THE EFFECTS OF PERSONAL CHARACTERISTICS ON ORGANIZATIONAL BEHAVIOUR USING RECURSIVE STRUCTURAL EQUATION MODELING

Sentharmalai K Kannan. K and Sathiya V
Department of Statistics, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, India.
Department of Statistics, Manonmaniam Sundaranar University, Tirunelveli, India.

Abstract: The concept of Employee Satisfaction has been developed in many ways by many different researchers and practitioners. The data is collected from 19 Arts & Science Colleges in Tirunelveli District. This study presents an analysis of various factors affecting Employee Satisfaction among Private Arts & College Lecturers in Tirunelveli District. Employee Satisfaction is developed with dependence on Employee Involvement, Work Place Conflict, Working Condition and Employee Retention. The Recursive SEM is used to test the hypothesis and solve the model using ADF Estimators. The Recursive CFA model is fitted. The SEM model is fitted. The fitted model is Recursive SEM Model. In the research work, the relationship between Work Place Conflict and Employee Retention did not have the significant result and can't be supported.
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1. Introduction
Employee satisfaction is the terminology used to describe whether employees are happy and contented and fulfilling their desires and needs at work. Many measures purport that employee satisfaction is a factor in employee motivation, employee goal achievement, positive employee morale in the workplace. This work presents the effects of personal characteristics on organizational behaviour using recursive structural equation modeling on the study of the employee satisfaction among Private Arts and Science College Lecturers in Tirunelveli District.

2. Literature Review

3. Methodology
A. The Hypothesized model
Based on the theoretical frame work shows in figure A1, 8 major hypothesis are proposed.
H1: “Employees Involvement” has a positive effect on “Working condition”
H2: “Employees Involvement” has a positive effect on “Employee Retention”
H3: “Workplace conflict” has a positive effect on “Working condition”
H4: “Workplace conflict” has a positive effect on “Employee Retention”
H5: “Working condition” has a positive effect on “Employee satisfaction”
H6: “Employee Retention” has a positive effect on “Employee satisfaction”
H7: “Employee Retention” has a positive effect on “Working condition”
H8: “Workplace conflict” has a negative effect on “Employee satisfaction”.

B. Sample Size Determination:
For Finite Population, N=1372
By Yamane’s sample size determination formula,

\[ n = \frac{N \cdot \bar{N}}{1 + N \cdot \bar{N}} \]

For the accuracy of the result, researcher has distributed 475 Questionnaires among arts and science college lecturers. Among 475 arts and science college lecturers in Tirunelveli District, 400 are taken into consideration and 75 are non-responses. Eliminate the omission or incomplete answer, yielding a response rate of 84.2%.

C. Sample Profile:
In this approach, summarize the demographic characteristics the respondents things as gender, age and so on. Table A2 shows the respondents’ demographics.

D. Sampling Design
The data is collected from 19 Arts & Science Colleges from Tirunelveli District. It is collected from 5 Departments (25 Persons) in each college. The Departments namely B.com, English, Chemistry, Physics, Computer Science. Researcher applied Simple Random sampling (Lottery Method) from probability sampling Technique to collect primary data through structured Questionnaire.

E. Scale reliability and validity
From the Table A3, the analysis shows the good reliabilities and validity of the data. On the other side, we also adopt the other discriminant validity as table A4. The analysis also shows the good disc validity (Narver, Slater and Machlachlan, 2004).

F. Model Assessment
After the analyzed of the scale reliabilities and validity, in this approach. The researcher use the structural equation modeling (SEM) with AMOS to analyze the data and the overall structure model in the fitness and the results of hypothesis testing.

4. Results and Discussion

A. AVE: A good rule of thumb is an AVE of .5 or higher indicates adequate convergent validity. An AVE of less than .5 indicates that on average, there is more error remaining in the items than there is variance explained by the latent factor structure you have imposed on the measure. CR:
The rule of thumb for a construct reliability estimate is that .7 or higher suggests good reliability. Reliability between .6 and .7 may be acceptable provided that other indicators of a model’s construct validity are good. A high construct reliability indicates that internal consistency exists. This means the measures all are consistently representing something.

All variance extracted (AVE) estimates in the above table are larger than the corresponding squared inter-construct correlation estimates (SIC). This means the indicators have more in common with the construct they are associated with than they do with other constructs. Therefore, the three construct CFA model demonstrates discriminant validity.

5. Setting of Hypothesis
A) H1: Employees “Involvement” has a positive effect on “Working condition”
Regarding our work, the hypothesis H1 is proposed: Employees “Involvement” has a positive effect on “Working condition”. The analysis results lend support for H1. It is consistent with the results of Mengue’s (1996) work. Employees Involvement could have the better performance.
B) H2: "Employee Involvement" has a positive effect on "Employee Retention".

Regarding our work, the hypothesis 2 is proposed: Employees "Involvement" has a positive effect on "Employee Retention". The result shows that there has significant positive relationship between the Employees "Involvement" and "Employee Retention". It is consistent with Mengue's (1996) work. Employees "Involvement" could have the better performance.

