

Impact of Psychological Empowerment on Job Satisfaction among the Employees of a Shipyard.

Dr.P.Paramanandam
Professor

P.S.Shobita
Research Scholar

Department of Management,
PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, India

Abstract: Psychological empowerment is a cognitive state that is characterized by a sense of perceived control, perceptions of competence, and internalization of goals and objectives of the organisation. Psychological empowerment refers to personal beliefs that employees have about their role in relation to the organization. The present study aims at studying the impact of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction among the employees of a shipyard. The sample consisted of 63 employees. Questionnaires were used for data collection. The collected data was analyzed with statistical tools which include mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, correlation and regression tests. The Results showed that approximately twenty nine per cent of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by psychological empowerment.

Key Words: Competence, Impact, Job Satisfaction, psychological empowerment, and self-determination.

I. INTRODUCTION

Psychological empowerment is defined as “intrinsic task motivation reflecting a sense of self-control in relation to one's work and an active involvement with one's work role”. The term empowerment used in a variety of contexts, such as psychology, social work, emancipation of women, politics, education, law, and employment (Conger and Kanungo, 1988; Lashley, 2001; Fride, 2006). This development into different directions and fields of usage caused the meaning of the word to become blurred. There is no universally accepted definition existing. Depending on the context, several interpretations of the term empowerment can be observed. Some define it as “an alternative strategy to the traditional way of promoting development”, others as “the ability to make decisions in questions that affect the life of a person”, and still others simply as “a change in the relations of power” (Fride, 2006).

Empowerment is still not consistently defined. Fride (2006) describes it as “the process of the distribution of power that allows the employee greater capacities for decision-making and greater autonomy over his/her work”. In the past, employers mainly assumed that employees are only working to earn money (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990), which made an authoritarian management style necessary to assure compliance to rules and regulations, decreasing the chance of experiencing empowerment for employees (Conger and Kanungo, 1988). According to Thomas and Velthouse (1990), the term empowerment within businesses became popular when globalization and international competition forced organizations to change their management style in order to reach innovation, employee commitment, and willingness to take risks. Moreover, at this time research enforced empowerment's popularity as it drew the attention of managers towards the hidden capabilities and potentials of their workforce.

Job satisfaction is one of the most researched variables in the area of workplace psychology, and has been associated with numerous psychosocial issues ranging from leadership to job design. Due to the popularity of job satisfaction within the field of occupational and organizational psychology, various researchers and practitioners have provided their own definitions of what job satisfaction is. However, the two most common definitions describe job satisfaction as: “the pleasurable emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job as achieving or facilitating the achievement of one's job values and “the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs.

Most definitions of empowerment relate to the affective feeling an employee has towards their job. This could be the job in general or their attitudes towards specific aspects of it, such as: their colleagues, pay or working conditions. In addition, the extent to which work outcomes meet or exceed expectations may determine the level of job satisfaction. However, job satisfaction is not only about how much an employee enjoys work. In a study Taber and Alliger found that when employees of an American educational institute

rated how much they enjoyed individual tasks within their role, their scores were moderately correlated to satisfaction with the work itself, and associated with global job satisfaction. Taber and Alliger also found that other measures (such as, level of concentration required for the job, level of supervision, and task importance) all had no impact on satisfaction. The present study aims at assessing the impact of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction.

II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE

Timothy Bartram, Therese A Joiner and Pauline Stanton (2000) in a study examined two factors that may contribute to the job satisfaction and job stress of nurses: social support and empowerment. Using a sample of 157 registered nurses in a private hospital in Melbourne, Australia, they found that social support derived from the nurse's supervisor and work colleagues lowers job stress and at the same time increases job satisfaction. The presence of nurse empowerment, meaning, impact, competence and self-determination, also lowered job stress and increased job satisfaction.

Lynn Holdsworth and Susan Cartwright (2003) in a study explored the relationship between stress, satisfaction and the four dimensions of psychological empowerment (meaning, impact, self-determination and competence) within a call centre. The occupational stress indicator and Spreitzer's empowerment measures were used to collect data from the North West (UK) call centre. The study found that the call centre agents were more stressed, less satisfied and reported poorer mental and physical health than the general working population. In addition the sample perceived themselves as less empowered than other workers in a traditional office environment. The empowerment dimensions of meaning, impact and particularly self-determination, seem to directly influence job satisfaction.

