



THE STUDY OF STAFF SATISFACTION IN CONSULTING CENTER SYSTEM—A CASE STUDY OF JOB CONSULTING CENTERS IN HO CHI MINH CITY, VIETNAM

Chia Nan Wang

*Department of Industrial Engineering and Management National Kaohsiung University of Applied Sciences,
Taiwan*

Nhu Ty Nguyen

*Department of Industrial Engineering and Management National Kaohsiung University of Applied Sciences,
Taiwan*

Tran Thanh Tuyen

*Department of Industrial Engineering and Management National Kaohsiung University of Applied Sciences,
Taiwan*

ABSTRACT

The topic of job satisfaction has been investigated over the years. However, the environmental impact of the work of job consulting centre's employee satisfaction is beginning to attract the attention of the researcher. Job consulting centre has become an integral part of most organizations today, play an important role in supplying-jobs services. This study aims to examine the key factors that are closely associated with job satisfaction of employees working at job consulting centre as well as to suggest proper solutions to enhance the performance of these organizations. The current investigation is implemented by surveying the employees and then made a comparison of their satisfaction level on all aspects of the work. The questionnaire is composed of three important parts: Demographics, Satisfaction Level and Overall Satisfaction. The data are carried out by using descriptive statistic, exploratory factor analysis, reliability analysis, multiple linear regressions, and correlations analysis, to get all purposes of the research. The results show that Administration, Working Condition, Staff Interaction are factors that have the strongest impact on the overall satisfaction. These research findings have emphasized the necessity of conducting more researches on job satisfaction of staff in the job consulting centres. Being aware of the difficulties, which exists in their workers' lives and consider this as an emergency situation, the policy makers with their future suitable policies will gradually create a comfortable working environment for employees. When employees' motivation in working is improving, and this could make better service-providing in job consulting for a big city like Ho Chi Minh City.

Keywords: Job satisfaction, Consulting centres, Statistics analysis.

1. INTRODUCTION

Nowadays, customers are searching, expecting and even requiring high quality of providing services among organizations, which has led to an increase especially in the so-call “centre-based services”. Even job satisfaction has been investigated over the years; the environmental impact of the work of job consulting centre’s employee satisfaction is beginning to attract the attention of the researcher (Rose and Wright, 2005). Job consulting centre has become an integral part of most organizations today, play an important role in supplying-jobs services. Rose and Wright (2005) state job centre is usually associated with low satisfaction due to the nature of their work rather low technical level.

Job satisfaction among employees of a Job Consulting Centre has not been researched as extensively within the wide area, Ho Chi Minh City of Vietnam. Holdsworth and Cartwright (2003), job consulting centre management is constantly exploring alternatives to combat internal, work-related issues in the industry. With the unemployment rate is Ho Chi Minh City’s biggest challenges faced today in Vietnam, job centres and business process outsourcing industry in providing the most promising solution to combat the high unemployment rate (Brown, 2004). According to Levin (2004) obviously, the necessity of conducting more researches on job satisfaction of staff in the job consulting centres makes the employees motivated in working, and this could make better service-providing in job consulting for a big city like Ho Chi Minh City. Tidmarsh (2003) stated that the city to have the successful chain of job consulting centres, the main objective of the organization is employee satisfaction.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. Job Consulting Centres

Job consulting centres provide an alternative means of doing business by striving to provide fast and efficient services to customers and serves as an integral part of many organizations and the job hunters. The employees or staffs in the job consulting centres are people referred to centres agents or representatives who are hired individually to the job consulting centres to solve the customers’ needs, concerns or requests. They have a very important role in the job consulting centres, according to Malhotra and Mukherjee (2004), because they represent the organizations, and it is also them who have the potential influence directly to customers.

Nowadays, the demand to have good employees in the job consulting centres is growing fast because of the current development of Ho Chi Minh City in both industrial companies and service providers. There are also many available positions for the job centre representatives on a temporary or permanent basis (Moshavi and Terborg, 2002). The staffs have to deal with job hunters and head hunters everyday by the scripts and storing data on the computers; the job consulting centre representatives are to handle the incoming requests, inquiries or complaints in a friendly and understandable ways.

Professional and technical skills can be appreciated but not required for job centre representatives since a large part of their job requires them to deal with routine office work (Kleemann and Matuschek, 2002). To have the good management, a successful job consulting centre needs to recognize the important factors driven such as profitability, investment in people, and technological support of front-line staff, then to improve recruitment and practical training and reimbursement in accordance with the employee's performance at the entry level (Malhotra and Mukherjee, 2004).

2.2. Definition for Job Satisfaction

Mbua (2003) defines job satisfaction as “the fulfilment acquired by experiencing various job activities and rewards”. It implied that job satisfaction can be understand as an emotional state of human beings that reflects the positive and pleasant feeling of a person when he or she appreciates his or her own job well. Conversely, we should mention the definition of job dissatisfaction. It argues in the study of Organ and Bateman (1991) that an employee’s attitudes towards her or his work are either positive or negative. It can be imply that if workers have positive attitude towards the work, they are then said to be satisfied. In contrast, in case of workers’ have negative attitudes towards their work, they are then said to be dissatisfied.

Gender, age, marital status, teaching fields, job experience, educational background, and income can be inferred as demographic factors that affect to job satisfaction (Miller *et al.*, 2009).

