

Beyond Wages: A Multidimensional Assessment of Job Satisfaction Among Migrant Workers in Industrial Coimbatore

Dr V.T Dhanaraj¹

Associate Professor & Head, Department of Commerce
Rathinam College of Arts and Science (Autonomous) Coimbatore¹

Ms Thilagavathi M², Natheera N³,

B. Com, UG Student, Department of Commerce
Rathinam College of Arts and Science (Autonomous) Coimbatore²

Abstract – Job satisfaction among migrant workers is shaped by more than the amount of wages received. Employment security, fair treatment, recognition, work–life balance, workload, occupational safety, relationships at work and access to employer support may combine to influence workers’ evaluations of their jobs. This paper develops a higher-level analytical interpretation of the supplied chapter, “Job Satisfaction among Migrant Workers in Coimbatore District,” and organises its reported evidence into a multidimensional framework. The source chapter reports questionnaire-based evidence from 286 migrant workers, a Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin value of 0.870, a significant Bartlett’s test ($\chi^2 = 2550.781$, $df = 190$, $p < .001$), and five extracted components accounting for 68.076% of the variance. Its rotated component matrix indicates that recognition and appreciation, relationships with colleagues, work–life balance and job motivation load on the first component, while fair treatment, job stability, facilities, training and growth opportunities load on the second. The paper synthesises these source-reported results, identifies methodological and policy implications, and proposes a more rigorous future research design. No new respondent-level data or statistical tests are claimed. The analysis highlights the need to interpret factor loadings alongside measurement validity, sampling limitations and migrant workers’ distinct employment conditions.

Keywords – migrant workers; job satisfaction; industrial employment; work–life balance; job security; workplace inclusion; occupational safety; Coimbatore.

I. INTRODUCTION

Migrant workers contribute to industrial production and urban services, but their employment experiences can be shaped by insecure contracts, unequal bargaining power, language differences, limited access to benefits and uncertainty about workplace rights. In an industrial district such as Coimbatore, satisfaction with employment has implications for worker well-being, productivity, labour-market stability and the sustainability of local industry. These implications should not, however, be reduced to a simple assumption that higher pay alone produces a satisfactory employment experience. The supplied chapter, “Job Satisfaction among Migrant Workers in Coimbatore District,” examines several dimensions of workers’ experience, including wages, job stability, workplace environment, employer support and inclusion. It reports a sample of 286 workers and uses percentage analysis and factor analysis to organise responses. The reported component solution explains 68.076% of total variance, suggesting that the questionnaire responses were summarised by several related dimensions rather than one undifferentiated measure. This paper builds an analytical contribution from those reported findings. It reframes the five-component solution as a connected set of worker-experience domains and discusses what the pattern may mean for employers, labour intermediaries and policymakers. The paper does not present the source chapter’s data as newly collected data; all numerical findings are explicitly attributed to the supplied source.

II. RESEARCH PROBLEM AND GAP

Workplace satisfaction is often discussed through separate policy levers—wages, safety, training or inclusion. The source chapter indicates that these conditions may cluster in workers’ perceptions: recognition appears alongside work–life balance and colleague relationships; job stability appears with fair treatment and development opportunities; and workload appears alongside employer support and pay-related indicators. This pattern raises a practical question: how can employers design worker-support measures that address the combined conditions under which satisfaction is experienced?

A second issue is methodological. Factor analysis can identify patterns of covariance among questionnaire items, but it does not by itself establish causal effects, rank the policy importance of all variables, or demonstrate that the same factor structure applies to every migrant-worker population. A stronger research design should therefore test the structure in a new sample, assess reliability and validity, and consider variation across industry, gender, language, contract type and length of residence.

The present paper addresses these issues through source-grounded synthesis and a future-research framework. Its contribution is analytical and methodological, not a claim of new fieldwork.

Objectives

- To synthesise the source-reported demographic and factor-analysis evidence on migrant workers' job satisfaction in Coimbatore District.
- To interpret the five-component solution in relation to recognition, employment conditions, employer support, job security and worker well-being.
- To identify methodological cautions that should guide the interpretation and replication of the source findings.
- To propose a testable framework and analysis plan for future research on migrant workers' job satisfaction.

III. LITERATURE AND THEORETICAL LENS

The source chapter draws on research concerning migration, precarious work, employment rights, social integration and workplace satisfaction. The theoretical framing can be strengthened by distinguishing job conditions that reduce dissatisfaction from features that support motivation and fulfilment. Herzberg's two-factor approach separates hygiene-related conditions, such as pay, safety and working conditions, from motivators such as recognition and achievement (Herzberg, 1966). This distinction is useful as an interpretive lens, although the source chapter's factor solution should not be treated as a direct empirical test of Herzberg's theory.

Maslow's hierarchy of needs offers another broad perspective: material security and safety can be particularly salient where workers face uncertain housing, employment or access to benefits (Maslow, 1943). In migrant-worker settings, these needs may interact with social belonging, respectful treatment and opportunities for skill development. These theories help frame the discussion, but they do not replace local evidence or justify causal conclusions from a cross-sectional survey.