Kevin E. Dickson and Alicia Lorenz (2009) examined relationships between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of temporary and part-time nonstandard workers. Data were collected from undergraduate students employed in short-term jobs outside their field of study. This study found two cognitions of psychological empowerment (meaning and impact) to be positively associated with job satisfaction. This study also tested the relationships between organizational tenure and psychological empowerment and organizational tenure and job satisfaction for temporary and part-time nonstandard workers. The results indicate a positive relationship between organizational tenure and psychological empowerment and a negative relationship between organizational tenure and job satisfaction.

Chun-Hsi Vivian Chen and Wei-Chieh Chang (2011) examined the effect of psychological empowerment on employee involvement, and the subsequent effect of employee involvement on employee job satisfaction, organizational identification, and psychological withdrawal behavior. The authors adopted a cross-level analysis to investigate the relationship between supportive organizational culture and psychological climate. The moderating effect of psychological climate on the relationship between psychological empowerment and employee involvement was also explored. The authors found that psychological empowerment relates positively to employee involvement, which has a positive effect on employees' job satisfaction and organizational identification. They also found that employee involvement mediates the relationships between psychological empowerment and employees' job satisfaction as well as organizational identification.

III. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY

The present study was aimed at studying the impact of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction among the employees of a Shipyard.

IV. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

A random sample consisting of 63 employees working in a shipyard participated in the study. Questionnaire method was used for data collection. The collected data was analyzed with mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, correlation and regression tests.

MEASURES:

The psychological empowerment instrument developed by Spreitzer (1995) was used to assess the level of empowerment among the respondents. The respondents were asked to rate each of the 16 items on a 5-point

Likert scale. Responses were scored as follows: Strongly agree = 5, agree=4, neutral=3, disagree=2, strongly disagree=1.

The Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) Short Form was used to assess the level of job satisfaction. The respondents were asked to rate each of the 20 items on a 5-point Likert scale. Responses were scored as follows: Highly satisfied = 5, Satisfied =4, Neutral =3, Dissatisfied =2, Highly dissatisfied =1.

V.RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Table 1 Demographic characteristics of the Sample

Characteristics	Classification	Number of Respondents	Percent
Age (in years)	30 & Below	31	49.2
	Above 30	32	50.8
Gender	Male	35	55.6
	Female	28	44.4
Education	Post graduate	27	42.9
	Graduate	36	57.1
Experience (in years)	Below 5	21	33.3
	5 -10	36	57.1
	Above 10	6	9.5
Income (in rupees)	20000 & Below	7	11.1
	20000-30000	34	54.0
	Above 30000	22	34.9

Among the 63 respondents, 32 (50.8%) belong to above 30 years age group; 35 (55.6%) are male; 36 (57.1%) are graduates; 36 (57.1) belong to 5-10 years experience group, and 34 (54.0%) belong to 20000 – 30000 rupees income group.

Table 2 Mean & Standard Deviation of research variables in different age groups.

Age (in years)		Competence	Meaning	Self determination	Impact	Psychological Empowerment	Job Satisfaction
30 & Below	Mean	11.32	12.29	9.71	10.81	44.13	64.03
	N	31	31	31	31	31	31
	Std. Deviation	1.956	1.216	2.132	1.957	4.958	6.686
Above 30	Mean	13.06	12.50	12.25	11.44	49.25	68.88
	N	32	32	32	32	32	32
	Std. Deviation	1.413	1.760	1.666	2.355	5.685	8.047
Total	Mean	12.21	12.40	11.00	11.13	46.73	66.49
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
	Std. Deviation	1.902	1.508	2.286	2.174	5.892	7.744
F Value		33.078 (.000)	.903 (.344)	69.326 (.000)	2.630 (.107)	33.190 (.000)	15.942 (.000)

High levels of competence (Mean = 13.06), meaning (Mean =12.50), self-determination (Mean = 12.25), impact (Mean = 11.44, overall psychological empowerment (Mean = 49.25) and job satisfaction (Mean = 68.88) were observed among the above 30 years age group. There was a significant difference in competence ($F = 33.078$ & $p = .000$), self-determination ($F = 69.326$ & $p = .000$), overall psychological

empowerment ($F = 33.190$ & $p = .000$), and job satisfaction ($F = 15.942$ & $p = .000$) among the respondents of different age groups.