2.2.1 Factors or Facets Associated with Job Satisfaction

According to (Snipes *et al.*, 2005), job satisfaction can be measured using six facets approach. In other words, the survey instrument should employ six job satisfaction facets and those facets include: “supervisor, work, pay, advancement opportunities, co-workers, and customers”. The author provides further descriptions of such facets as table 2.1.

2.2.2. Job Satisfaction in Job Centers

Employees are considered to be low levels of satisfaction (Rose and Wright, 2005) because their jobs require not many skills, and Rose & Wright, 2005 also figured that the sociological research evidence have proved the low-skilled work does not result in intrinsic satisfaction. Then these kinds of staffs tend to find the extrinsic satisfaction through payment and other compensatory mechanisms. Levin (2004) did a research on more than 1000 employees in the field and concluded that there is a direct connection between job diversity and satisfaction. 85% of the respondents wanted to have more job satisfaction. In another aspect, according Marr and Neely (2004), the management in the job centres is mostly favoured on the operational measures; then the employees just do jobs relating on the success of services by a strong need to serve the customers.

2.2.3. Measures of Job Satisfaction

Because job satisfaction is necessary and significant, we need to know the current scales to apply. Normally, the satisfaction of employees is conducted by interviews and questionnaires. Muchinsky (1993) criticised that the literature on job satisfaction is confusing because some are on scale of global; some measure the facets of the problem with the not good results measuring the same. There would be three popular scales to review (Muchinsky, 1993) providing some insight view towards the measurement of job satisfaction. They are listed below:

2.2.3.1. The Job Descriptive Index (JDI)

The JDI has been used frequently to research and measure job satisfaction. It was developed by Smith. There are five facets of job satisfaction analysed by JDI namely satisfaction with work itself, supervision, pay, promotions and co-workers, including either 9 or 18 items in the each individual facet. The test-retest reliability of 0.57 for this scale was reached after a 16-month interval and researchers felt this score was high enough “to justify the JDI in longitudinal studies because satisfaction can change over time” (Muchinsky, 1993).

2.2.3.2. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ)

According to Muchinsky (1993), this is the second most popular scale. The MSQ, developed by Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist in 1967 was designed to measure job satisfaction with 20 facets of a job. Each 20 facets are made up of five items to which an individual is to respond on a five-point Likert scale. The MSQ comes in two forms namely, the 100-item long version and the 20-item short version. The scale ranges from very dissatisfied to very satisfied. While the MSQ is more time consuming than the JDI, four of its scales corresponds with that of the JDI. Muchinsky (1993) claims that the number of facets a job satisfaction scale should measure is open to debate since data has shown that these facets are not independent.

2.2.3.3. Faces Scale

According to Muchinsky (1993) this scale was developed by Kunin in 1955 and is vastly different to the two discussed above, as it measures global satisfaction as opposed to facet satisfaction, which uses words or phrases. According to Muchinsky (1993), this is the third most popular scale. The advantage of this scale is that it allows less room for ambiguity since the individual simply selects the picture face that reflects how he or she feels at that moment.

3. METHODOLOGY

3.1. Research Model

Thus, the research model of this study was constructed based on Porter/Lawler Expectancy. The Porter and Lawer model explains that an individual’s motivation to complete a task affected by the reward they expect to receive for completing the task. This model is an extension of an earlier expectation model developed by Victor Vroom in 1964. A person will decide to behave or act in a certain way because of what they expect the result of that selected behaviour will be. They also said

that motivation is also affected by the individual's ability to perform the task and their perception of the task. They suggested that individual' abilities and role perceptions moderate the relationship between effort and performance.

Intrinsic: Intrinsic rewards are the positive feelings that the individual experiences from completing the task e.g. satisfaction, sense of achievement.

Extrinsic: Extrinsic rewards are rewards obtained from outside the individual control such as bonus, commission and pay increases.

Performance is the factor that leads to intrinsic as well as extrinsic rewards. These rewards lead to satisfaction, therefore satisfaction of the individual depends upon the fairness of the reward.

3.2. Job Characteristics Theory

The job characteristics model, designed by Hackman and Oldham, is based on the idea that the task itself is the key to employee motivation. Specifically, a boring and monotonous job stifles motivation to perform well, whereas a challenging job enhances motivation. Variety, autonomy and decision authority are three ways of adding challenge to a job. Job enrichment and job rotation are the two ways of adding variety and challenge. It states that there are five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) which impact three critical psychological states (experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility for outcomes, and knowledge of the actual results), in turn influencing work outcomes (job satisfaction, absenteeism, work motivation, etc.). The five core job characteristics can be combined to form a motivating potential score (MPS) for a job, which can be used as an index of how likely a job is to affect an employee's attitudes and behaviours.

3.3. Hypotheses

A research hypothesis is the statement created by researchers when they speculate upon the outcome of a research or experiment. The study's research hypotheses are formulated to make it directed and focused.

H₁: Administration has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

H₂: Working Condition has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

H₃: Compensation has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

H₄: Staff Interaction has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

H₅: Professional Development has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

H₆: Labour Safety has a positive effect on job satisfaction.

3.4. Research Design

The research design used in this study is the survey method. A field of applied statistics, survey methodology studies the sampling of individual units from a population and the associated survey data collection techniques, such as questionnaire construction and methods for improving the number and accuracy of responses to surveys.

Statistical surveys are undertaken with a view towards making statistical inferences about the population being studied, and this depends strongly on the survey questions used.

