



International Journal of Engineering, Business and Enterprise Applications (IJEBA)

www.iasir.net

WHAT DO YOU LOOK FOR IN A JOB

Vijaya Puranik

Associate Professor, HR, Sinhgad Institute of Management and Computer Application,
Pune, Maharashtra, INDIA.

Abstract: What the job aspirants look for, in a job, is of interest to the industry. This is because the companies, in every industry, would like to understand the needs of an employee, so as to design the compensation structure which can satisfy them. The present study focuses on the reasons/factors why a job aspirant would want to join a company. A compiled list of factors was used to collect the data on the preferred factors of these students. Factors are categorized as Motivational factors and Hygiene factors. The study was conducted on 252 management students, distributed in 42 groups of varying sizes. The ranks given by the groups have been studied to find out if the group members influence the members' preference. The data is also analysed to see if there is a preference for motivational factors or hygiene factors and whether there is a difference between the preferences of males and females. It is seen that the preferences of males and females are significantly different from each other on certain factors. It is observed that the groups do influence member decisions and the sample does not differ on their preferences of the Motivational and Hygiene factors in a job.

Key words: Motivational factors, Hygiene factors, Job aspirants.

I. Introduction:

The recession in the industry all over the world and also in India, had resulted in a decrease in job opportunities in 2006-07. However the recession is no more very acute (Sherk, 2012, Maximus 2013, ECRI, 2012). Job opportunities for freshers and experienced employees is increasing (The Recruitment Society, July 11, 2013). Most of the industries are recruiting large number of new employees. The number of managerial jobs is also increasing in most of the domains of management: viz. Marketing, Finance, Human Resources Management, Foreign Trade Management, Operations Management and so on. It is important that the industry knows the preferences of the job aspirants in terms of salary, safety, incentives and work environment.

Most of the job aspirants of managerial jobs pursue a degree in management (MBA, MMM, MPM, PGDM etc). There are many specialized courses in most of the Universities of India and abroad for these job aspirants. The best place therefore, to understand the preferences of managerial job aspirants, is when they take admission for such specialized courses. This forms the basis for the current research.

Not much research has been done on the needs of managerial job aspirants. Dan Shawbel, (2013) through a study has found that Salary, flexible schedule, being able to make a difference, challenging work, ability to work from home, are the 5 Job Factors which the Employees prefer. Shappel (2013), has identified 10 job factors which attract and retain employees younger than 40. They are Job security, Base pay, Healthcare benefits, Vacation/paid time off, Organization's reputation as a great place to work, Length of commute, Career development opportunities, Retirement benefits, Challenging work and Promotion opportunities. Zigarmi and Houson working along with Witt and Diehl (2011) identified Job Factors (Autonomy, Meaningful Work, Feedback, Workload Balance, and Task Variety), Organizational Factors (Collaboration, Performance Expectations, Growth, Procedural, Justice (process fairness), and Distributive Justice (rewards, pay, and benefits)) and Relationship Factors (Connectedness with Colleagues and Connectedness with Leader) which lead to Employee Work Passion. In The Times of India (Ascent), December 16, 2006 Santosh Nair, Head Training, MaFoi Consultancy says that the following are the priorities of job seekers: Brand image, Pay, Benefits, Class and quality of coworkers, Challenges of jobs, Attractiveness of position and designation, Opportunities for career growth and Technology which the employee is exposed to. Mofoi recruits employees mainly in the IT sector, and mainly those with experience.

II. Methodology

Sample: All the students who joined the MBA/MMM/MPM/PGDFT/MLM courses in 2010 and 2011.

Sampling: All students joining SIMCA, Pune, and MERC, Pune in 2010 and 2011 (purposive sampling).

Sample size: Total 252 for group analysis and 172 for individual data (Individual data of 80 students was incomplete)

Tool: A list containing the following 14 factors was administered to the participants. These factors were taken based on the literature review and mainly from the article by Santosh Nair in the Times of India.

Administration of the Tool: The participants were asked to rank the 14 factors. The most preferred factor to be ranked '1' and so on, the least preferred factor will be ranked 14.

