

# **The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Employee Engagement at Royal Malaysian Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis**

Amilina binti Abdul Hamid

School of Business Innovation and Technopreneurship

## **Abstract**

The purpose of this research was to study the relationship between job satisfaction and employee engagement. A quantitative method was used in this study for data gathering. 80 questionnaires were distributed to employee of Royal Malaysia Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis. The job satisfaction dimension are work environment, motivation and communication. The finding shows that only communication has significant relationship with employee engagement in Royal Malaysia Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis while the others factor which is work environment and motivation has no significant relationship with employee engagement.

**Keywords:** Employee engagement, Job satisfaction, Motivation, Work environment, Communication

## **INTRODUCTION**

Nowadays, employers are getting concern on the job satisfaction on employees. Employee engagement in an organization is already identified as the main backbone of the successfulness in an organization all over the world. They identified it as a main supporter lead to unknown practices.

Few researchers have indicted that employee engagement predicts employee outcomes, organizational success and financial performance (Bates, 2004). Thus, to survive and compete successfully in today's unstable economic environment, organizations need employee to be practical, show initiative while engaging with their role and remain committed to performing at high standards. (Bakker, 2010).

Organizational agility requires employees who exhibit energy and self-confidence and exhibit genuine enthusiasm and passion for their work (Shaulefi, 2008). In sum, modern organizations require an engaged work force.

According to Bakker (2011), total expenditure is influenced by the commitment of a workers. A lower output will be produced if an employee is disengagement. That's why managers and the whole organization need to make sure that employees in the organization are satisfied with the

environment of the work, the activities that organized by the organization and their scope of job.

We will come towards to answer theses few questions in order to attain our findings in this research, the questions are mainly asking about the job satisfaction.

These question are:

1. What is job satisfaction dimension towards employee engagement?
2. Is there any relationship between job satisfaction dimension (work environment, communication, motivation) toward employee engagement.

On the off chance that they are specifically and reliably educated about key issues, they as a result are taking an interest in what is occurring all through the organization. The result is that workers who feel esteemed are more beneficial, more prone to step up, and are oftentimes additionally eager to assume a part in development (Lloyd M. Field, 2008).

## LITERATURE REVIEW

### EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT :

According to Shanmuga and Vijayadurai (2014), quantifiable level of an employee's positive or negative energetic association with their movement, partners and affiliation that fundamentally affect their status to learn and perform is granulating ceaselessly is employee engagement. Refer to Saks (2006), employee engagement is a different and unique structure that consists of cognitive, emotional, and behavioral components that are related with performance and individual role.

According to Kahn (1990), employee engagement is “the benefits of organization members with their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively and emotionally during role performances”. Emotional and cognitive engagement is two major dimension for psychological engagement. Having good relations with superiors and peers and experiencing empathy for others were known as emotional engagement.

### JOB SATISFACTION :

Job satisfaction is defined what would the employee view their work as a favorable or unfavorable aspects with (Grieshaber et al., 1995). It also has been defined as how much the employee like their work (Seo et al., 2004). To have a higher satisfaction of the employee, the more his or her work environments fulfill their need, values or personal characteristics. (Abraham, 2012).

According to Locke (1976), a pleasurable or positive emotional state, resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experience has defined job satisfaction. It is a full of feeling or passionate reaction toward different aspects of one's activity. Smith, Kendall & Hulin (1969) defined job satisfaction as the emotions a specialist has about his or her activity. “An effective reaction to a job that results from the incumbent's comparison of actual outcomes with those that are desired” is defined as job satisfaction (Cranny, Smith & Stone, 1992).

According to Dawal, Taha & Ismail (2009), once they satisfied with their jobs, employees will work

harder. However, if the job satisfaction is low the employees are willing to remove themselves either from job or the organization and decrease the work commitment by spending less time (Cohen & Golan, 2007).

### WORKING ENVIRONMENT :

According to Anitha (2014), “work environment and employee engagement had a positively significant relationship”. Environment of the workplace play an optimum role to employees in whether they need to continue working in the association. A protected workplace can pull in new hopefuls into the field to apply for the positions that still should be satisfied. The workplace assumes a vital part as individuals need to work in a protected work environment.