3.5. The Population

The questionnaire was designed and presented in December, 2012 by the researcher after objective criticisms and suggestions from the instructors who are experts in measurement and evaluation. In the cases where respondents did not answer every question, the questionnaires were discarded. It was sent to the total of 630 employees in Consulting Centres around Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The participants were employees who had earned permanent status and were employed full time. There were totally 630 questionnaires delivered; however, there were only 515 pieces collected with only 500 valid observations. Modes of data collection in our survey:

- Telephone
- Mail (post)
- Online surveys
- Personal in-office surveys
- Hybrids of the above.

3.6. Measurement Instrument

The title of the research's questionnaire is: "An Empirical Research on Staff Satisfaction of Job Consulting Centers in Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam".

Section A elicited information on the demographic data, while section B elicited information on the expectations and perceptions of employees for the six aspects of their job satisfaction: Administration, Working Condition, Staff Interaction, Professional Development and Labour Safety.

Section B was composed of two matched sets of 30 items. Set one are questions of job satisfaction and set two are questions of job expectation. These items were in the form of five-point Likert scale. Options were ordered as; "Strongly dissatisfy", "Dissatisfied", "Undecided", "Satisfied" and "Strongly satisfied". The answers were ordered from "Strongly Dissatisfied" to "Strongly Satisfied" by grading them from 1 to 5.

3.7. Data Collection

As mentioned above, the questionnaires were sent in late 2012 to the total of 630 employees in Consulting Centres around Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The participants were employees who had earned permanent status and were employed full time. There were totally 630 questionnaires delivered; however, there were only 515 pieces collected with only 500 valid observations; which were deemed good to be analyzed, and represented a response rate of 79,3%.

3.8. Method of Data Analysis

Questionnaire Validity: Validity refers to whether the questionnaire or survey measures what it intends to measure. The overriding principle of validity is that it focuses on how a questionnaire or assessment process is used. Content validity referred to whether the instrument can cover items that purpose to cover (Cohen *et al.*, 2007). Muijis (2004) recommends that literature had to be reviewed to get the theoretical knowledge about the content or definitions of concepts that are used before designing the instrument for the particular study.

Questionnaire Reliability: Reliability indicates degrees of consistency between multiple measurements of a variable. The lower limit for Cronbach’s alpha is .70, although it may decrease to .60 in exploratory research. The present study adopts Peterson (1994) suggestions with the value 0.6 deemed the lower limit of acceptability. And, to measure item reliability, we regard on the item-to-total correlation (the correlation of the item to the summated scale score). It is suggested that the item-to-total correlations should exceed 0.3 (Peterson, 1994).

Exploratory factor analysis (EFA) is a technique within factor analysis whose overarching goal is to identify the underlying relationships between measured variables. In multivariate statistics, EFA is a statistical method used to uncover the underlying structure of a relatively large set of variables.

Multiple regression analysis helps us to predict the value of Y for given values of X1, X2, ...,Xk

The objective of multiple regression analysis is to use the independent variables whose values are known to predict the single dependent value selected by the researcher. By multiple regressions, we mean models with just one dependent and two or more independent (exploratory) variables. The variable whose value is to be predicted is known as the dependent variable and the ones whose known values are used for prediction are known independent (exploratory) variables.

In general, the multiple regression equation of Y on X1, X2, ...,Xk is given by:

$$Y = b_0 + b_1 X_1 + b_2 X_2 + \dots + b_k X_k$$

Here b0 is the intercept and b1, b2, b3, ...,bk are analogous to the slope in linear regression equation and are also called regression coefficients. They can be interpreted the same way as slope. Thus if bi = 2.5, it would indicates that Y will increase by 2.5 units if Xi increased by 1 unit.

Besides, the standardized regression coefficients (β) reflect the relative impact on dependent variable of a change in one standard deviation in either variable. Now that we have a unit of measurement, we can determine which variable has the most impact.

R2 - coefficient of determination: Once a multiple regression equation has been constructed, one can check how good it is (in terms of predictive ability) by examining the coefficient of determination (R2). R2 always lies between 0 and 1. The closer R2 is to 1, the better is the model and its prediction.

Correlation Analysis: The correlation coefficient, denoted by r, is a measure of the strength of the linear relationship between two variables. The correlation coefficient takes on values ranging between +1 and -1. If correlation coefficient equal to 0 indicates no linear relationship, +1 indicates a perfect positive linear relationship: as one variable increases in its values, -1 indicates a perfect negative linear relationship: as one variable increases in its values. In details, if correlation

coefficient values between 0 and 0.3 (0 and -0.3) indicate a weak positive (negative) linear relationship via a shaky linear rule, between 0.3 and 0.7 (0.3 and -0.7) indicate a moderate positive (negative) linear relationship via a fuzzy-firm linear rule, between 0.7 and 1.0 (-0.7 and -1.0) indicate a strong positive (negative) linear relationship via a firm linear rule.

4. DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

4.1. Data Analysis According to Research Questions and Hypotheses Testing

Determinants impact on Job Satisfaction by EFA: Factor analysis was also carried out on 6 items (X25, X9, X14, X6, X15 and X10) with relatively low factor loadings (<0.5) and difference of factor loading within 0.1 were eliminated, thus 22 remained. After performing factor analysis, 22 items was finally summarized to 7 underlying factors. These items are suitable for Cronbach's Alpha analysis at the next step. The set of 22 statements are extracted into 07 factors as shown in Table 4.2. As table 1.1 shown, 7 underlying factors were summarized as the 6-dimension. Firstly, the 5-item X1, X2, X3, X4, X5 is Administration. Secondly, the 2-item X7 and X8 is Working Conditions. Thirdly, the 3-item X11, X12, and X13 is *Staff Interaction*. Fourthly, the 6-item X16, X17, X18, X19, X20, and X21 is *Compensation*. Fifthly, the 3-item X22, X23, X24 is Professional Development. Lastly, the 3-item X26, X27, and X28 is Institution's Safety.

