

## SUBJECTIVE WELL-BEING AND PSYCHOLOGICAL EMPOWERMENT AMONG THE EMPLOYEES OF AN AUTO COMPONENT MANUFACTURING COMPANY

**Dr.P.Paramanandam &  
Ms. K. Abinaya**

### **ABSTRACT**

Subjective well-being refers to a person's cognitive and affective evaluations of his or her life. Psychological empowerment is defined as the fundamental personal beliefs that employees have about their role in relation to the employing organization. The present study was aimed at studying Subjective well-being and Psychological empowerment among the employees of an auto component manufacturing company. A convenience sample consisting of seventy four employees working in an auto component manufacturing company participated in the study. Structured Questionnaires were used to gather primary data. By administering questionnaires subjective well-being and psychological empowerment among the employees were assessed. The collected data was analysed with Mean, Standard Deviation, Correlation, regression and ANOVA tests. Results indicated that there was a significant difference in psychological empowerment and subjective well-being among the respondents of different age groups; among the married and unmarried respondents; and also among the respondents of different experience groups. There was a significant correlation between psychological empowerment and subjective well-being. Approximately seventeen per cent of the variance in psychological empowerment was explained by subjective well-being.

**Keywords:** Competence, Impact, Psychological empowerment, Self-determination, and Subjective well-being.

### **I. INTRODUCTION**

Psychological empowerment is defined as the fundamental personal beliefs that employees have about their role in relation to the employing organization. The beliefs are organized into four dimensions: meaning, self-determination, competence, and impact (Spreitzer, 1995). Self-determination is the amount of freedom and discretion people have in the workplace, meaning is having a personal connection to work, competence is the confidence about one's abilities to perform work responsibilities, and impact is the ability to make a difference in the work organization (Spreitzer, 1995).

According to Spreitzer and Quinn (2001) psychological empowerment at work is developed within an individual; it is not granted by a superior or institution. While the institution may facilitate the development of psychological empowerment, it may not award psychological empowerment. The member of the organization must develop the four dimensions of psychological empowerment independently.

The four dimensions of psychological empowerment theory have been correlated with various work behaviors and affective outcomes at work (Spreitzer, Kizilos, & Nason, 1997). Meaning has been most strongly associated with job satisfaction (K. Thomas & Tymon, 1994). Self-determination is also associated with job satisfaction. Impact is related most strongly to work effectiveness. Competence is negatively related to job stress and positively related to work effectiveness (Spreitzer & Quinn, 2001).

The four dimensions are said to combine additively to create an overall construct of psychological empowerment. In other words, the lack of any single dimension will deflate, though not completely eliminate, the overall degree of felt empowerment. Thus the four dimensions specify "a nearly complete or sufficient set of cognitions" for understanding psychological empowerment (Thomas and Velthouse, 1990).

Diener, Lucas, & Oishi, (2002) defined Subjective well-being (SWB) as 'a person's cognitive and affective evaluations of his or her life'. The cognitive evaluation relates to what one thinks about his or her life satisfaction in global terms and in domain terms. The affective evaluation relates to emotions, moods and feelings. Affect is considered positive when the feelings experienced are pleasant and affect is considered to be negative when the feelings experienced are unpleasant. Evidences indicate that psychological empowerment is likely to result from high SWB. Researchers have concluded that people who are chronically happy tend to feel more empowered than unhappy individuals. Individuals who have been successful in the past are likely to feel empowered, seek new goals, and believe that they have the resources to achieve their goals. People who fail repeatedly may experience negative emotions which may affect psychological empowerment (Ed Diener, 2003).

## **II. REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

Argyle, (2001) conducted a study and concluded that people who have jobs tend to be happier than those who are unemployed. He also concluded that skilled workers seem to be happier than their unskilled workers. Many researchers have

concluded that a rich and fulfilling social life and a network of social support with family and friends is related to SWB. Diener & Seligman, (2002) conducted a study among college students and found that those who engage in large amounts of social activity were the happiest.

Lynn Holdsworth and Susan Cartwright (2003) examined the relationship between stress, satisfaction, and the dimensions of psychological empowerment. The sample included employees of a call centre. The researchers concluded that compared to general working population call centre employees were more stressed, less satisfied, had poor mental and physical health and perceived themselves to be less empowered.