Table 3 Mean & Standard Deviation of research variables in different gender groups.

Gender		Competence	Meaning	Self determination	Impact	Psychological Empowerment	Job Satisfaction
Male	Mean	12.60	12.60	10.71	11.29	47.20	66.09
	N	35	35	35	35	35	35
	Std. Deviation	1.866	1.594	2.080	2.177	6.058	6.590
Female	Mean	11.71	12.14	11.36	10.93	46.14	67.00
	N	28	28	28	28	28	28
	Std. Deviation	1.863	1.380	2.512	2.193	5.733	9.084
Total	Mean	12.21	12.40	11.00	11.13	46.73	66.49
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
	Std. Deviation	1.902	1.508	2.286	2.174	5.892	7.744
F Value		9.518 (.002)	3.643 (.058)	3.734 (.055)	.769 (.382)	1.097 (.297)	.404 (.526)

High levels of competence (Mean = 12.60), meaning (Mean = 12.60), impact (Mean = 11.29), and overall psychological empowerment (Mean = 47.20) were observed among the male respondents. A high level of job satisfaction (Mean = 67.00) was observed among the female respondents. There was a significant difference in competence ($F = 9.518$ & $p = .002$) among the respondents of different gender.

Table 4 Mean & Standard Deviation of research variables in different education groups.

Education		Competence	Meaning	Self determination	Impact	Psychological Empowerment	Job Satisfaction
PG	Mean	12.11	12.33	10.41	11.15	46.00	64.11
	N	27	27	27	27	27	27
	Std. Deviation	2.154	1.301	1.907	2.265	5.477	5.706
UG	Mean	12.28	12.44	11.44	11.11	47.28	68.28
	N	36	36	36	36	36	36
	Std. Deviation	1.717	1.664	2.466	2.135	6.204	8.624
Total	Mean	12.21	12.40	11.00	11.13	46.73	66.49
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
	Std. Deviation	1.902	1.508	2.286	2.174	5.892	7.744
F Value		.034 (.855)	.027 (.870)	9.017 (.003)	.179 (.673)	1.193 (.277)	10.955 (.001)

High levels of competence (Mean = 12.28), meaning (Mean = 12.44), self-determination (Mean = 11.44), overall psychological empowerment (Mean = 47.28), and job satisfaction (Mean = 68.28) were observed among the under graduates (UG) group. There was a significant difference in self determination ($F=9.017$ & $p=.003$) and job satisfaction ($F = 10.955$ & $p = .001$) among the respondents of different education groups.

Table 5 Mean & Standard Deviation of research variables in different experience groups.

Experience (in years)		Competence	Meaning	Self determination	Impact	Psychological Empowerment	Job Satisfaction
Below 5	Mean	11.67	12.33	9.95	11.00	44.95	65.29
	N	21	21	21	21	21	21
	Std. Deviation	2.244	1.390	2.085	2.345	5.599	6.769
5-10	Mean	12.11	12.06	11.11	10.78	46.06	64.83
	N	36	36	36	36	36	36
	Std. Deviation	1.508	1.372	2.053	1.838	4.478	5.283
Above 10	Mean	14.67	14.67	14.00	13.67	57.00	80.67
	N	6	6	6	6	6	6
	Std. Deviation	.516	.516	1.549	2.066	4.648	9.893
Total	Mean	12.21	12.40	11.00	11.13	46.73	66.49
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
	Std. Deviation	1.902	1.508	2.286	2.174	5.892	7.744
F Value		14.998(.000)	21.396 (.000)	22.464 (.000)	12.173 (.000)	32.875 (.000)	45.455 (.000)

High levels of competence (Mean = 14.67), meaning (Mean =14.67), self-determination (Mean = 14.00), impact (Mean = 13.67), overall psychological empowerment (Mean = 57.00), and job satisfaction (Mean = 80.67) were observed among the above 10 years experience group. There was a significant difference in competence (F = 14.998 & p = .000), meaning (F = 21.396 & p = .000), self-determination (F = 22.464 & p = .000), impact (F= 12.173 & p = .000), overall psychological empowerment (F = 32.875 & p = .000), and job satisfaction (F = 45.455 & p = .000) among the respondents of different experience groups.

Table 6 Mean & Standard Deviation of research variables in different income groups.