Table- 1.1. Rotated Component Matrix for the Final Step

Statements	Components						
	1	2	3	4	5	6	7
X1 Respondents of head masters to staff's suggestions	.820	--	--	--	--	--	--
X2 Support and encourage of administrators	.803	--	--	--	--	--	--
X3 Involving in decisions that affect the organization	.800	--	--	--	--	--	--
X4 Procedure for performance evaluation	.755	--	--	--	--	--	--
X5 Cooperative effort among the staff	.642	--	--	--	--	--	--
X7 Materials and equipment needed		.825	--	--	--	--	--
X8 Creativity and innovation are always supported		.769	--	--	--	--	--
X11 I trust our leadership team			.760	--	--	--	--
X12 I respect the work of my peers			.808	--	--	--	--
X13 Level effectiveness of team cooperation			.745	--	--	--	--
X17 Bonuses				.786	--	--	--
X18 Time off and flexible schedules				.710	--	--	--
X19 Long term incentives				.858	--	--	--
X20 Parental leave					.781	--	--
X21 Promotion Opportunity					.622	--	--
X16 Salary					.876	--	--
X22 Processes of Prof. Development Evaluation and Reward						.557	--
X23 Training Courses helped me gain new information and skills						.790	--
X24 Development & training act. (theory, demonstration, practice)						.729	--
X26 First aid facilities							.926
X27 Smoking restriction							.934
X28 Mechanical ventilation systems are regularly maintained							.912

Mean comparisons between Satisfaction Level and Expectation Level based on Reliability Analyses for the Six Dimensions in Satisfaction Level: In order to find out the satisfaction level of employee, it is now necessary to calculate the values of relevant factors in the column of Satisfaction level and then compared to the values in the column of Importance level. Table 1.2 demonstrates how this can be done.

Table- 1.2. Levels of Satisfaction versus Importance

Factor	Satisfaction Level	↔	Importance Level
Administration	X1		Y1
	X2		Y2
	X3		Y3
	X4	↔	Y4
	X5		Y5
Working Condition	X7		Y7
	X8	↔	Y8
Staff Interaction	X11		Y11
	X12	↔	Y12
	X13		Y13
Compensation	X17		Y17
	X18		Y18
	X19	↔	Y18
	X20		X20
	X21		X21
Professional Development	X22		Y22
	X23	↔	Y23
	X24		Y24
Institution's Safety	X26		Y26
	X27	↔	Y27
	X28		Y28

Based on the correspondence in Table 1.2, the mean values of all six factors in the satisfaction level and the importance level are calculated under the reliability analysis and briefly demonstrated in Table 1.3

Column *Satisfaction and Importance ratio* in table 1.3 indicated that most of the employees among Job Consulting Centres around Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam are satisfied with company's policies. *Administration* and *Labour Safety* are the two factors that make employees very satisfied. Employees seem dissatisfied with *Compensation* matters.

Table- 1.3. Summary Statistic Means Value of Six Factors in Satisfaction and Important Level

Factors	Mean Value of Satisfaction Level	Mean Value of Importance Level	Satisfaction and Importance ratio
Administration	3.444	3.587	96%
Working Condition	3.423	3.782	90%
Staff Interaction	3.173	3.445	92%
Compensation	3.059	3.771	81%
Professional Development	3.356	3.548	95%
Labour Safety	3.443	3.545	97%

Source: Output from SPSS

The index in table 1.3 indicates that *Administration* can meet 96% of employees' expectation. For further details about this issue, table 1.4 shows the comparison between each item in satisfaction level and importance level so that the company knows which items should be paid more attention for improvement.

Table-1.4. Satisfaction level on each item in FAC1 (*Administration*)

Item	Content	Satisfaction Mean	Importance Mean	Satisfaction and Importance ratio
X1	Respondents of head masters to staff's suggestions	3.25	3.28	99%
X2	Support and encourage of administrators	3.27	3.40	96%
X3	Involving in decisions that affect the organization	3.46	3.58	96%
X4	Procedure for performance evaluation	3.70	3.80	97%
X5	Cooperative effort among the staff	3.72	3.97	93%

Source: Output from SPSS

The index in table 1.3 indicates that *Working Condition* can meet 90% of employees' expectation. However, its level of satisfaction is lower than *Administration*, *Labour Safety*, *Staff Interaction*, and *Professional Development*. For further details about this issue, table 1.5 shows the comparison between each item in satisfaction level and importance level so that the company knows which items should be paid more attention for improvement.

Table- 1.5. Satisfaction level on each item in FAC2 (*Working Condition*)

Item	Content	Satisfaction Mean	Importance Mean	Satisfaction and Importance ratio
X7	Materials and equipment needed	3.46	3.85	90%
X8	Creativity and innovation are always	3.48	3.73	93%

Source: Output from SPSS

Then, Staff Interaction (FAC3) meeting about 92% the employee's expectation (shown in table 1.3) indicates that although Staff Interaction is the factor that occupies important positions in customer's working desire, it makes employees feel less satisfied than Administration, Professional Development and Labour Safety. For further details about this issue, table 1.6 shows the

comparison between each item in satisfaction level and importance level so that the company knows which items should be paid more attention for improvement.