1. Job security
2. Adequate salary

3. Fringe benefits
4. Opportunities for promotion
5. Comfortable working conditions
6. Interesting work
7. Sound company policies and practices
8. Respect and recognition
9. Responsibility and independence
10. Doing something worthwhile
11. Considerate and sympathetic supervisor
12. Technically competent supervisor
13. Restricted hours of working
14. Pay according to ability and competence

Rationale: The researcher wanted to analyse if individuals' preferences change due to group member influence. Hence the participants were asked to work in groups. The following methodology was used to study the effect of group members on the preferences of individuals.

The participants were split into groups of 5-7 members each. This was done randomly. They were then asked to rank the factors in a group, collectively. Every individual was told not to refer to their individual rankings of the factors, when they were working in a group. The ranking given by all the groups was documented and analysed. This ranking was called the group ranking. The exercise was conducted at five different sessions with varying number of groups in each session. The distribution of groups over sessions is given in Table 1.

Table 1: Distribution of groups in five sessions

Session	No. Of groups	Individual members
1	11	Not considered in analysis
2	7	43
3	7	30
4	6	28
5	11	71
Total groups	42	172

The medians of the ranks were computed. Appropriate statistics was used to analyse the data.

III. Objectives:

1. To find most preferred and least preferred factor
2. To find the difference between female and male preferences
3. To find whether groups affect individual preferences significantly.
4. To find if preference of Motivational Factors differs from that of Hygiene factors

A. Individual Analysis

1. **Most preferred factor:** The median of the ranks assigned by the individuals was computed for each factor. The medians were ranked.

Table 2: Ranking by median

Sr. No	Factor	Median	Rank
1	job security	3	1.5
2	adequate salary	3	1.5
3	interesting work	4	3
4	Opportunities for promotion	5	4.5
5	respect ,recognition	5	4.5
6	Comfortable working conditions	6	6
7	responsibility, independence	7	7
8	fringe benefits	9	9.5
9	sound policies	9	9.5
10	doing something worthwhile	9	9.5
11	pay according to ability and comp	9	9.5
12	technically comp. supervisor	11	12.5
13	restricted hours of work	11	12.5
14	considerate sup	12	14

It is seen from the above Table 2 that 'Job security' and 'Adequate salary' share the first rank. This means they are the most preferred factors. 'Considerate supervisor' seems to be the least important factor for a fresher.

2. By Gender

The sample was split into two groups by gender. The medians are presented in Table 3.

Table 3: Comparison of the medians: gender wise

No	Factor	Median of Rank (Female) N=36	Median of Rank (Male) N=136
1	job security	2	3
2	adequate salary	3	3
3	fringe benefits	11	9
4	Opportunities for promotion	4	5

5	Comfortable working conditions	7	6
6	interesting work	3.5	4
7	sound policies	7	10
8	respect ,recognition	5	5
9	responsibility, independence	8	7
10	doing something worthwhile	9.5	9
11	considerate sup	13	12
12	technically comp. supervisor	11	11.5
13	restricted hours of work	11	11
14	pay according to ability and comp	9	9

It is seen from the Table 3 that the factor most important to the Females is Job security. For Males the first rank is shared by the two factors: job security and adequate salary. The least important for the females and the males is a considerate supervisor. The rank correlation for the sample is 0.95 sig at $p < 0.01$. This means that there is a close association between the males' and females' preferences of factors.

To find out if there is a factor wise difference between the male preferences and the female preferences, Man-U-Whitney test was used. The descriptive statistic is presented in Table 4.

Table 4: Factor wise difference by gender: Descriptive Statistics
Male (2) n=136, Female (1) n=36

Sr. No	Factor	Gender	N	Mean Rank
1	job security	1	36	79.68
		2	136	88.31
		Total	172	
2	adequate salary	1	36	86.76
		2	136	86.43
		Total	172	
3	fringe benefits	1	36	107.25
		2	136	81.01
		Total	172	
4	Opportunities for promotion	1	36	80.15
		2	136	88.18
		Total	172	
5	Comfortable working conditions	1	36	92.88
		2	136	84.81
		Total	172	
6	interesting work	1	36	86.56
		2	136	86.49
		Total	172	
7	sound policies	1	36	64.33
		2	136	92.37
		Total	172	
8	respect ,recognition	1	36	73.29
		2	136	90.00
		Total	172	
9	responsibility, independence	1	36	104.35
		2	136	81.78
		Total	172	
10	doing something worthwhile	1	36	87.35
		2	136	86.28
		Total	172	
11	considerate sup	1	36	105.90
		2	136	81.36
		Total	172	
12	technically comp. supervisor	1	36	80.89
		2	136	87.99
		Total	172	
13	restricted hours of work	1	36	84.74
		2	136	86.97
		Total	172	
14	pay according to ability and comp	1	36	83.58
		2	136	87.27
		Total	172	