Wang, Guangping and Lee, Peggy D (2009) investigated the impact of psychological empowerment dimensions on job satisfaction. They collected data from employees working in number of organizations. Choice dimension has a limited negative effect on job satisfaction when both competence and impact are high or low. But choice has a strong positive effect when one of the two, that is competence or impact, is low and the other is high. Impact dimension has no effect on job satisfaction when choice and competence dimensions are either high or both low.

Mohd Onn Rashdi Abd Patah, Salleh Mohd Radzi, Rahman Abdullah, Azahar Adzmy, Razlan Adli Zain, Nazarudin Derani (2009) conducted a study to examine the impact of psychological empowerment on job satisfaction level among the employees of five star hotels in Kuala Lumpur. The sample included two hundred and ten Front Office Receptionists. Results indicated that psychological empowerment has a significant impact on job satisfaction of the receptionists.

### **III. OBJECTIVE OF THE STUDY**

The objective of the present study was to study Subjective well-being and Psychological empowerment among the employees of an auto component manufacturing company.

### **IV. METHODOLOGY**

For the purpose of the study a survey design was used. The population for the study was 214 employees which included middle level managers, supervisors and administrative staff working in an auto component manufacturing company. The target sample chosen for the study was 90 employees. Structured Questionnaires were used to assess subjective well-being and psychological empowerment

among the employees. The researcher has received only 74 completely filled questionnaires. The collected data was analysed with Mean, Standard Deviation, Correlation, regression and ANOVA tests.

#### **A. MEASURES:**

Psychological Empowerment Instrument (Spreitzer, 1995) was used to assess psychological empowerment. This instrument has 12 items and responses were scored on 5-point Likert scale (1 = strongly disagree to 5 = strongly agree). Subjective well-being Inventory developed by Indian Council of Medical Research was used to assess the level of well-being. This tool has 40 items with 3 point Likert scale. The responses were scored as follows: Very much/ very good/ most of the time =3, To some extent/ quite good / some time =2, and Not so much / not so good / hardly ever = 1.

#### **V. RESULTS AND DISCUSSION**

This section presents the analysis of the data collected from the respondents.

(Kindly Refer Table – I)

Among the 74 respondents, 47 (63.5%) belong to below 30 years age group; 49 (66.2%) are female; 38 (51.4%) are single; 28 (37.8%) belong to below 15000 income group, and 28 (37.8%) belong to below 5 years experience group.

(Kindly Refer Table – II)

A higher level of psychological empowerment (Mean=28.57) and subjective well-being (Mean=83.21) was observed among the respondents of below 30 years age group.

(Kindly Refer Table – III)

A higher level of psychological empowerment (Mean=27.00) and subjective well-being (Mean=82.88) was observed among the male respondents.

(Kindly Refer Table – IV)

A higher level of psychological empowerment (Mean=28.92) and subjective well-being (Mean=83.50) was observed among the unmarried respondents.

(Kindly Refer Table – V)

A higher level of psychological empowerment (Mean=30.82) and subjective well-being (Mean=84.11) was observed among the respondents of less than 5 years experience group.

(Kindly Refer Table – VI)

A higher level of psychological empowerment (Mean=29.73) was observed among the respondents of 20000-25000 income group and a higher level of subjective well-being (Mean=83.36) was observed among the respondents of above 25000 income group. Psychological empowerment was less (Mean=25.62) among the respondents of 15000-20000 income group than other groups. A lower level of subjective well-being (Mean=77.32) was observed among the respondents of below 15000 income group.

(Kindly Refer Table – VII)

Results of the ANOVA test revealed that there was a significant difference in psychological empowerment ( $F=5.289$  &  $p<.05$ ) and subjective well-being ( $F=12.877$  &  $p<.01$ ) among the respondents of different age groups.

(Kindly Refer Table – VIII)

Independent samples t-test revealed that there was a significant difference in Psychological Empowerment ( $t = 2.324$  &  $p<.05$ ), and also in Subjective Wellbeing ( $t = 3.287$  &  $p< .01$ ) among the married and unmarried respondents.