Table-1.6. Satisfaction level on each item in FAC3 (*Staff Interaction*)

Item	Content	Satisfaction Mean	Importance Mean	Satisfaction and Importance ratio
X11	I trust our leadership team	3.34	3.59	94%
X12	I respect the work of my peers	3.34	3.71	90%
X13	Level effectiveness of team cooperation	3.72	4.02	92%

Source: Output from SPSS

As also shown in the table 1.3, *Compensation (FAC4)* only can meet about 81% of the employee's expectation. This indicates that although factor *Compensation* is the factor that occupies a very important position in customer's working desire, it makes employees very dissatisfied. The employees expect that the company could pay them better in comparison with what they have sacrificed for company's development. They also hope the price of overtime work could be increased annually and simultaneously. They also desire about time off and flexible schedules. The company may offer employees better long term incentives and parental leave. Furthermore, they are also in hope of getting more occasional bonus.

According to the research interview, the way of payment is not too important for company's employees. Both of using credit card or cash as the mean of the payment can be acceptable. What the employees want is to get the payment properly, especially in time and on time. However, worker's satisfaction level is lower than important level.

Consequently, the firm management should look for solutions to solve this problem. For further details about this issue, Table 1.7 shows the comparison between each item in satisfaction level and importance level so that the company knows which items should be paid more attention for improvement.

Table- 1.7. Satisfaction level on each item in FAC4 (*Compensation*)

Item	Content	Satisfaction Mean	Importance Mean	Satisfaction and Importance ratio
X17	Bonuses	2.64	3.47	76%
X18	Time off and flexible schedules	2.94	3.75	78%
X19	Long term incentives	3.17	3.71	85%
X20	Parental leave	3.24	3.95	82%
X21	Award for getting period promotion	3.19	3.86	82%

Source: Output from SPSS

Furthermore, as Table 1.3 stating that factor *Professional Development (FAC5)* can meet about 95% of the employee's expectation. This indicates that factor *Compensation* seems go well. For further details about this issue, Table 1.8 shows the comparison between each item in satisfaction level and importance level so that the company knows which items should be paid more attention for improvement.

Table- 1.8. Satisfaction level on each item in FAC5 (*Professional Development*)

Item	Content	Satisfaction Mean	Importance Mean	Satisfaction and Importance ratio
X16	Providing promotion opportunity	3.27	3.37	97%
X22	Processes of Prof. Development Evaluation and Reward	3.37	3.44	98%
X23	Training Courses helped me gain new information and skills	3.51	3.72	94%
X24	Development & training activities with theory, demonstration, and practice	3.26	3.55	91%

Source: Output from SPSS

Finally, the factor *Labour Safety (FAC6)* is the factor which made employees satisfied because it can meet 97% of employees' expectation (stated in table 1.3). This index indicates that *Labour Safety* seems go well. For further details about this issue, Table 1.9 shows the comparison between each item in satisfaction level and importance level so that the company knows which items should be paid more attention for improvement.

Table-1.9. Satisfaction level on each item in FAC6 (*Labour Safety*)

Item	Content	Satisfaction Mean	Importance Mean	Satisfaction and Importance ratio
X26	First aid facilities	3.27	3.31	98%
X27	Smoking restriction	3.77	3.95	95%
X28	Mechanical ventilation systems are regularly maintained	3.55	3.71	96%

Source: Output from SPSS

Correlation Analysis: In this section, researcher used correlation analysis to measure the relationship between each factor and job satisfaction. A strong or high correlation means that two or more factors have a strong relationship with overall satisfaction while a weak or low correlation means that the factors are hardly related.

- **Which one of six factors has correlated to job satisfaction of employees among Job Consulting Centers around Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam?**

The table 2.1 indicates that all hypotheses support for positive correlations.

Administration is found to be significant, strong positive linear relationship and highly correlated with workers' satisfaction (correlation coefficient or "r"= 0.742). *Working Condition* is found to be significant, weak positive correlated with workers' satisfaction (correlation coefficient or "r"= 0.242). *Staff Interaction* is found to be significant, weak positive correlated with workers' satisfaction (correlation coefficient or "r"= 0.291). *Compensation* is found to be significant, moderate positive correlated with workers' satisfaction (correlation coefficient or "r"= 0.411). *Professional Development* is found to be significant, weak positive correlated with workers' satisfaction (correlation coefficient or "r"= 0.215), *Labour Safety* is found to be significant and moderate positive correlated with workers' satisfaction (correlation coefficient or "r"= 0.395).

As above results, we can conclude that hypotheses H1, H2, H3, H4, H5 and H6 are supported.

Table- 2.1. Correlation Analysis

Factors	Pearson Correlation	Sig. (2-tailed)	N
Administration	.742	.000	200
Working Condition	.242	.002	200
Staff Interaction	.291	.000	200
Compensation	.411	.000	200
Professional Development	.215	.002	200
Labour Safety	.395	.000	200
Overall Satisfaction	1	--	200

Source: Output from SPSS

Regression Analysis: In this section, the researcher selects one single dependent variable, named as the overall satisfaction (DV), and six independent values, named as *Administration*, *Working Conditions*, *Compensation*, *Staff Interaction*, *Professional Development* and *Labour Safety* to make a prediction by using multiple linear regressions. The object of the prediction is to find out the factors having the strongest impact on the overall job satisfaction of employees among Job Consulting Centres. In other words, we use the process of multiple liner regressions to show which independent variables have strongest impact on the overall satisfaction of them.