Mann-U-Whitney test is used for comparing the males with the females on all the factors.

Table 5: Comparison of Male and Female preferences of factors

Sr. No	Factor	Z Value	Sig	Sr. No	Factor	Z Value	Sig
1	Job security	-.936	NS	8	Respect and recognition	-1.799	NS
2	Adequate salary	-.036	NS	9	Responsibility, independence	-2.428	Sig (p>0.01)
3	Fringe benefits	-2.826	Sig p>0.005	10	Doing something worthwhile	-0.115	NS

4	Opportunities for promotion	-0.867	NS	11	Considerate supervisor	-2.662	Sig (p>0.01)
5	Comfortable working conditions	-0.868	NS	12	Technically competent supervisor	-0.768	NS
6	Interesting work	-0.008	NS	13	Restricted hours of working	-0.242	NS
7	Sound policies	-3.016	Sig (p>0.005)	14	Pay according to ability and competence	-0.397	NS

Table 5 indicates that the males and the females differ significantly on the following **four** factors: Fringe benefits (Females prefer more than the males), Sound Policies (males prefer more than the females), Responsibility and Independence (females prefer more than males), considerate supervisor (females prefer more than the males)

B. Group Analysis

3. Comparison of Individuals' ranks versus ranks of groups

The individual ranks are compared with the group ranks. The medians of every factor are computed for Individual ranks of the sample and they are compared with the ranks given by the sample when they were working in groups.

Table 6: Ranks of individuals versus ranks given by groups

S.No.	Factor	Individuals' ranks	Group ranks
1	job security	3	3
2	adequate salary	3	3.5
3	fringe benefits	4	10.5
4	Opportunities for promotion	5	6
5	Comfortable working conditions	5	6.5
6	interesting work	6	1
7	sound policies	7	8
8	respect ,recognition	9	6
9	responsibility, independence	9	6.5
10	doing something worthwhile	9	9
11	considerate sup	9	12.5
12	technically comp. supervisor	11	12
13	restricted hours of work	11	12
14	pay according to ability and comp	12	10

Using the Wilcoxon test for equality of medians, it is seen that the T value=12.5 is significant at $p<0.02$, df_{12} with the table value being 10. Thus the Null hypothesis is not supported. This shows that the ranks given by individuals differ significantly from the ranks given by the same individuals when they were working in groups. This means when individuals form groups their priorities about what they would prefer in a job change significantly.

4. Individual differences for males and females

Each individual was asked to calculate his/her 'individual difference' from the group to which they belong. This is done as follows: The difference between the rank given by the individual and that given by the group is calculated for each factor. The total of all the differences is the 'individual difference'. Since the groups are of unequal sizes, the individual differences within groups are converted into percentages for the purpose of combining the data.

The entire sample is then split into two groups for analysis, by gender. The percentage of the individual differences of Males and Females are compared.

Table 7: Descriptive data of Individual difference: Gender wise

Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Female	36	14.26	4.729
Male	136	18.29	6.613

t value is 3.423 significant at $p>0.001$. This means that the males when working in groups are affected by the group members and change their individual preferences more than the females do.

5. Motivational and Hygiene factor:

The fourteen factors include 6 Hygiene factors, 6 motivational factors and one affective factor and one cognitive factor.

The motivational factors are compared with the Hygiene factors in the following Table 8.

