

## The Effect of Occupational Satisfaction in Steel Mobarakeh Company Employees

<sup>1</sup>Hassan Palahang and <sup>2</sup>Azar Asgharian

<sup>1</sup>Department of Psychiatric, Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Shahrekord, Iran

<sup>2</sup>Shahrekord University of Medical Sciences, Shahrekord, Iran

---

**Abstract:** Today's human resources play an important role in achievement of society's affair and there is a closely relationship between socio – economical improvements and occupational satisfaction. Occupational satisfaction refers to positive feelings and views people who have to their occupation. This study was undertaken to investigate the impact of occupational satisfaction in Steel Mobarake employees.

**Key words:** Steel Mobarake • Occupational satisfaction • Employee • Motivation

---

### INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is defined as the positive personal perception towards work or work experiences [1]. In fact, job satisfaction has been identified as an important determinant of employee retention, turnover and work performance [2]. Today's human resources play an important role in achievement of society's affair and there is a close relationship between socio – economical improvements and occupational satisfaction.

Importance of occupational satisfaction results from this fact that most people spend almost half of their sleep hours in workplace. It refers to positive fleetingness and views people have to their occupations. When one says she is satisfied with his/ her occupation, it means that he likes it very much, or has favorite feeling to it and values for it. Otherwise, job satisfaction was found to be inversely related with turnover of employees [3], i.e., poor job satisfaction is linked to high turnover [4].

Work abandonment enters huge chivvy damages to the organization and substitution of another one in his/her post is very expensive because it decreases productivity. Therefore, doing durable and regular researches in this area prevents from satisfaction reduction and provide situation for employees psycho – physical promotion.

One who is satisfied with his/ her occupation can compensate various material damages by making good (logical) decisions; In fact, he always produces value – added, wealth and efficiency for organization. In other

word, he increases material capital. Satisfied employees have more productivity for organization than unsatisfied ones because the latter's increase problems by making illogical decisions.

In most studies special attention was given to relationship between motivation and occupational satisfaction. Lamborn showed that motivation is an important prediction in occupational satisfaction [5]. Another significant factor is relationship between age and marriage. Results in another study showed that married employees and those with more precedence have more satisfaction in comparison with young and single persons [6].

A researcher showed that the more the digress of employees, the more his expectation in spiritual and material affairs, as a result that leads to desperation and dissatisfaction [7]. Other researches proved that with increasing of occupational satisfaction, productivity and creativity improve. In other word, abandonment of work decreases [8].

Another related factor about occupational satisfaction is management. It was proved that there was a closely relationship between management and occupational satisfaction [9].

### MATERIALS AND METHODS

This contextual study carried out cross- sectionally. Statistical society was consisted of 6500 official employees in Mobarake Steel Co. For evaluating

occupational satisfaction in units asked them to complete on line questionnaire in 15 days. During this time 2068 (31.6%) questionnaires were completed. by using demographic feature questionnaire, & questions about age, married status, educational degree, residence, occupation, work place and precedence of employees were investigated. By using occupational satisfaction questionnaires with 43 questions, amount of employees satisfaction was investigated, mentioned questionnaire involved 6 scales:

- Satisfaction from occupation,
- Satisfaction from supervisor,
- Satisfaction from cooperators,
- Satisfaction from promotion,
- Satisfaction from wage,
- Satisfaction from reward.

Questionnaire validity and reliability (MFJSQ) [10]:

Most of questions derived from JDI and others designed according to the condition and structural features of company by consultation with experienced persons.

For investigating questionnaire validity, convergent validity was used 40 employees completed occupational satisfaction and JDI questionnaire of Emit that was validated by Arshadi [10] and its validity and reliability was .66 and /94 respectively.

- Mobarake Foolad Job satisfaction questionnaire.
- Job descriptive index.

Correlation of this questionnaire was .71 that showed an idealized validity for evaluating questionnaire reliability, test retest method was used and 40 employees completed it after 15 days. Results showed reliability was /92. Internal reliability obtained by Cranach & was. /91 that indicated internal consistency. SPSS software for windows ver. 16, was used to analyze findings of the study and for examining the hypothesis of the study

descriptive statistics (frequency, percentage and standard deviation) and inferential statistics (chi square, analysis of variance and Pearson correlation) were used.

## RESULTS

Of all the employees, 43.8% were operators, 55.7% were experts, 0.5% were managers. Finding showed a tangible increasing In all scales except for cooperators in comparison with 2010. As it was shown in the table, highest amounts belonged to reward and wage with 0.3% and 0.10 respectively (Table 1).

Results of Table 2 showed that there was a striking difference between occupational and total satisfaction. In all scales, managers satisfaction was higher than employees except from cooperators and wages.

There are differences in amount of occupational satisfaction of employees according to their occupations. These differences are shown in Table 3.

Occupational satisfaction of employees differs according to kinds of shift. It was shown in Table 4.