(Kindly Refer Table – IX)

Results of the ANOVA test revealed that there was a significant difference in psychological empowerment ( $F=5.823$  &  $p<.01$ ) and subjective well-being ( $F=3.846$  &  $p <.05$ ) among the respondents of different experience groups.

(Kindly Refer Table –X)

Results of the ANOVA test revealed that there was no significant difference in psychological empowerment ( $F=.593$  &  $p>.05$ ) and subjective well-being ( $F=2.090$  &  $p >.05$ ) among the respondents of different income groups.

(Kindly Refer Table – XI)

Correlation test revealed that there was a significant correlation ( $r=.319$  &  $p<.01$ ) between psychological empowerment and job subjective well-being.

(Kindly Refer Table – XII)

Regression analysis was used to investigate the relationship between psychological empowerment and subjective well-being. F-Test was statistically significant, which means that the model was statistically significant. The R-Squared is .172 which means that approximately 17% of the variance in psychological empowerment was explained by the predictor variable, that is, subjective well-being.

## VI. CONCLUSION

Subjective well-being refers to a person's cognitive and affective evaluations of his or her life. Psychological empowerment is defined as the fundamental personal beliefs that employees have about their role in relation to the employing organization. The present study was aimed at studying Subjective well-being and Psychological empowerment among the employees of an auto component manufacturing company. A convenience sample consisting of seventy four employees working in an auto component manufacturing company participated in the study. Structured Questionnaires were used to gather primary data. By administering questionnaires subjective well-being and psychological empowerment among the employees were assessed. The collected data was analysed with Mean, Standard Deviation, Correlation, regression and ANOVA tests. Results indicated that a higher level of psychological empowerment and subjective well-being was observed among the respondents of less than 30 years age group. A higher level of psychological empowerment and subjective well-being was observed among the male respondents; among the unmarried respondents; and among the respondents of less than 5 years experience group. A higher level of psychological empowerment was observed among the respondents of 20000-25000 income group and a high level of subjective well-being was observed among the respondents of above 25000 income group. There was a significant difference in psychological empowerment and subjective well-being among the respondents of different age groups; among the married and unmarried respondents; and also among the respondents of different experience groups. There was a significant correlation between psychological empowerment and subjective well-being. Approximately seventeen per cent of the variance in psychological empowerment was explained by subjective well-being.

## REFERENCES

1. Bandura, A. (1977). Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioral change. *Psychological Review*, 84: 191-215.
2. Brief, A. & Nord, W.R. (1990). *Meaning of Occupational Work*. Lexington, MA: Lexington Books.
3. Conger, J.A., & Kanungo, R.N. (1988). The empowerment process: Integrating theory and practice. *Academy of Management Review*, 13, 471-482.
4. Deci, E.L., & Ryan, R.M. (1989). The support of autonomy and the control of behavior. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 53: 1024-1037.
5. Dewar, R.D., Whetten, D.A., & Boje, D. (1980). An examination of the reliability and validity of the Aiken and Hage scales of centralization, formalization and task routineness. *Administrative Sciences Quarterly*, 25, 120-128.

