfaction was influence by unexplained factors. This model is highly significant, as indicated by the F-value of 32.647 ($p = 0.000 < 0.05$). **Thus, hypotheses H4b was accepted.**

The results showed that seven out of eleven environmental factors were significant predictors of employee job satisfaction since the sig. value less than 0.05. There were (in order of strength contribution) performance appraisal ($\beta = 0.213$, $p = 0.000$), salary and incentives ($\beta = 0.187$, $p = .000$), professional development ($\beta = 0.159$, $p = 0.004$), promotion opportunity ($\beta = -0.157$, $p = 0.003$), relationship with co-workers ($\beta = 0.154$,

p = 0.003), communication (β = 0.122, p = 0.030), and nature of work (β = 0.111, p = 0.020). Whereas, other predictors such public perception, supervision, job stress, and organizational policy and strategy were not significant predictors of job satisfaction (GJS) since sig. value more than 0.05 (p > 0.05).

Table 4.13: Regressions analysis between environmental variables and general job satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.649	.244		2.654	.008
Performance Appraisal	.184	.045	.213	4.073	.000
Salary and Incentives	.183	.047	.187	3.864	.000
Professional Development	.151	.052	.159	2.901	.004
Promotion Opportunity	-.134	.045	-.157	-2.980	.003
Relationship with Coworkers	.156	.052	.154	3.026	.003
Communication	.094	.034	.122	2.800	.005
Nature of Work	.113	.043	.111	2.617	.009
Public Perception	.082	.045	.077	1.798	.073
Supervision	.082	.056	.072	1.461	.145
Job Stress	-.009	.032	-.011	-.288	.774
Organizational Policy and Strategy	-.020	.033	-.026	-.597	.551

a. Dependent Variable: General Job Satisfaction (GJS)
R = 0.683; R Square = 0.466, F = 32.647, Sig = 0.000

These findings suggest that performance appraisal (β = 0.213) has a highest impact on job satisfaction. This was followed by a positive perception of salary and incentives (β = 0.187), professional development (β = 0.159), promotion opportunity (β = -0.157), relationship with co-workers (β = 0.154), communication (β = 0.122), and nature of work (β = 0.111).

4.5.4.3 Multiple regression analysis between implementation COP/NKRA programs and general job satisfaction.

Table 4.14: Regressions analysis between implementation COP/NKRA programs and general job satisfaction

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	3.588	.098		36.695	.000
NKRA Programs Involvement	.092	.035	.129	2.659	.008

a. Dependent Variable: General Job Satisfaction (GJS)
R = 0.129; R Square = 0.017, F = 7.069, Sig = 0.008

Table 4.14 presented that 1.7% of the variance in employee job satisfaction among police officers' was explained by community policing (COP)/NKRA programs factors as predictors of job satisfaction (R^2 = .017). In other words, the remaining 98.34% of employee job satisfaction was influence by unexplained factors. This model is highly significant, as indicated by the F-value of 7.069 ($p = 0.008 < 0.05$).

4.5.4.4 Comparison between the contribution of environmental variables and demographic variables in predicting job satisfaction

In order to identify the set of environmental variables that serve as predictor of GJS with and without controlling for demographic variables., a multiple regression analysis was conducted on the GJS by forcing the eleven environmental variables, representing the factors generated from the factor analysis solutions, into the model first, and then following with the eleven demographic variables using the Stepwise method. Table 4.15 presents the summary result of standardized coefficient beta (β) from two separate multiple linear regression analyses (Reg. 1 and Reg. 2) on GJS scores. In the first

regression, the eleven environmental variables were entered into the model as predictor of GJS with controlling the demographic variables. In the second regression analysis we entered both the eleven environmental and the eleven demographic variables in the model (Detail results see Appendix E)

A comparison of R^2 (see Table 4.15) between model 1 and model 2, reveals that the demographic variables, namely gender, age, ethnicity, marital status, highest level of education, years of experience, rank, current department, department hierarchy level, job duty and NKRA programs involvement added only 1.8 per cent to the total amount of variance explained. In addition, the actual differences in the regression coefficient (β) values for the 11 environmental variables between the two models were very small and appear to be of little significance. From the above findings, one can conclude that the set of the eleven environmental variables is a stronger predictor of GJS than are demographic variables. **Therefore, the hypothesis of H4c was accepted.**

Table 4.15: Summary results of comparison between the standardised coefficient beta (β) of the predictor variables produced from the regression models 1 and 2

Model	Standardized Coefficients		β (differences)
	β (Reg 1) [a]	β (Reg 2) [b]	
R Square	46.6%	48.4%	1.8%
F value	32.647	15.528	
Sig	.000[a]	.000[b]	

Notes: [a] Only the environmental variables were entered in the model.
[b] Both the environmental and demographic variables were entered in the model.
Dependent Variable: general job satisfaction

4.6 Summary of Hypotheses Results

Summary of the hypotheses has been explained previously are as Table 4.16.