Earlier studies have shown that to determine the level of engagement for each employee working in the organization the work environment is a factor that can be used. Studies by Miles (2001) and Harter et al. (2001) found that “various aspects of work environment can result in various levels of employee engagement”. This is supported by Holbeche & Springett (2003), May et al. (2004) and Rich et al. (2010).

A management that fosters a supportive working environment have a characteristic of the organizations that play their roles and show their concern about employees' needs and feelings, provide positive feedback and allow employees to make known their concerns, develop new skills and solve work-related problems. (Deci & Ryan, 1987).

### COMMUNICATION :

Frank & Brownell (1989) communication transactions between individuals and/or groups at various levels and in different areas of specialization that are intended to design and redesign organizations, to implement design and contribute from day-to-day activities define employee communication.

When they perceive absence of consistent and honest communication the employees become concerned about the future of the organization and will start thinking about leaving the organization (Durkin, 2007). Durkin (2007) recommended that association should share obviously with every one

of the workers it's vision and values and in a perfect world this ought to go past simply making benefits. According to Sukri, Asogan & Waemustafa (2015), that an individual feel fulfilled when they firmly identified with their work market, for example, yield, stops and nonattendance.

“Most employees, regardless of their position in the organization, will cite communication as an area in their workplace that needs improvement” (Prime Resources, Inc, 2009). Internal communication is to improve performance by changing the behavior of all employees, including managers is one the fundamental purpose (Steyen & Groenewald, 1996).

**MOTIVATION :**

Motivation intends to be moved to accomplish something. As needs be, some person is animated or acted towards an end is seen as induced, however, for those who feels no motivation to act along these lines considered as unmotivated (Deci & Ryan, 2000). It is additionally characterized as creating "engagement in and steadiness with the learning undertaking” (Crookes & Schmidt,1998).

Human direct is unusual; a couple of needs are perceptive while others are neglectful. Sometimes their necessities are driven by their unaware expectations. Kamal et al (2006), “human are much the same as an ice sheet, as the tip of the chunk of ice is obvious (conscious), yet whatever is left of the parts which is under the surface isn't noticeable”. Despite the fact that, there are unmistakable assumptions about importance of motivation, yet all pros almost agree that, the power oblige human to start an activity and complete it with putting the dominant part of their undertakings to fulfill their needs.

“Both theories and empirical research holds that a need-based motivations are the important input that engage people in various behaviors and such motivation can be divided into two major groups: extrinsic and intrinsic” (Jiming & Xinjian, 2013), Amabile, 1993). “Intrinsic motivation arises from the intrinsic value of the work for the individual (for example, its interest value), whereas, extrinsic motivation arises from the desire to obtain some outcomes (for example, as rewards) that are apart from the work itself” (Amabile, 1993). “Intrinsic motivation refer to perform a behavior for one own

sake for pleasure and satisfaction, whereas, extrinsic motivation refers to perform a behavior for instrumental values such as monetary rewards, that are apart from the behavior” (Deci and Ryan, 1987).

**HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT :**

H1: There is relationship between work environment influence job satisfaction towards employee engagement.

H2: There is relationship between communication affect job satisfaction towards employee engagement.

H3: There is relationship between motivation effect job satisfaction towards employee engagement.

**METHODOLOGY**

**Research Model**



**DATA COLLECTION:** Data was collected with the help of structure questionnaire. A quantitative method was used in this study for data gathering. 80 questionnaires were distributed to employee of Royal Malaysia Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis. Descriptive analysis, reliability test, and multiple regressions analysis has been carried out in this research.

**RESULTS & FINDING**

**DEMOGRAPHIC DATA**

**Table 4.2 Demographic characteristics of respondents**

Variables	Categories	Frequency	Percentage (%)
Gender	Male	43	53.8
	Female	37	46.3
Age	20-30 years old	19	23.8
	31-40 years old	38	47.5
	41 years old and above	23	28.8
Race	Malay	57	71.3
	Chinese	13	16.3
	Indian	7	8.8
	Other	3	3.8
Work duration	Below 1 year	7	8.8
	1-5 years	30	37.5
	5 years	43	53.8
	above		

Table 4.2 shows the summarization of the demographics data collected that consists of respondents' gender, age, race and work duration. It shows that majority respondents are male (53.8%) followed by female (46.3%).

While for the age, majority respondent are aged between 31- 40 years old (47.5 %), 41 years old and above (28.8 %) and 20-30 years old (23.8 %).