Table 5: shows that according to shift, there is tangible difference in employees' satisfaction. In nature of work scale, the highest and lowest means of 4.07 and 3.88 belong to work shift 11.21 and 21.21 respectively. About supervisors with 3.59 and 3.49, it belongs to day work and shift work 11.21. In cooperators with 3.69 and 3.50, employees' satisfaction belongs to shift work employees' 11.21. In wages with 2.83 and 2.69, it belongs to shift work 11.21 and day work.

## DISCUSSION

Findings of this study were come from a questionnaire based on descriptive and inferential statistics and thus, just reflect the attitude and satisfaction of employees in steel Mobarake Co. Therefore, reports shows that there is a striking difference between managers and employees satisfaction due to their benefits.

Table 1: Comparison of occupational satisfaction in Steel Mobarake Co. in different years

Scales of occupational satisfaction	Studies years									Changes in comparison with 2010
	2002	2003	2004	2005	2006	2007	2008	2010	2011	
Nature of Job	3.20	3.62	3.72	3.99	3.93	3.99	3.94	3.82	3.92	+0.10
Supervisor	3.10	3.56	3.51	3.55	3.57	3.67	3.63	3.48	3.56	+0.08
Cooperators	3.50	3.63	3.65	3.67	3.63	3.70	3.69	3.64	3.56	- 0.08
Occupational promotion	2.10	2.27	2.25	2.51	2.52	2.60	2.50	2.42	2.52	+0.10
Wage	2.50	2.72	2.58	2.69	2.57	2.52	2.46	2.46	2.74	+0.28
Reward	-	-	-	2.60	2.59	2.74	2.75	2.55	2.68	+0/13
Total satisfaction	2.88	3.17	3.31	3.38	3.31	3.56	3.35	3.22	3.32	+0.10

Table 2: Analysis of variance according to occupation

Scales	Change source	Total square	Degree of freedom	Mean of square	F	Meaning full level
Nature of work	Occupation	9.494	2	4.747	12.086	0.001
	Bug	809.147	2060	0.393		
	Total	818.641	2062	-		
Supervisor	Occupation	11.272	2	5.64	11.198	0.001
	Bug	1035.854	2058	0.503		
	Total	1047.126	2060	-		
Cooperators	Occupation	5.720	2	2.863	6.829	0.001
	Bug	860.540	2053	0.419		
	Total	866.265	2055	-		
Promotions	Occupation	8.102	2	4.051	4.639	0.01
	Bug	1792.810	2053	0.873		
	Total	1800.912	2055	-		
Wages	Occupation	2.705	2	1.353	4.498	0.011
	Bug	614.716	2044	0.301		
	Total	617.421	2046	-		
Rewards	Occupation	9.554	2	4.777	5.058	0.006
	Bug	1932.283	2046	0.944		
	Total	1941.836	2048	-		
Total	Occupation	2.029	2	1.014	5.054	0.006
	Bug	409.815	2042	0.201		
	Total	411.844	2044	-		

Table 3: Statistical indexes of occupational satisfaction according to occupation

Scales	Occupation	Frequency	Mean	Standard deviation
Nature of Job	Manager	11	4.18	0.27
	Employees expert	1147	3.97	0.61
	Operator	9.5	3.84	0.66
Supervisor	Manager	11	3.86	0.27
	Employees expert	1146	3.62	0.69
	Operator	904	3.48	0.73
Cooperators	Manager	11	3.73	0.31
	Employees expert	1141	3.51	0.63
	Operator	904	3.61	0.67
Promotions	Manager	11	3.36	0.58
	Employees expert	1142	2.52	0.92
	Operator	903	2.50	0.95
Wages	Manager	11	3.20	0.42
	Employees expert	1139	2.72	0.54
	Operator	897	2.75	0.56
Reward	Manager	11	3.22	0.75
	Employees expert	1140	2.72	0.96
	Operator	898	2.61	0.99
Total	Manager	11	3.68	0.24
	Employees expert	1138	3.34	0.45
	Operator	896	3.30	0.45

Table 4: Statistical indexes of occupational satisfaction according to kinds of shift

Scales	Shift	Frequency	Mean	Standard deviation
Nature of work	Daily work	1.43	3.93	0.61
	Shift work 21.21	940	3.88	0.65
	Shift work 11.21	80	4.07	0.59
Supervisor	Daily work	1042	3.59	0.70
	Shift work 21.21	940	3.52	0.73
	Shift work 11.21	79	3.49	0.69
Cooperators	Daily work	1038	3.50	0.65
	Shift work 21.21	939	3.60	0.65
	Shift work 11.21	79	3.69	0.56
Promotions	Daily work	1040	2.51	0.93
	Shift work 21.21	937	2.52	0.95
	Shift work 11.21	79	2.65	0.92
Wages	Daily work	1036	2.69	0.55
	Shift work 21.21	932	2.78	0.55
	Shift work 11.21	79	2.83	0.54
Rewards	Daily work	1038	2.69	0.96
	Shift work 21.21	932	2.66	1.00
	Shift work 11.21	79	2.72	0.84
Total	Daily work	1035	3.31	0.45
	Shift work 21.21	931	3.33	0.44
	Shift work 11.21	79	3.32	0.45