C) H3: "Work Place Conflict" has a positive effect on "Working condition"

Regarding our work, the hypothesis 3 is proposed: "Work Place Conflict" has a positive effect on "Working condition". The analysis results lend support for H3. It is consistent with Mengue's (1996) work. "Work Place Conflict" could have the better performance.

D) H4: "Work Place Conflict" has a positive effect on "Employee Retention"

Regarding our work, the H4 is proposed: H4: "Work Place Conflict" has a positive effect on "Employee Retention". The result shows that there has significant positive relationship between Work Place Conflict and Employee Retention. It is consistent with Mengue's (1996) work. It is indicated that Employee Retention would increases by finish the work in deadline, do the best to apply the abilities, and completeness of the responsibilities coverage. As the result, well-appointed schedule detailed the work standard, and the job description could assist the employees in getting more targets to measure the working condition. Because of the maturely supporting policies would enhance the effect: Work Place Conflict on the Employee Retention.

E) H5: "Working condition" has a positive effect on "Employee satisfaction"

Regarding our work, the H5 is proposed: H5: "Working condition" has a positive effect on "Employee satisfaction". The analysis results lend support for H5. Our finding is consistent with the finding of wangNetemever (2002). A person who have better Employee satisfaction will look forward to being better than other colleagues. As the result, they will set a moderate standard, mean while better performance than others.

F) H6: "Employee Retention" has positive effect on "Employee satisfaction"

Regarding our work, the hypothesis H6 is proposed: "Employee Retention" has positive effect on "Employee satisfaction". The analysis results lend support for H3. It is consistent with Mengue's (1996) work. "Employee Retention" could have the better performance.

G) H7: "Employee Retention" has positive effect on "Working condition"

Regarding our work, the hypothesis 7 is proposed: "Employee Retention" has positive effect on "Working condition". The result shows that there has significant positive relationship between the "Employee Retention" and "Working condition". It is consistent with Mengue's (1996) work. "Employee Retention" could have the better performance.

H) H8: "Work Place Conflict" has a negative effect on "Employee satisfaction"

Regarding our work, the H8 is proposed: "Work Place Conflict" has a negative effect on "Employee satisfaction". The result shows that there has no significant positive relationship between the Work Place Conflict and Employee Satisfaction. It is inconsistent with Boshoff and Allen's (2000) work. There have possible season is the adoption of karatepea's (2005) measurement hat focus on self-evaluation of employee in the external objective of supervision. Employers may consider the high performance as an advantage that could help to find a better job. In this research, Employers that have large percentage of samples, balanced the rewards against the high performance mentality. Since the failure of equilibrium caused the dis-connect and raise the Employees Satisfaction.

6. Conclusion

In our research work, the relationship between Work Place Conflict and Employee satisfaction did not have the significant result and can't be supported. As the result, we hope conduct further research in this area. To our measurement, because of the lack of the literature in the topics in this work observed by the author, we have short of the theoretical support. Therefore, the research side with the exploratory research needs the further replicated and amended.

To the variables, thus focus on the service-side, there still have other organization variables. We recommend the follow-up research to include the relevance of variables in organization theory, such as Employee's orientation and organizational culture, etc. Another direction for further research is to assess these theories in other organization. Test in different areas will raise the understanding in a great diversity of the organization.
Table A4: DISCRIMINANT VALIDITY

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>construct</th>
<th>ave</th>
<th>EI</th>
<th>WC</th>
<th>ES</th>
<th>WPC</th>
<th>ERT</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>EI</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.656</td>
<td>0.656</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WC</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.824</td>
<td>0.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>ES</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.488</td>
<td>0.488</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WPC</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.737</td>
<td>0.737</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table A5: Hypothesis-Testing Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Path Coefficient</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>H1: EI ← WC</td>
<td>0.23</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H2: EI ← ERT</td>
<td>0.38</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H3: WPC ← WC</td>
<td>0.07</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H4: WPC ← ERT</td>
<td>0.18</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H5: WC ← ES</td>
<td>0.15</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H6: ERT ← ES</td>
<td>0.14</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H7: ERT ← WC</td>
<td>0.39</td>
<td>Support</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H8: WPC ← ES</td>
<td>-0.03</td>
<td>Not Support</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure B1: Theoretical Frame Work

Appendix B: Figure B1: Theoretical Frame Work

Figure B2: Recursive Structural Equation Modeling

HYPO THESES

- H1: EI ← WC
  - Path Coefficient: 0.23
  - Conclusion: Support

- H2: EI ← ERT
  - Path Coefficient: 0.38
  - Conclusion: Support

- H3: WPC ← WC
  - Path Coefficient: 0.07
  - Conclusion: Support

- H4: WPC ← ERT
  - Path Coefficient: 0.18
  - Conclusion: Support

- H5: WC ← ES
  - Path Coefficient: 0.15
  - Conclusion: Support

- H6: ERT ← ES
  - Path Coefficient: 0.14
  - Conclusion: Support

- H7: ERT ← WC
  - Path Coefficient: 0.39
  - Conclusion: Support

- H8: WPC ← ES
  - Path Coefficient: -0.03
  - Conclusion: Not Support
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