6. Diener, E., & Lucas, R. E. (1999). Personality and subjective well-being. In D. Kahneman, E. Diener, & N. Schwarz (Eds.), *Wellbeing: The foundations of hedonic psychology* (pp. 213–229). New York: Sage Foundation.
7. Diener, E., & Seligman, M. E. P. (2004). Beyond money: Toward an economy of well-being. *Psychological Science in the Public Interest*, 5, 1–31.
8. Gist, M. (1987). Self-efficacy: Implications for organizational behavior and human resource management. *Academy of Management Review*, 12: 472–485.
9. Indradevi, R. (2012). The Impact of Psychological Empowerment on Job Performance and Job Satisfaction in Indian Software Companies. *EXCEL International Journal of Multidisciplinary Management Studies*, 2 (4), 36–48.
10. Kanungo, R.N. (1982). *Work Alienation*. New York: Praeger.
11. Liden et al., (2000). An examination of the mediating role of psychological empowerment on the relations between the job, interpersonal relationships and work outcomes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(3), 407–416.
12. Lynn Holdsworth, Susan Cartwright, (2003). Empowerment, stress and satisfaction: an exploratory study of a call centre. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 24 (3), 131 - 140
13. Mohd Onn Rashdi Abd Patah, Salleh Mohd Radzi, Rahman Abdullah, Azahar Adzmy, Razlan Adli Zain, Nazarudin Derani (2009). The Influence of Psychological Empowerment on Overall Job Satisfaction of Front Office Receptionists. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 4, 167–176.
14. Robbins, S.P. et al (2012). *Organizational Behavior*. New Delhi: Pearson.
15. Rosenberg, M. (1965). *Society and the adolescent self-image*. Princeton, NJ: Princeton University Press.
16. Segerstrom, S. C., & Miller, G. E. (2004). Psychological stress and the human immune system: A meta-analytic study of 30 years of inquiry. *Psychological Bulletin*, 130, 601–630.
17. Segerstrom, S. C., & Sephton, S. E. (2010). Optimistic expectancies and cell-mediated immunity: The role of positive affect. *Psychological Science*, 21, 448–455.
18. Smith, C.A., Organ, D.W., & Near, J.P. (1983). Organizational Citizenship Behavior: Its nature and its antecedents. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 653–663.
19. Sparks, A. M. (2011). Psychological empowerment and job satisfaction between Baby Boomer and Generation X nurses. *Journal of Nursing Management*, 20, 451–460.

20. Spreitzer, G.M. (1995). Psychological empowerment in the workplace: dimensions, measurement, and validation. *Academy of Management Journal*, 38(5), 1442-1465.
21. Spreitzer, G.M. (1996). Social structural characteristics of psychological empowerment. *Academy of Management Journal*, 39, 483- 504.
22. Thomas, K.W., & Velthouse, B.A. (1990). Cognitive elements of empowerment: An “interpretive” model of intrinsic task motivation. *Academy of Management Review*, 15(4), 666-681.
23. Zimmerman, M. A. (1995). Psychological empowerment: issues and illustrations. *American Journal of Community Psychology*, 23(5), 581-599.

## TABLES

**Table I Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents**

Demographic factors	Classification	Number of Respondents	Percent
Age ( in years)	Below 30	47	63.5
	30 & Above	27	36.5
Gender	Male	25	33.8
	Female	49	66.2
Marital status	Married	36	48.6
	Single	38	51.4
Income (in rupees)	Below 15000	28	37.8
	15000-20000	13	17.6
	20000-25000	11	14.9
	Above 25000	22	29.7
Experience (in years)	Below 5	28	37.8
	5 - 10	24	32.4
	Above 10	22	29.7

**Table II Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of Research Variables in Different Age Groups**

Age (in years)		Psychological Empowerment	Subjective Well-being
Below 30	Mean	28.57	83.21
	N	47	47
	Std. Deviation	7.837	8.183
30 & above	Mean	24.00	75.85
	N	27	27
	Std. Deviation	8.901	9.020
Total	Mean	26.91	80.53
	N	74	74
	Std. Deviation	8.476	9.160

**Table III Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of Research Variables in Different Gender Groups.**

Gender		Psychological Empowerment	Subjective Well-being
Male	Mean	27.00	82.88
	N	25	25
	Std. Deviation	8.480	7.480
Female	Mean	26.86	79.33
	N	49	49
	Std. Deviation	8.561	9.760
Total	Mean	26.91	80.53
	N	74	74
	Std. Deviation	8.476	9.160

**Table IV Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of Research Variables in Different Marital Status Groups**

Marital status		Psychological Empowerment	Subjective Well-being
Married	Mean	24.78	77.39
	N	36	36
	Std. Deviation	8.469	8.868
Single	Mean	28.92	83.50
	N	38	38
	Std. Deviation	8.082	8.513
Total	Mean	26.91	80.53
	N	74	74
	Std. Deviation	8.476	9.160

**Table V Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of Research Variables in Different Experience Groups**

Experience (in years)		Psychological Empowerment	Subjective Well-being
Below 5	Mean	30.82	84.11
	N	28	28
	Std. Deviation	7.737	8.995
5-10	Mean	23.54	79.00
	N	24	24
	Std. Deviation	5.978	9.537
Above 10	Mean	25.59	77.64
	N	22	22
	Std. Deviation	9.922	7.712
Total	Mean	26.91	80.53
	N	74	74
	Std. Deviation	8.476	9.160