Table 4.16: Summarization of hypotheses testing

Hypotheses		Result
H1a	There is a significant difference in the mean of general job satisfaction between male and female employees.	Rejected
H1b	There is a significant correlation between employees' age and general job satisfaction.	Rejected
H1c	There is a significant difference in the mean of general job satisfaction between Malay and Non-Malay.	Accepted
H1d	There is a significant difference in the means of general job satisfaction between single and married employees.	Rejected
H1e	There is a significant difference in the means of general job satisfaction and employees' level of education.	Rejected
H1f	There is a significant correlation between employees' years of experience and general job satisfaction.	Rejected
H1g	There is a significant difference in the means of general job satisfaction and employees' rank level.	Rejected
H1h	There is a significant difference in the means of general job satisfaction and employees' work in different department.	Accepted
H1i	There is a significant difference in the means of general job satisfaction and employees' work in different organizational hierarchy level.	Accepted
H1j	There is a significant difference in the means of general job satisfaction and employees' type of job duty.	Accepted
H2a	There is a significant relationship between salary and incentives, and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2b	There is a significant relationship between supervision and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2c	There is a significant relationship between Public perception and general job satisfaction.	Accepted

H2d	There is a significant relationship between promotion opportunity and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2e	There is a significant relationship between organizational policy and strategy, and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2f	There is a significant relationship between relationship with co-workers and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2g	There is a significant relationship between professional development and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2h	There is a significant relationship between nature of the work and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2i	There is a significant relationship between communication and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2j	There is a significant relationship between job stress and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H2k	There is a significant relationship between performance appraisal and general job satisfaction.	Accepted
H3	There is a significant difference between level of job satisfaction and employee involvement with the NKRA programme.	Accepted
H4	Environmental variables are stronger predictors of GJS than are demographic variables.	Accepted
H4a	The ten demographic predictors will significantly explain the variance in employee job satisfaction.	Rejected
H4b	The eleven environmental predictors will significantly explain the variance in employee job satisfaction.	Accepted
H5	There is a significant relationship between general job satisfaction and job performance.	Accepted

4.7 Discussion of Research Results

With regards to the first research question, results of the statistical analyses in Table 4.7 revealed that more than one third (38.3%) of the police officers reported low level of job satisfaction with their job, while, 46.3% police officers reported high level of job satisfaction. In general, we can conclude that police officers in under Kuala Lumpur contingent police were generally least satisfied with their jobs. According to rank category, 50% of senior police officer in the sample has low satisfaction than those in high satisfaction with 43%, whereas, rank and file category, only 36.5% of them reported low level of job satisfaction than those in high satisfaction with 47%. This result suggests that senior police officers not enjoy with their work. There are many reason of this finding, for example, overload task or duty can increase their job stress and high level of stress can decrease job satisfaction level. This finding was contrast with previous job satisfaction studies in policing indicates that mid-level police managers at Southern Police Institute (SPI) were high level of job satisfaction (Ercikti et al., 2011).

With regards to the second research question, results of the t-test, ANOVA test and correlation analyses in Table 4.8 and Table 4.9, demonstrated that four out of ten demographic variables were statistically significant contribution to job satisfaction level. There are ethnicity ($p = 0.023$), current department served ($p = 0.005$), department hierarchy level ($p = 0.002$) and type of job duty ($p = 0.007$). Table 4.8 shows that Non-Malay police officers reported the highest level of job satisfaction than Malay officers group. This result suggests that Malay officers not enjoy with their work. Table 4.9 shows that employees served at logistic department are less satisfied; it

may be due to the nature of work they are doing not challenging job and were engaged in non-enforcement type desk duty. Level of job satisfaction of employee working at police station level is most satisfied than contingent and district level of the respondents. The reason is that most of the employees working at police stations were engaged in enforcement-oriented outside duty and deal with the public in community oriented policing (COP) had higher job satisfaction than those who were engaged in non-enforcement type desk duty. Result also indicate that police officers served in a specific or specialist task such investigation, traffic, narcotics, detective and technical are the most satisfied than those who served in general duty task. This result suggests that employee nature of work involved in investigation, deal with public, outside duties may lead to job enrichment and were more likely to be satisfied with their work. These findings were consistent with Hwang (2008) study which revealed that type of work and department hierarchy were significantly associated with job satisfaction among police officer in Korea.