The majority of respondents are Malay (71.3%), Chinese (16.3%), Indian (8.8%), and other (3.8%).

As for the work duration, out of 80 respondents, the data show that most of the respondents consist of 43 respondents with 53.8% with working experience more than 5 years. Followed by 30 respondent recorded with 37.5% with working experience between 1 to 5 years. The least employee with 8.8 % with work duration less than 1 year.

**RELIABILITY ANALYSIS**

**Table 4.3 Results of Reliability Test**

Variable	Number of items	Cronbach Alphas
Employee Engagement	5	.798
Motivation	5	.690
Working Environment	5	.744
Communication	5	.859

Reliability analysis of each variable was validated using the Cronbach's Alpha scale. The Cronbach's Alpha is determined in Table 4.3 together with each dependent variable, employee engagement and independent variables item namely motivation, working environment and communication.

The Cronbach's Alpha range from .690 to .859 which suggested the specified indicators are sufficient for use (Nunnally, 1978). The reliability

coefficient is better when it get closer to 1.0, and alpha over 0.8 is considered good while if alpha 0.7 considered acceptable and for alpha less than 0.6 is considered as poor (Sekaran, 1992). The most reliable variable is the communication followed by working environment and motivation.

**DESCRIPTIVE ANALYSIS**

**Table 4.4 Descriptive analysis**

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Employee Engagement	80	2.80	5.00	3.9375	.51958
Motivation	80	2.60	5.00	3.9575	.42060
Work Environment	80	3.00	5.00	3.9900	.41111

Communication	80	2.80	5.00	3.7950	.47305
---------------	----	------	------	--------	--------

Table 4.4 shows the summary of all descriptive statistics that are means and standard deviation for all the variables that is tested in this study. It is clearly presented that the mean for all the variables are in range from 3.7950 to 3.99. Among all variable, the highest mean is work environment

(3.99) and the next is motivation (3.9575 followed by employee engagement (3.9375) and last is communication (3.7950).

#### CORRELATIONAL ANALYSIS

**Table 4.5 Pearson Correlation**

		Correlations			
		Engagement	Motivation	Environment	Communication
Engagement	Pearson Correlation	1	.590**	.535**	.728**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	80	80	80	80
Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.590**	1	.659**	.661**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	80	80	80	80
Environment	Pearson Correlation	.535**	.659**	1	.658**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	80	80	80	80
Communication	Pearson Correlation	.728**	.661**	.658**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	80	80	80	80

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

The inter-correlations among the study variables are shown in Table 4.5. Motivation, working environment and communication were independent variables and employee engagement was dependent

variable. As can be seen, communication ( $r=.728, p<.01$ ), motivation ( $r=.590, p<.01$ ) and working environment ( $r=.535, p<.01$ ) were all significantly and related with employee engagement.

#### REGRESSION RESULTS

**Table 4.6 Result of Multiple Regression Analysis**

		Coefficients <sup>a</sup>				
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.452	.422		1.072	.287
	Motivation	.227	.138	.183	1.646	.104
	Environment	.033	.141	.026	.232	.817

Communication	.648	.122	.590	5.295	.000
---------------	------	------	------	-------	------

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Engagement

Table 4.6 shows the results of regression of three independent variables that consists of motivation, communication and working environment against dependent variable which is employee engagement. It was indicated that the highest  $\beta$  is communication with  $\beta=.590$ ;  $\text{sig}<.05$ . That means the communication is significant with employee engagement. However, the other independent variables; motivation with  $\beta=0.183$ ,  $\text{sig}>.05$  and working environment with  $\beta=.026$ ,  $\text{sig}>.05$  are considered as insignificants with employee engagement.

### CONCLUSION

It indicates that a good communication skill trigger the employee engagement more than motivation and working environment in Royal Malaysian Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis. In Royal Malaysian Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis, someone who has a good communication skill practiced is considered someone who is friendly, has feeling of empathy and have a sense of humor. The employees also need a good communication skills within department to engage in any task given.

From the study finding, motivation has no relationship with employee engagement. It is probably because most of the employee has been working for more than 5 years. Therefore are comfortable with the organization itself. It could also presumed that the employee has fair rewards and benefit from the job itself that make them less motivated to engaged more to the organization.

Working environment has also no relationship with the employee engagement towards the organization. This is because those working in the Royal Malaysian Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis has been working for a long duration of time. They has experienced other working environment and not affected by changes. Leader comes and go but the working environment remain the same.