- **Which factors have the strongest impact on the overall job satisfaction of employees among Job Consulting Centres?**

And, with the above satisfaction level of each factor, now, it becomes critical to know which the role of each factor in affecting the overall satisfaction level so that the company leaders would decide the priority of its strategies in enhancing its employees' satisfaction. To do this, Regression analysis is applied. In this analysis, the overall satisfaction level (DV) is considered as the dependent variable and the six factors are independent variables. The analysis results are as in Table 2.2.

Table- 2.2. Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate	Change Statistics				
					R Square Change	F Change	df1	df2	Sig. F Change
1	.775 ^a	.601	.572	.59822	.601	20.816	6	83	.000

a. Predictors: (Constant), Administration, Working Condition, Staff Interaction, Compensation, Professional Development and Labour Safety

b. Dependent Variable: Overall Satisfaction (DV)

SPSS will generate quite a few tables in its results section for a linear regression. In this session, we are going to look at the important tables. The first table of interest is the **Model Summary** table (*Table 2.2*). This table provides the *R* and *R*² value. The *R* value is 0.775, which represents the simple correlation and, therefore, indicates a high degree of correlation. The *R*² value indicates how much of the dependent variable, overall satisfaction of employees can be explained by the independent variable, *Administration*, *Working Condition*, *Staff Interaction*, *Compensation*, *Professional Development* and *Labour Safety*. In this case, 60.1% can be explained, which is large.

Note: In statistics, the *coefficient of determination* R^2 is used in the context of statistical models whose main purpose is the prediction of future outcomes on the basis of other related information. R^2 is most often seen as a number between 0 and 1.0, used to describe how well a regression line fits a set of data. An R^2 near 1.0 indicates that a regression line fits the data well, while an R^2 closer to 0 indicates a regression line does not fit the data very well. The *coefficient of determination* ($R^2 = 0.601$) shown in table 4.12 indicates that our regression line fits the data well.

The next table is the **ANOVA** table. Table 2.3 indicates that the regression model predicts the outcome variable significantly well. How do we know this? Look at the "Regression" row and go to the **Sig.** column. This indicates the statistical significance of the regression model that was applied. Here, $P < 0.0005$ which is less than 0.05 and indicates that, overall, the model applied is *significantly good enough* in predicting the outcome variable.

Table- 2.3.ANOVA

ANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	44.697	6	7.450	20.816	.000 ^a
	Residual	29.703	83	.358		
	Total	74.400	89			

a. Predictors: (Constant), Administration, Working Condition, Staff Interaction, Compensation, Professional Development and Labour Safety

b. Dependent Variable: Overall Satisfaction

To do the regression output, **Table 2.4** shows that Compensation, Professional Development and Labour Safety variables which barely fail to reach significance (sig >5%) are one by one removed from model.

Table-2.4. Coefficients (Original)

Model	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig	95% Confidence Interval for B	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
(Constant)	-.186	.551	--	-.337	.000	-1.282	.910
Administration	.214	.027	.821	8.019	.000	.161	.267
Work Condition	-.185	.056	-.294	-3.324	.001	-.296	-.074
Staff Interaction	-.031	.035	.187	2.511	.014	.018	.157
Compensation	.054	.029	.089	1.073	.286	-.027	.089
Prof. Development	-.019	.033	-.048	-.593	.555	-.085	.046
Labour Safety	-.004	.044	-.008	-.093	.926	-.092	.084

Sig.: Significant differences (P<0.05)

Dependent Variable: D

After discarding *Compensation*, *Prof. Development* and *Labour Safety* factors, **Table 2.5** shows that *Administration*, *Working Condition* and *Staff Interaction* are statistically significant in this regression model. Other evidence can be referred to Table 2.5 where ANOVA analysis is done to test the model fit. The significance level of F-statistics is too small compared to the given significance. Therefore, it can be concluded that the regression model is good enough to use in this study.

Table-2.5. ANOVA AnalysisANOVA^b

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	176.469	3	58.823	148.096	.000 ^a
	Residual	77.851	196	.397	--	--
	Total	254.320	199	--	--	--

a. Predictors: (Constant), F5, F1, F4

b. Dependent Variable: D

After one by one removed from the regression model and the final output is shown in Table 2.6.

Table-2.6. Coefficients (After discarded)

Model	Un-standardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.056	.336		166	.000
Administration	.196	.014	.812	13.542	.000
Working Condition	-.119	.036	-.195	-3.302	.001
Staff Interaction	.070	.024	.149	2.874	.005

Sig.: Significant differences (P<0.05)

Dependent Variable: D

The result of this regression in the Table 2.6 shows that all factors are statistically significant (sig. <0.05). The standardized coefficient of Administration is 0.812; Working Condition is -0.195; Staff Interaction is 0.149 respectively. It's showed that Administration is the most important factor affect to job satisfaction of employees. Besides, Staff Interaction and Working Condition play the second and third important role in making employees satisfied, respectively.