With regards to the third research question, results of the correlation analyses in Table 4.11 revealed that ten environmental dimensions were statistically significant ($p < 0.05$) and positive moderate correlations on job satisfaction. There are public perception ($r = 0.363$), professional development ($r = 0.510$), salary and incentives ($r = 0.463$), nature of the work ($r = 0.401$), supervision ($r = 0.487$), communication ($r = 0.431$), organizational policy and strategy ($r = 0.301$), relationship with co-workers ($r = 0.533$), promotion opportunity ($r = 0.370$), and performance appraisal ($r = 0.561$). However, the correlation between job stress and general job satisfaction is also significant ($p < 0.05$) but negative low correlation ($r = -0.217$). Therefore, we can conclude that professional, relationship with co-workers and performance appraisal has a highest correlation on job

satisfaction. These findings were consistent with recent studies in policing such Abdulla (2009) and Abdulla et al. (2011). A possible explanation for the significant negative relationship between job stress and job satisfaction levels could be related to the role ambiguity and role conflict, role overload, organizational constraints, work-family conflict, interpersonal conflict have the potential to cause mental or physical illness and lead to decrease job satisfaction. Previous research and theories suggest that work stressors were all negatively associated with job satisfaction (Fisher & Gitelson, 1983; Spector & Jex, 1998; Kossek & Ozeki, 1998; Bowling & Beehr, 2006).

With regards to the fourth research question, results of the multiple regression analyses in Table 4.12, Table 4.13 and Table 4.15 shows that demographic variables (age, gender, ethnicity, marital status, education levels, year of service, officer rank, current department, department hierarchy and job duty) were not significant predictors of job satisfaction since sig. value in ANOVA table more than 0.05 ($p = 0.076$), whereas, the eleven environmental variables were a significant predictors of job satisfaction since sig. value less than 0.05 ($p = 0.000$). The model explains 46.6% of the variation in job satisfaction perceptions of police officers could explain by environmental factors. Our result in Table 4.15 shows that demographic variables added only 1.8 per cent to the total amount of variance explained in the regression model when without control the demographic variables. These finding were consistent with previous job satisfaction studies in policing indicated demographic variables are the little value or no explanation as determinants of job satisfaction among police officers (Abdulla et al., 2011; Ercikti et al., 2011; Abdulla, 2009; Ercikti, 2008; Zhao et al., 1999). From these findings, we can conclude that the set of eleven environmental variables is a stronger predictor of GJS than demographic variables. This finding is important even though it is not

original. It helps future research focused on environmental factors to understand variations in the level of job satisfaction within RMP organization. Based on this finding, RMP policy makers, Top of Management, academics and practitioners should concentrate on the nature of the job rather than on the characteristics of the individual to understand why some employees express high level of satisfactions with their job and others report lower levels of satisfaction in RMP.

With regards to the fifth research question, results of the multiple regression analyses in Table 4.13, demonstrated that out of 11 environmental factors, only seven variables were significant predictors of job satisfaction. There are salary and incentives ($p = 0.000$), performance appraisal ($p = 0.000$), professional development ($p = 0.004$), relationship with co-workers ($p = 0.0003$), promotion opportunity ($p = 0.003$), nature of work ($p = 0.009$) and communication ($p = 0.005$). In term of the strongest predictors, the results showed that performance appraisal had the highest impact on job satisfaction ($\beta = 0.213$). This was followed by:

- salary and incentives ($\beta = 0.187$),
- professional development ($\beta = 0.159$),
- promotion opportunity ($\beta = -0.157$),
- relationship with co-workers ($\beta = 0.154$),
- communication ($\beta = 0.122$), and
- nature of the work ($\beta = 0.111$).