Income (in rupees)		Competence	Meaning	Self determination	Impact	Psychological Empowerment	Job Satisfaction
20000 & Below	Mean	14.43	12.71	12.14	12.43	51.71	69.00
	N	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Std. Deviation	.535	2.138	1.069	.535	2.138	.000
20000-30000	Mean	12.06	12.35	10.76	11.29	46.47	66.35
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34
	Std. Deviation	2.159	1.390	2.475	2.646	6.964	8.556
Above 30000	Mean	11.73	12.36	11.00	10.45	45.55	65.91
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22
	Std. Deviation	1.162	1.529	2.225	1.335	3.888	7.715
Total	Mean	12.21	12.40	11.00	11.13	46.73	66.49
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
	Std. Deviation	1.902	1.508	2.286	2.174	5.892	7.744

Income (in rupees)		Competence	Meaning	Self determination	Impact	Psychological Empowerment	Job Satisfaction
20000 & Below	Mean	14.43	12.71	12.14	12.43	51.71	69.00
	N	7	7	7	7	7	7
	Std. Deviation	.535	2.138	1.069	.535	2.138	.000
20000-30000	Mean	12.06	12.35	10.76	11.29	46.47	66.35
	N	34	34	34	34	34	34
	Std. Deviation	2.159	1.390	2.475	2.646	6.964	8.556
Above 30000	Mean	11.73	12.36	11.00	10.45	45.55	65.91
	N	22	22	22	22	22	22
	Std. Deviation	1.162	1.529	2.225	1.335	3.888	7.715
Total	Mean	12.21	12.40	11.00	11.13	46.73	66.49
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
F Value		16.403 (.000)	.846 (.431)	2.443 (.091)	7.395 (.001)	8.488 (.000)	.976 (.380)

High levels of competence (Mean = 14.43), meaning (Mean = 12.71), self-determination (Mean = 12.14), impact (Mean = 12.43), overall psychological empowerment (Mean = 51.71) and job satisfaction (Mean = 69.00) were observed among the below 20000 income group. There was a significant difference in competence ($F = 16.403$ & $p = .000$), impact ($F = 7.395$ & $p = .001$), and overall psychological empowerment ($F = 8.488$ & $p = .000$) among the respondents of different income groups.

Table 7 Correlation among the research variables

		Competence	Meaning	Self determination	Impact	Psychological Empowerment	Job Satisfaction
Competence	Pearson Correlation	1	.336**	.453**	.540**	.784**	.373**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.007	.000	.000	.000	.003
	N	63	63	63	63	63	63
Meaning	Pearson Correlation		1	.290*	.230	.562**	.222
	Sig. (2-tailed)			.021	.069	.000	.080
	N		63	63	63	63	63
Self determination	Pearson Correlation			1	.506**	.795**	.518**
	Sig. (2-tailed)				.000	.000	.000
	N			63	63	63	63
Impact	Pearson Correlation				1	.799**	.347**
	Sig. (2-tailed)					.000	.005
	N				63	63	63
Psychological Empowerment	Pearson Correlation					1	.506**
	Sig. (2-tailed)						.000

	N					63	63
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation						1
	Sig. (2-tailed)						
	N						63

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Correlation test revealed that there was a significant correlation between competence and meaning, competence and self-determination, competence and impact, and competence and job satisfaction. There was a significant correlation between meaning and self-determination, meaning and impact, and meaning and job satisfaction. There was a significant correlation between self-determination and impact, and self-determination and job satisfaction. There was a significant correlation between impact and job satisfaction.

Table 8 Regression analysis with job satisfaction as the dependent variable

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.543 ^a	.295	.246	6.722

a. Predictors: (Constant), PE

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	1096.944	4	274.236	6.069	.000
	Residual	2620.802	58	45.186		
	Total	3717.746	62			

Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	39.246	7.935		4.946	.000
	Competence	.589	.564	.145	1.044	.301
	Meaning	.213	.609	.042	.350	.728
	Self determinat	1.406	.452	.415	3.110	.003
	Impact	.175	.498	.049	.351	.727

Regression analysis was conducted to investigate the relationship between psychological empowerment and job satisfaction. F-Test was statistically significant, which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Square is 0.29 which means that approximately 29 % of the variance of job satisfaction was explained by the predictor variable, that is, psychological empowerment. The findings of this study are consistent with the findings of the previous researchers Timothy Bartram, Therese A Joiner and Pauline Stanton (2000), Lynn Holdsworth and Susan Cartwright (2003), Kevin E. Dickson and Alicia Lorenz (2009), and Chun-Hsi Vivian Chen and Wei-Chieh Chang (2011).