Beta (standardised regression coefficients). The beta value is a measure of how strongly each predictor variable influences the criterion (dependent) variable. The beta is measured in units of standard deviation. The higher the beta value the greater the impact of the predictor variable on the criterion variable. In multiple regressions, to interpret the direction of the relationship between variables, look at the signs (plus or minus) of the *B* coefficients. If a *B* coefficient is positive, then the relationship of this variable with the dependent variable is positive (e.g., the greater the IQ the better the grade point average); if the *B* coefficient is negative then the relationship is negative (e.g., the lower the class size the better the average test scores). Of course, if the *B* coefficient is equal to 0 then there is no relationship between the variables.

In this study, among three factors, Administration has the highest positive value of standardized coefficient "Beta", Staff Interaction comes second and Working Condition has the

negative standardized coefficient “Beta”. These figures indicate that Administration has the strongest impact on the overall satisfaction level of employees and Staff Interaction comes second; Because of their B coefficient is positive, then the relationship of this variable with the dependent variable is positive. If we have best solutions to improve Administration and Staff Interaction, then the overall satisfaction of employees also are improved better. Working Condition has the negative standardized coefficient “Beta” which is equal to -0.195. This demonstrates that most employees are not happy with the current Working Condition. Because of that, the leaders should think of better solutions for this factor. For example, with the smaller workload requirement, the better productivity the leaders can receive from their employees.

Besides, Compensation, Professional Development and Labour Safety do not have any effect on the overall satisfaction level of employees towards the organization. These findings are the foundations for the leaders to make proper strategies in its business to make its employees more satisfied.

5. DISCUSSION AND SOLLUTIONS

In regression model in table 2.6, we can predict that there are three important factors that have the strongest impact on the overall satisfaction; they are *Administration, Working Condition and Staff Interaction*. In table 2.6 standardized Coefficients of Administration, Working Condition and Staff Interaction shows that Administration has the highest positive value of standardized coefficient “Beta”, Staff Interaction comes second and Working Condition comes third and have the negative standardized coefficient “Beta”.

Therefore, the organization should have their proper policies and actions to firstly increase the satisfaction level on Administration; then Staff Interaction and finally Working Condition.

5.1. Suggested Solutions to Enhance the Satisfaction Level on Administration

Administration is the factors which have strongest impact on the overall satisfaction of employees. The support of administrators and the procedure for evaluating employees and staff performance should be noticed carefully. When leaders determine the procedure for employee’s performance evaluation, they tend to get strict and put hard requirements on young employee performance. Moreover, the elderly also hold conservative thinking, thus they would not be flexible in case of urgency. All these things may lead to some dissatisfaction feelings on employees. Therefore, the procedure for evaluating employees and staff performance should be taken carefully and effectively.

Besides, a good leader should consider about the influence of employees and staff over policy and practices. The organization can be only operated effectively if teacher and staff can self-recognize themselves as important resources that have scarified all their life for the development of working place. In order to improve employee’s satisfaction toward organization policy, it is necessary to put their rights as priorities.

In addition, Leadership and Self-Assessment Evaluations are also found as one of the most important elements. Good leaders should keep a good image in employees’ thinking because they give the privilege and the responsibility of managing others. It is necessary to give clear instructions and decisions. Besides, leaders should manage employees in such a way that their talents and skills are utilized to bring in maximum productivity in work. To increase employees’

satisfaction level, these leaders should keep work place to be fair in all aspects: promotion, evaluation and discipline. Lastly, all employees must obey the rule of the organization and respect the decision making by the leaders. A great leader should create his organization to become a nice, peaceful and trusted place.

5.2. Suggested Solutions to Enhance The Satisfaction Level on Staff Interaction and Leadership

Staff Interaction meeting about 92% the employee's expectation (shown in table 1.3) indicates that although Staff Interaction is the factor that occupies important positions in customer's working desire, it makes employees feel less satisfied than Administration, Professional Development and Labour Safety. Satisfaction and importance ratio, as shown in table 1.6, indicates that the three important problems that leaders should make them improved are a leadership team based on trust, the work of peers has a right to be treated with respect, and the level effectiveness of team cooperation.

For the first problem-a leadership team based on trust-the author has one suggestion for the leader as below:

- Open Communication and Honesty with the Team: Be yourself while always maintaining a professional persona. People deal with situations, good or bad, when they feel you are being honest in a professional yet personable way. This will also create a good union-company relationship if applicable. Encourage input and opinions. Be open for debate. Also, always suggest that an employee, or group of employees, talk to you first with any grievances before going to HR or upper management. The issue will be worked out right then and there. Human Resources will love you for it as well.

For the second problem- the work of peers has a right to be **treated with respect** -the author has some suggestions as below:

- If a leader wants to manage his team successfully, he at first has to know how to make his teammate respect the work of each other.
- Employee should learn to speak well and prevent gossip. Not many will learn to like you if you are too quiet or say the most boring things. Learn what to talk about something new or creative.
- Accept compliments graciously. After people see you are a smart colleague, chances are that they will compliment you. Learn to return compliments and if you can't find anything good to say back, just say "thanks" or speak modestly about yourself.
- Accept some criticism. Having power in a community means accepting criticism, so if you only have a handful of critics. Don't take it too seriously unless it starts to affect your reputation.

For the third problem- the level effectiveness of team cooperation-the author has some suggestions as below:

- Develop a Collaborative Approach. When your employees are engaged in the vision and

goals of the department, they will feel a sense of pride. Creativity, loyalty, and motivation will grow. Absenteeism and employee turnover will decrease, while problem solving and productivity will increase.