Performance appraisal clearly emerged as the most powerful determinant of job satisfaction. These findings suggest that RMP police officers' pay a great deal of attention to fairness performance appraisal system and also demand for supporting and

guidance from supervisors. Performance appraisal linked to power distance since supervisors are generally reluctant to engage in two-way communication in the appraisal process (Chang et al., 2009; Fletcher, 2001). Our study reveals that the perception of equity in appraising employee performance is linked to job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with the previous study indicating that performance appraisal is one of the most important predictor on job satisfaction (Abdulla et al., 2011). On the others hand, performance appraisal scores has a connection with employees' promotion opportunity. In the RMP, one of the criteria to promotion advancement is the annual performance appraisal reports. If the performance appraisal score is low, it will influence the chances for promotion or advancement in the force.

In addition to performance appraisal, the finding shows that satisfaction with the salary and incentives is a second most powerful determinant of job satisfaction. These findings suggest that RMP police officers' pay a great deal of attention to remuneration such as salary, fringe benefits, allowances, recognition, and financial rewards. The reason why employees put a strong emphasis on salary and incentives in the Malaysia because of their impacts on living standards and their important in providing a sense of security. Furthermore, the high importance paid to salaries and incentives could be due in part to the high cost of living in Klang Valley compared to other regions in Malaysia. This finding is in line with the previous study indicating that salary and incentives has the highest impact on job satisfaction among police officers in Dubai Police Force (Abdulla et al., 2011).

With regards to the sixth research question, result of the correlation analyses in Table 4.11 indicated that job satisfaction has a statistically significant and positive moderate correlation with job performance ($p = 0.000$, $r = 0.431$). This result suggests that high level of job satisfaction will lead to increase employee performance either in-role performance or extra-role performance. These findings were consistent with previous study found that job satisfaction was significantly positive associated with job performance (Muhammad & Ajmal, 2011; Jaafar et al., 2006; Judge et al., 2001, Iaffaldano & Muchinsky, 1985). From these findings, we can conclude that organizations cannot achieve high competitive levels of customer service quality and increase job performance if their employees do not feel satisfied, in- line with previous research finding (Garcia-Bernal et al., 2005).

Finally, with regards to the seventh research objective, results of the ANOVA analyses in Table 4.9 demonstrated that the job satisfaction levels of police officers who are always participating or involved in COP/NKRA programme (mean = 4.018) were significantly higher than those who were not involved in these programs (mean = 3.678). Further, the multiple regression analysis in Table 4.14 revealed that there is a significant predictors of job satisfaction since sig. value less than 0.05 ($p = 0.008$). The model explains 1.7% of the variation in job satisfaction perceptions of RMP police officers could explain by COP/NKRA programs participation. These suggest that the implementation of COP/NKRA programs may lead to job enrichment and greater job enjoyment for police officers. This result is in line with the previous studies conducted by Ercikti et al., (2011), Adams et al., (2002) and Halsted et al., (2000).

CHAPTER 5

CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.0 Chapter Overview

This final chapter will be covers the summary of this study and seeks to propose some recommendations on future studies that can be conducted to expand on this research.

5.1 Summary and Conclusion

This study shed some light on the status of job satisfaction among police officers' for those who are working under contingent police involved with the COP/NKRA programs and this information could provide some salient information that is important to RMP Human Resource Development, staff officers, police supervisors and particularly to Head of Departments or Units under RMP.

The three main aims of this research were (1) to identify the level of overall job satisfaction among police officers, (2) to identify the determinants of job satisfaction in RMP, and (3) to identify the impact of implementation of COP/NKRA programs on level of job satisfaction. Data were collected through questionnaire which has demonstrated its validity and reliability.

The results of this study indicate that police officers for those who are working under Kuala Lumpur Contingent Police administrations were generally least satisfied with their jobs since 38.3% indicate low level of job satisfaction. It was further determined that environmental variables were strongest predictors of the job satisfaction

perceptions of RMP police officers than demographic variables. The major determinants of job satisfaction were identified as salary and incentives, performance appraisal, professional development, relationship with co-workers, promotion opportunity, nature of the work and communication. Among these factors, performance appraisal and salary and incentives were the strongest predictors of job satisfaction, followed by professional development, promotion opportunity, relationship with co-workers, communication, and nature of the work.