**Table VI Showing the Mean and Standard Deviation of Research Variables in Different Income Groups**

Monthly income (in rupees)		Psychological Empowerment	Subjective Well-being
Below 15000	Mean	26.11	77.32
	N	28	28
	Std. Deviation	8.482	9.381
15000-20000	Mean	25.62	81.15
	N	13	13
	Std. Deviation	8.837	12.409
20000-25000	Mean	29.73	82.27
	N	11	11
	Std. Deviation	8.557	6.405
Above 25000	Mean	27.27	83.36
	N	22	22
	Std. Deviation	8.458	6.856
Total	Mean	26.91	80.53
	N	74	74
	Std. Deviation	8.476	9.160

**Table VII Showing the Results of ANOVA Test of Research Variables in Relation to Age.**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Psychological Empowerment	Between Groups	358.848	1	358.848	5.289	.024
	Within Groups	4885.489	72	67.854		
	Total	5244.338	73			
Subjective Well-being	Between Groups	929.166	1	929.166	12.877	.001
	Within Groups	5195.280	72	72.157		
	Total	6124.446	73			

**Table VIII Showing the Results of Independent Sample t-test for Research Variables in Relation to Marital Status**

		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
									Lower	Upper
Psychological	Equal variances assumed	0.076	0.783	-2.324	72	0.023	-4.465	1.921	-8.296	-0.635
	Empowerment			Equal variances not assumed	-2.322	70.406	0.023	-4.465	1.923	-8.3
Subjective Wellbeing	Equal variances assumed	0.413	0.523	-3.287	72	0.002	-6.557	1.995	-10.534	-2.58
	Wellbeing			Equal variances not assumed	-3.284	70.155	0.002	-6.557	1.997	-10.54

**Table IX Showing the Results of ANOVA Test of Research Variables in Relation to Experience.**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Psychological Empowerment	Between Groups	738.954	2	369.477	5.823	.005
	Within Groups	4505.384	71	63.456		
	Total	5244.338	73			
Subjective Well-being	Between Groups	598.676	2	299.338	3.846	.026
	Within Groups	5525.769	71	77.828		
	Total	6124.446	73			

**Table X Showing the Results of ANOVA Test of Research Variables in Relation to Income.**

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Psychological Empowerment	Between Groups	130.037	3	43.346	.593	.621
	Within Groups	5114.301	70	73.061		
	Total	5244.338	73			
Subjective Well-being	Between Groups	503.374	3	167.791	2.090	.109
	Within Groups	5621.072	70	80.301		
	Total	6124.446	73			

**Table XI Showing the Correlation among the Research Variables**

		PESCORE	SWSCORE
Psychological Empowerment	Pearson Correlation	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)		
	N	74	
Subjective Well-being	Pearson Correlation	.319**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.006	
	N	74	74

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

**Table XII Showing Regression Analysis with Psychological Empowerment as Dependent Variable**

**Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.319 <sup>a</sup>	.172	.089	8.742

a. Predictors: (Constant), SWB

**ANOVA<sup>b</sup>**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	621.721	1	621.721	8.135	.006 <sup>a</sup>
	Residual	5502.725	72	76.427		
	Total	6124.446	73			

a. Predictors: (Constant), SWB

b. Dependent Variable: PSYEMP

**Coefficients<sup>a</sup>**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	71.263	3.403		20.940	.000
PESCORE	.344	.121	.319	2.852	.006

a. Dependent Variable: PSYEMP

**ABOUT AUTHORS**

**Dr.P.Paramanandam** is currently Associate Professor, at GRG School of Management Studies, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. He obtained his Ph.D (Psychology) from Bharathiar University, Coimbatore. He has two decades of teaching experience and has published more than thirty papers in journals. He specializes in Organisational Behaviour.



**Ms. K. Abinaya** is a Research Scholar in the Department of Business Management, PSGR Krishnammal College for Women, Coimbatore, Tamil Nadu. She has obtained her Bachelor of Computer Applications and Master of Business Administration degrees from Bharathiar University.