- Have Effective Meetings. Communicating with upper management and to your staff, as described throughout this course, is extremely important in creating clear-cut direction to achieve the well-defined goals and objectives. Meeting with staff is of vital importance, however, you need the meetings to follow an agenda and stick to the point to truly be effective.
- Give Employee a Bright Future. Employees always feel worried about the future position and look for a better promotion. So administrator should get them excited about a better future by making them feel secure about the company, providing a clear and shared hope for the future, and keeping everything under control.

5.3. Suggested Solutions to Enhance The Satisfaction Level on Working Condition

Working Condition that can make employees well satisfied as stated in table 1.3. Also mentioned in table 1.3, the level of satisfaction is lower than Administration, Labour Safety, Staff Interaction, and Professional Development. This factor can meet 90% of employees' expectation. Satisfaction and importance ratio, as shown in table 1.5, indicates that the two important problems that leaders should make them improved are *Materials and equipment needed, and Creativity and innovation are always supported*.

Firstly, materials and equipments should be checked and well documented. The adoption of new materials and replacing old equipments have provided for many advances in work. Secondly, leaders know creativity and innovation are the life blood of their organization. Leaders should stimulate creativity for two very important reasons: to prevent obsolescence and to increase productivity. So, the mission of every leader should be to search continually for ideas and programs that are superior to the ones the organization is currently committed to. But what can the leaders do to promote creativity and innovation? The most obvious answer, short of hiring a new work force, is to use management initiatives that create a work environment that stimulates the existing staff to be more creative and innovative.

6. CONTRIBUTIONS

The researcher did the investigation of job satisfaction among Job Consulting Centres around Ho Chi Minh City, Vietnam. The results of this study may contribute towards improving satisfaction of these organizations and can be used as reference for future researches. The findings of this study indicate that demographic characteristic of employees and six factors of job satisfaction, including Administration, Compensation, Working condition, Staff interaction, Professional Development and Labour Safety are associated with the level of satisfaction.

Go through the final findings, the research gave some useful suggestions for improving bad points that exist in the company in order to orient it how to adjust the system more effectively. Increasing satisfaction level of employee may prevent the risk of burnout, while thousands of workers are rushing to go abroad for working. This research's findings also remind policy-makers to recognize the fact that compensation is the central components of effective policy-making. Besides they should recognize that even though low salary is a barrier for anyone who wants to be faithful with the organization.

7. LIMITATIONS AND FUTURE RESEARCH

This research has some limitations. Firstly, this study is limited because it investigates the situation of restricted number of respondents. It recommended for future research to do a larger scales with a larger sample for getting more reliable and accuracy information.

Further research should include other factors in the research's area. For example, future researches may examine satisfaction level in other fields of the national economy, such as banking, health, education, .etc because these labour forces are also very necessary for our nation.

REFERENCES

- Brown, L., 2004. Call centres offer real careers. Cape Argus Job shop: p. 5.
- Cohen, L., L. Manion and K. Morrison, 2007. Research methods in education. London: Routledge Tylors and Francis.
- Holdsworth, L. and S. Cartwright, 2003. Empowerment, stress and satisfaction: An exploratory study of a call centre. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24(3): 131-140.
- Kleemann, F. and I. Matuschek, 2002. Between job and satisfaction: Motivations and career orientations of German high quality call center employees. Retrieved November 9, 2004. Available from http://www.sociology.org/content/vol006.002/kleemann_matuschek.html.
- Levin, G., 2004. A look at what works in agent rewards and recognition. Retrieved November 4, 2004. Available from <http://www.ccmreview.com>.
- Malhotra, N. and A. Mukherjee, 2004. The relative influence of organizational commitment and job satisfaction on service quality of customer –contact employees in banking call centres. *Journal of Services Marketing*, 18(3): 162-174.
- Marr, B. and A. Neely, 2004. Managing and measuring for value: The case of call centre performance. Bedfordshire, great Britain: Cranfield university. Cranfield School of Management and Fujitsu.
- Mbua, F.N., 2003. Educational administration: Theory and practice. Limbe, south west province, cameroon: Design house.
- Miller, H.A., S. Mire and B. Kim, 2009. Predictors of job satisfaction among police officers: Does personality matter? *Journal of Criminal Justice*, 37: 423-433.
- Moshavi, D. and J.R. Terborg, 2002. The job satisfaction and performance of contingent and regular customer service representatives: A human capital perspective. *International Journal of Service Industry Management*, 13(4): 333-347.
- Muchinsky, P., 1993. Psychology applied to work: An introduction to industrial/ organizational psychology. L.A: Brooks/Cole.
- Muijjs, D., 2004. Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS. London: Sage Publications.
- Organ, D.W. and T.S. Bateman, 1991. Organizational behaviour. Homewood, IL: IRWIN.
- Peterson, R., 1994. A meta- analysis of cronbach's coefficient alpha. *Journal of Consumer Research*, 21(September): 381-391.
- Rose, E. and G. Wright, 2005. Satisfaction and dimensions of control among call centre customer service representatives. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 16(1): 136.

Snipes, R.L., S.L. Oswald, M. LaTour and A.A. Armenakis, 2005. The effects of specific job satisfaction facets on customer perceptions of service quality: An employee-level analysis. *Journal of Business Research*, 58: 1330-1339.

Tidmarsh, T., 2003. I can't get no call centre satisfaction. Retrieved November, 3, 2004. Available from <http://www.callcentres.net/CALLCENTRES/LIVE/me.get?site.sections&CALL> 07.