VI.CONCLUSION

Psychological empowerment is defined as the increased task motivation that results from an individual's positive orientation to the work role. The present study was aimed at studying the impact of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction. A random sample consisting of sixty three employees working in a shipyard participated in the study. Questionnaire method was used for data collection. The collected data was analyzed with mean, standard deviation, ANOVA, correlation and regression tests. The results indicated that there was a significant difference in competence, self-determination, overall psychological empowerment, and job satisfaction among the respondents of different age groups. There was a significant difference in competence, meaning, self-determination, impact, overall psychological empowerment, and job satisfaction among the respondents of different experience groups. There was a significant difference in competence, impact, and overall psychological empowerment among the respondents of different income groups. There was a significant correlation among all the research variables. Approximately 29 per cent of the variance in job satisfaction was explained by psychological empowerment.

VII.REFERENCES

- Abd. Ghani et al., (2009). The Impact of Psychological Empowerment on Lecturers' Innovative Behaviour in Malaysian Private Higher Education Institutions. *Canadian Social Science*. 5(4), 54-62
- Ahearne et al., (2005). To Empower or Not to Empower Your Sales Force? An Empirical Examination of the Influence of Leadership Empowerment Behavior on Customer Satisfaction and Performance.
- Barrutia et al., (2009). Salesperson empowerment in Spanish banks:A performance-driven view. *Journal of Financial Services Marketing*, 14(1), 40-55
- Borman, W. C., and Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), *Personnel selection in organizations* (pp. 71-98). San Francisco, CA: Jossey Bass.
- Bradley et al., (2006) Privacy in Organizations: Empowering Creative and Extrarole Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91(1), 221-232
- Carlesses, S.A (2004). Does Psychological Empowerment mediate the relationship between Psychological Climate and Job Satisfaction? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(4), 405-425.
- Carter, J.D.T (2009). Managers empowering employees *American Journal of Economics and Business Administration*, 1 (2) 39-44
- Chen, Chun-Hsi Vivian and Chang, Wei-Chieh (2011). "Effects of Psychological Empowerment on Employee Involvement and Work Attitudes: The Moderation of Psychological Climate" *International Conference on Innovation and Management, Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia, July 12-15*.
- Dickson, K. E., & Lorenz, A. (2009). Psychological empowerment and job satisfaction of temporary and part-time nonstandard workers: A preliminary investigation. *Journal of Behavioral and Applied Management*, 10(2), 166-191.
- Lynn Holdsworth and Susan Cartwright (2003). "Empowerment, stress and satisfaction: an exploratory study of a call centre", *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, Vol. 24 Issue: 3, pp.131-140.
- Menon, S.T (1999). Psychological empowerment: definition, measurement, and validation. *Canadian Journal of Behavioural Science*, 31(3), 161-164.
- Rehman, M.S and Waheed, A, (2011). An Empirical Study of Impact of Job Satisfaction on job Performance in the Public Sector Organizations, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 2 (9), 167-181
- Sally A. and Carless, S.A (2004). Does psychological empowerment mediates the relationship between psychological climate and job satisfaction? *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 18(4), 405-425

Schermerhorn, J.R. (1996). *Essentials of management and organizational behavior*. John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Seibert et al., (2004). Taking empowerment to the next level: a multiple-level model of empowerment, Performance and Satisfaction, *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(3), 332–349.

Sparrowe, R. T. (1994). Empowerment in the hospitality industry: An exploration of antecedents and outcomes. *Hospitality Research Journal*, 17(3), 51-73.

Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications, Inc.

Spreitzer et al., (1997). A dimensional analysis of the relationship between psychological empowerment and effectiveness, satisfaction and strain, *Journal of Management*, 23 (5), 679-705.

Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.

Thomas, K.W. and Tymon, W. (1994). Does empowerment always work: understanding the role of intrinsic motivation and personal interpretation. *Journal of Management systems*, 6(2), 1-13

Thomas, K.W. and Velthouse, B.A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: an “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15 (4), 666-681.

Timothy Bartram, Therese A Joiner and Pauline Stanton (2000). How empowerment and social support affect Australian nurses' work stressors. *Australian health review*, 28(1):56-64.