Table 8: Motivational factors and Hygiene factors

Hygiene factors	Rank	Motivational factors	Rank
1. Job security	1.5	4. Opportunities for promotion	4.5
2. Adequate Salary	1.5	6. Interesting work	3
3. Fringe Benefits	9.5	8. Respect and recognition	4.5
5. Comfortable working conditions	6	9. responsibility and independence	7
7. Sound company policies and practices	9.5	10. Doing something worthwhile	9.5
13. restricted hours of working	12	14. pay according to ability and competence	9.5

Using the Mann-U-Whitney test, the U value is 17. Table value for U=17 is 0.29. Since 0.29 is greater than 0.025 we accept the Null hypothesis at $p < 0.05$. This means that there is no significant difference between the preference of Motivational factors and Hygiene factors.

IV. Findings:

1. 'Job security' and 'Adequate salary' share the first rank and are the most preferred factors in a job by freshers.
2. 'Considerate supervisor' seems to be the least important factor for a fresher.
3. It is seen that the factor most important to the Females is Job security. For Males the first rank is shared by the 2 factors: job security and adequate salary.
4. There is a significant association between the ranks of the females and the males on the factors.
5. There is however a significant difference between the male and female preferences of Fringe benefits (Females prefer more than the males), Sound Policies (males prefer more than the females), Responsibility and Independence (females prefer more than males), considerate supervisor (females prefer more than the males)
6. The males and females, after they join the groups, have changed their opinions and the change is more in males than in females.
7. There is no significant difference between the preference of Motivational factors and Hygiene factors in the population.

V. Discussion

Job security and adequate salary have emerged as the most preferred factors in a job for a management job aspirant. These adequately explain the current apprehensions in the mind of the youth. The decrease in jobs and salary which resulted after the recession is still seen to be giving rise to the concerns of salary and security in the minds of all. Least preferred factor is 'considerate supervisor'. This maybe because very few students from the present sample have a job experience and most of them are inexperienced and hence may not be able to relate with the concept of a 'considerate supervisor'. A significant association is seen between the preferences of the males and the females in an overall analysis of all the factors together. However a factor wise analysis of the difference in gender wise preference reveals that the females and the males differ significantly on their preferences of four factors. Of particular importance is the finding that the females prefer responsibility and independence more than the males do. It is a reflection of the changing demographic trends of the employees in the current industrial scenario. The females are increasingly seen to take up jobs which are of strategic importance in the industry.

The males seem to be more open to change and the females seem to be more rigid in the group analysis (Table 5). This may be because the number of females as compared to the males is very less (36, 136). As a result in every group which was formed for the activity, there was either only one female or in some cases two. Indian culture being more masculine (Hofstede, 1980) and taking cognisance of the fact that these students did not know each other very well, it may have so happened that the boys tended to be more caring and give the females the benefit of doubt, resulting in more differences between the individual scores and group scores of males than the females. The preference of the motivational factors and the hygiene factors is seen to be same. Herzberg's theory has been criticized to be culture specific (Luthans, 2013). It is not applicable universally. Therefore the preference of any sample would be applicable to that sample only and cannot be generalised. This finding, therefore, may be true only for this group.

References

- [1]. Christian Schappel, 'Most important factors that attracted employees younger than 40 to an employer' <http://www.hrmorning.com>
- [2]. Drea Zigarmi, Dobie Houson, David Witt, and Jim Diehl, (2011) 'Employee Work Passion' <http://www.kenblanchard.com>
- [3]. Economic Cycle Research Institute, September 13, 2012, 'The 2012 Recession: Are we there yet?' www.businesscycle.com/ecri-news-details
- [4]. Hofstede, Geert (1980), Culture's consequences: International Differences in Work-Related Values, Beverly Hills, CA: Sage Publications
- [5]. Luthans, Fred (2013), 'Organizational Behaviour', McGraw Hill (India) pp 166-167
- [6]. Maximus, Fabius (2013, March 6), 'Did the US fall into recession during 2012? Are we in recession today?' fabiusmaximus.com/2013
- [7]. Schawbel, Dan, (2013), 5 Job Factors Employees Want, , <http://quickbase.intuit.com>
- [8]. Sherk, J. (2012, August 30), 'Not looking for work: Why Labor Force Participation has fallen during recession' www.heritage.org/research
- [9]. The Recruitment Society, July 11 2013, 'Professional Job Opportunities increase by 10% in Q2 2013 compared to Q2 2012.' www.recsoc.org/professional-job-opportunities-increase