Implementations of COP/NKRA programs also play an important factor that influences the level of employees' job satisfaction, which police officers who always involved with the COP/NKRA programs were highly satisfied than those who do not involved with the COP/NKRA programs. The results also indicate that there was a significance positive and moderate relationship between all environmental factors except job stress on job satisfaction. Further, there is a significant positive and weak association between job satisfaction and job performance. One critical requirement is the need to ensure that the working environment in the RMP organization enhances job satisfaction and thereby increases job performance.

To sum up, the results highlight the importance of the work environment in improving employee job satisfaction and enhancing productivity. Organizational commitment to quality improvement, effectiveness and productivity implies, therefore, that all work-related factors, especially salary and incentives, performance appraisal and professional development, should be reviewed periodically.

In order to increase employee job performance and public satisfaction, RMP should increase level of employees satisfaction first through give more intention on the seven factors to increase level of police officers job satisfaction in order to increase their performance such as provide fairness performance appraisal system, better salary and incentives, more professional development and promotion opportunity. Second suggestion, RMP should expand the implementation of COP/NKRA programs to others contingent/states because implementation of NKRA programs may lead to job enrichment for police officers.

Finally, we hoped these findings will assist the RMP policy makers, RMP Human Resource Department, Chiefs Police Officer, Officer In-Charged Police District, staff officers and police supervisor to increase the job satisfaction levels and performances of their police personnel. Very important to make sure our nation is safe from crime and we can all live in a safer nation.

5.2 Limitations of the Study

The study has encountered several limitations which should otherwise produce more frank and concrete results. The quantitative study using questionnaire survey adopted for this study has inherent response bias (Spector, 1985). The survey instruments utilized in this assessment were self-report assessments presented by police officers' based on their subjective perceptions. Some respondents may have lackadaisical attitude and prejudice in their response to the survey. Response bias could arise if police officers fear retaliation from superior or Head of Department. Consequently, the policemen may not provide a feedback that is open and honest.

Total of 86.8 per cent of the respondents were obtained from the lower rank level comprised of Sub-inspector and below and majority of the respondents are Malay (84.2 per cent), these respondents may have difference beliefs, behaviors' and certain extent of emotion towards affective response to questionnaire presented. Thus the results obtained may not accurately reflect the overall job satisfaction among police officers.

These studies are an attempt to explore the job satisfaction among RMP. Since this is the first attempt, the results are indicate and may not be conclusive. It provides some insight with the hope to improve the efficiency of RMP.

5.3 Suggestions for Future Study

Although this study was first of its kind conducted in the contingent police who involved with the COP/NKRA programs for job satisfaction, it yielded important results about police officer level of job satisfaction, there is much more research to be done. One recommendation is to conduct a study in the contingent police that totally not involved with NKRA programs and make a comparison of the results with contingent involved with NKRA programs. It is important to find the impact of NKRA programs on level of job satisfaction between police officers who participating in these programs and those who do not involved in these programs. In this study, researcher just compared employees involved and not involved in the same place or contingent.

Furthermore, due to the limitation of the time to do in deep study, some important variables in the Malaysian context, such as the crime rate and citizen support, could not be included. Further researchers need to include these variables.

Finally, the new theoretical framework with new job satisfaction scale that was constructed from this study needs to be validated further.

5.4 Implications

This study has addressed some of the most important issues within the contemporary literature relating to job satisfaction. More specifically, the contribution has been through the following:

- This study was keen to construct a new job satisfaction scale using principle components analysis with varimax rotation to produce subscales. This resulted in eleven subscales congruent with the Malaysia policing culture. These new subscales have a high internal consistency and reliability. These new scale has the potential to make a considerable contribution in both theoretical and practical terms and might be a useful tool for descriptive qualification of job satisfaction and can provide a valuable research tool.

- In terms of results, this research has discovered one additional construct, namely, implementation of COP/NKRA programs which have not been identified in previous studies.

- The model developed by this study extends the present knowledge on how job satisfaction is affected by a number of factors (i.e. demographic factor, environmental factors and implementation of COP/NKRA programs) and on how job satisfaction affects other organizational behaviors (i.e. Job performance

and OCB). A review of existing literature indicates that little research has been undertaken to develop a model for job satisfaction including both antecedents and consequences.

- This study has enabled human resource practitioners to identify factors that have influence on job satisfaction in order to help them increase employee job satisfaction level in an organization. Since it is proven through this study that environmental factors leads to decrease / increase employee job satisfaction. Human resource practitioner can utilize this scale to gain better understanding of their employees.