Note : 21.21 has three shifts and 11.21 is two shift, morning until 3 P.M and 3 P.M until 24:00

Table 5: Results of analysis of variance according to shift

Scale	Change source	Total square	Freedom of degree	Square mean	F	Meaning ful level
Nature of work	Shift	3.077	2	1.538	3.886	.121
	Bug	815.564	2060	396		
	Total	818.641	2062	-		
Supervisor	Shift	3.222	2	1.611	3.176	0.042
	Bug	1043.904	2058	0.507		
	Total	1047.126	2060	-		
Cooperators	Shift	6.203	2	3.102	4.404	0.001
	Bug	860.062	2053	0.419		
	Total	866.265	2055	-		
Promotions	Shift	1.487	2	0.744	0.848	0.428
	Bug	1799.425	2053	0.876		
	Total	1800.912	2055	-		
Wages	Shift	4.640	2	2.320	7.738	0.001
	Bug	612.781	2044	0.300		
	Total	617.421	2046	-		
Reward	Shift	0.553	2	0.277	0.292	0.747
	Bug	1941.283	2046	0.949		
	Total	1941.836	2048	-		
Total	Shift	0.642	2	0.321		1.595
	Bug	411.201	2042	0.201		
	Total	411.844	2044	-		

It is worthy to mention that occupational satisfaction was more in young employees than adults.

In scales, The highest satisfaction belongs to age group 56 and more. In nature of work, the lowest satisfaction belongs to age groups 18-25 about supervisor belongs to age groups 18-25 and 26-35. In employees and promotion equally belongs to 26-35. About wage and reward it belongs to 36-45 and 26-35 respectively.

Most significant factor for adult satisfaction is their presence from early establishment of the company. This study has documented that elevated satisfaction during work was associated with elevation of precedent and post.

Another important finding was that official employees were more satisfied than contractual ones.

Investigations show that there is a tangible difference in employees' satisfaction – i.e. in cooperators and promotion based on their educational degree. In cooperators scale highest amount of satisfaction belongs to people with diploma and below diploma. It seems that there is an amicable relationship between employees for need of furlough and other occupational problems. In promotion scale, the highest satisfaction is seen in people with M.A and higher degrees.

In comparison with 2010, absolute mean of employees' satisfaction had an increasing about +10.

Wage with +0.28 reward with +0.13, work nature and occupational promotion with + 0.10 had tangible differences in comparison with 2010, but cooperators had 8% decreasing.

During 9 years ago, highest satisfaction belonged to 2007 after that descending order was seen until 2010. Now with managers' arrangement, it was observed positive changes.

#### ACKNOWLEDGEMENTS

We acknowledge the deputy of research affairs in Shahrekord university of medical sciences, Iran for supporting the project financially. We sincerely appreciate the cooperation of employees and their spouses in Mobarakeh Steel Co. who took part full heartedly in this project as well.

#### CONCLUSION

Since employees' satisfaction plays an important role in their effectiveness in society and workplace, it is important to consider their willing, because there is a closely relationship between motivation and occupational satisfaction.

#### REFERENCES

1. Howard, M., 2002. Deconstructing job satisfaction: Separating evaluations beliefs and affective experiences. *Hum Resource Manage Review*, 12:174.
2. Sibbald, B., I. Enzer, C. Cooper, U. Rout and V. Sutherland, 1987. GP job satisfaction in 1990 and 1998: lessons for the future? *Fam Pract*, 17: 364-371.
3. Pathnlanl, D.E., T.R. Konrad, E.S. Williams, W.E. Scheckler, M. Linzer and S.J. Dougla, 2002. Physician job satisfaction, dissatisfaction and turnover. *J Fam Pract*, 51:593.
4. Parsons, S.K., W.P. Simmons, K. Penn and M. Furlough, 2003. Determinants of satisfaction and turnover among nursing assistants: The results of a statewide survey. *J. Gerontol Nurs.*, 29: 51-58.
5. Lamborn, M.L., 1991. Motivational and job satisfaction of dears of schools of nursing. *Journal of Professional Nursing*, 7(1): 33-40.
6. Clark, A., A.J. Oswald and P. Warr, 1996. Is job satisfaction a shaped in age? *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 69: 57-81.
7. Hamermesh, D.S., 2001. The changing distribution of job satisfaction. *Journal of Human Resources*, 36: 1-30.
8. Terry, D., 1992. The effect of work stress on psychology of well being and job satisfaction. The stress buffering role of social support. *Australian. Journal of Psychology*, 45(3): 168-175.
9. Billmore, D., 2006. How do female and male faculty member construct job satisfaction? The role perceived institutional leadership. *Journal of Technology Transfer*, 31(3): 355-365.
10. Arshadi, N., 1990. The evaluation of reliability and validity the JDI questionnaire in South oil area national company. MA thesis, Ahvaz University.