### LIMITATION

First limitation is the resources. The study had limited respondent to answer our questionnaire because the study only focus on the staff of

management department in Royal Malaysian Customs Department (RMCD) Kangar, Perlis. Due to the small sample size available for the study, the results may not be generalizable beyond the specific population from which the sample was drawn. Second limitations is the busy schedule of the respondents. The employees of the RMCD who will be the respondents of the questionnaire may have busy work schedule thereby making them to provide answers to the questions hurriedly, which can affect their answers negatively.

### FUTURE RESEARCH

For future research, several suggestions can be considered to provide a wider and in depth research to measure employee engagement. The result of this study highlights the need for future research. Based on the result of multiple regression shows that 55.1 percent of the variation been affected by the three variables and the balance 44.9 percent by other variables. In order to improve the research, future researcher need to change and experiment with other independent variables. Some variables that can be used for future research are leadership and job design. Sampling design used in this research is too small and only focused in one department. Future research may experiment with larger department. Future research may also focus on demographic factors such as work duration in relation with employee engagement.

### REFERENCES

- Abraham, S (2012), "Job satisfaction as an Antecedent to employee Engagement", SIES Journal Of Management, Vol 8. (2).
- Avery, D.R., McKay, P.F. & Wilson, D.C.(2007). *Engaging the aging work force: The relationship between perceived age similarity, satisfaction with co-workers, and employee engagement*. Journal of Applied Psychology, 92, pp. 1542-1556
- Briner, R.B (2000), relationship between work environments, psychological environments and psychological wellbeing: in-depth review. *Occup. Med*

- 50(5), 299-303. Retrieved from <http://occm.ed.oxfordjournals.org/content/50/5/299.full.pdf>
- Emma Bridger (2015) *Employee Engagement*, Kogan Page limited, United States of America
- Gallup (2005) *Employee engagement index survey*, Gallup Management Journal
- Harter, James K., Schmidt, Frank L (2002), *Job Satisfaction as an Antecedent to Employee Engagement*, SIES Journal of Management, September 2012, Vol. 8(2)
- Hayes, Theodore L. (2002), *Business unit-level Relationship between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-analysis*, Journal of Applied Psychology. 87(2), pp. 268-79.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990), "An Exercise of Authority", Organizational Behavior Teaching Review, 4 (2), pp. 28-42
- Lars Foldspang, Michael Mark, Laurits Rømer Hjorth, Christian Langholz-Carstensen, Otto Melchior Poulsen, Ulf Johansson, Guy Ahonen, Steinar Aasnæss, Louise Lund Rants, 2014. *Working environment and productivity: A register-based analysis of Nordic Enterprises* Nordic Council of Minister
- Locke, E.A. & D. Henne (1986). *Work motivation theories*. In C.L. Cooper & I. Robertson (Eds.) International review of industrial and organizational psychology,. London: Wiley. pp. 1-35
- MacLeod D & Clarke N (2009) *Engaging for Success: Enhancing performance through employee engagement*. London: Office of Public Sector Information.
- Pritchard, Robert D., Chen, Gilad, Kanfer, Ruth, work motivation : Past, Present And Future Society for Industrial and Organizational Psychology (U.S.) 2008
- Rana, Neeti, Dr. and Chhabra, Neeti Leekha, (2011), *Employee Engagement: A primer for strategic human resource management*, Asian Journal of Research in Business, Economics and Management, 1(2), pp. 16 – 27.
- RobinsonD, Perryman S, & S.H. 2004. The driver of employee Engagement. Brighton: Institute for Employment Studies.
- Rothbard, N. P 2001 *Enriching or depleting? The dynamics of engagement in work and family roles*. Administrative Science Quarterly.46:655-684
- Shuck, B., & Wollard K.K.2010. Employee Engagement and HRD: a seminal review of the foundations, Human resource Development Review,9(1):89-110
- Sukri, S., Asogan, P., & Waemustafa, W. (2015), *Factor influencing job involvement in Universiti Malaysia Perlis (UniMAP)*. Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences, December 2015, Vol. 6 (6)
- Tiwari, Shashi, (2011), *Employee Engagement - The Key to Organizational Success*, ICOQM – 10, June 28 -30, pp. 311 – 328.