The source chapter's discussion also stresses occupational safety, employment stability, workplace inclusion, communication and employer support. For policy relevance, these dimensions should be considered together. For methodological rigour, each should be operationalised clearly and tested with a suitable measurement instrument before claims are made about its independent effect.

V. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The proposed framework treats overall job satisfaction as a broad outcome associated with five interrelated domains suggested by the source chapter's rotated component matrix: (1) recognition, relationships and work-life balance; (2) fair treatment, job stability and development; (3) workload, employer support, wages and management communication; (4) work environment and job security; and (5) work pressure, health and safety, and inclusion. The labels below are concise analytical summaries of the source's reported items, not new factor estimates.

Analytical domain	Source-reported item pattern	Potential practical meaning
Recognition and social experience	Recognition/appreciation (.820); colleague relationships (.766); work-life balance (.706); job motivation (.663); schedule flexibility (.519)	Workers may evaluate satisfaction through dignity, social relations, motivation and the compatibility of work with life outside work.
Fairness, security and development	Fair treatment (.733); job stability (.704); facilities (.685); training/skill development (.620); commuting/work location (.618); growth opportunities (.540)	Fair processes, predictable employment and accessible development opportunities may be experienced as a connected employment package.
Workload and employer support	Workload (.764); employer support (.710); wages/benefits (.584); communication with management (.555)	Work demands may be assessed alongside the support and resources available to manage them.
Work environment and security	Work environment (.822); job security (.752)	Physical and organisational conditions may reinforce perceptions of stability and safety.
Pressure, safety and inclusion	Work pressure (.721); health and safety measures (.688); workplace inclusion (.626)	Satisfaction analysis should include both demands and protections, including whether workers feel included.

Interpretive caution: the source chapter reports a rotated component matrix with loadings. The labels and explanations in this table are analytical summaries; they should not be interpreted as evidence that one variable causes another.

Research Questions and Propositions

- RQ1: How do recognition, work–life balance and workplace relationships feature in the reported structure of job satisfaction?
- RQ2: How are fair treatment, job stability and development opportunities represented in the source-reported component solution?
- RQ3: What additional evidence is needed to establish whether the reported factor structure is reliable across sectors and migrant-worker groups?
- P1: In a future independent sample, supportive employment conditions are expected to be positively associated with job satisfaction.
- P2: Work pressure is expected to be negatively associated with job satisfaction when adequate support and protections are absent.
- P3: Perceived fairness, job security and inclusion are expected to be positively associated with job satisfaction, subject to empirical testing.

These are research questions and propositions for further testing. The source chapter does not provide enough information to claim that these propositions have been tested as independent causal relationships.

VI. METHODOLOGY OF THE SOURCE STUDY AND PROPOSED EXTENSION

1. Source-study design

According to the supplied chapter, the source study used primary data from 286 migrant workers in Coimbatore District. It describes structured questionnaires, interviews, focus-group discussions and field observations, while the statistical results presented in the chapter include simple percentage analysis and factor analysis. The chapter states that convenience sampling was used. The sample profile and factor-analysis statistics below are reproduced as source-reported values, not independently re-estimated.

2. Analytical approach in this paper

This paper uses a secondary analytical approach: it reorganises and interprets the descriptive statistics and rotated component matrix reported in the supplied chapter. The source chapter does not provide the respondent-level dataset, complete questionnaire, full item-level correlation matrix or raw analysis output. Consequently, it is not possible to independently reproduce the factor analysis, calculate confidence intervals, test group differences or estimate regression models from the chapter alone.

3. Recommended design for a future empirical study

A replication should use a clearly defined sampling frame across sectors such as manufacturing, construction, textiles and services, with a documented recruitment procedure. Where access allows, stratified sampling by sector, employment type and gender would improve coverage compared with convenience sampling. The questionnaire should be pilot-tested in workers' preferred languages and should distinguish job satisfaction from related concepts such as organisational commitment, intention to quit and general well-being.

Report the sampling frame, recruitment locations, response rate, eligibility criteria and treatment of incomplete questionnaires.

Use established items where appropriate, translate and back-translate carefully, and report expert review and pilot results.

Assess internal consistency and construct validity before creating composite scores.

For factor analysis, report KMO, Bartlett's test, extraction method, rotation, item communalities, factor loadings, cross-loadings and factor-retention rationale.

Use confirmatory factor analysis in an independent sample if the purpose is to validate the proposed structure.

Use regression or structural equation modelling only when the data, sample size, assumptions and measurement quality justify the method; report effect sizes and confidence intervals.

Protect workers from retaliation: obtain informed consent, avoid collecting unnecessary identifiers, and ensure that employers cannot link critical responses to individual workers.

VII. RESULTS AND ANALYSIS

The following tables report the figures visible in the supplied chapter, particularly pages 9–10. Because the raw dataset is not available, the tables are descriptive and interpretive; no new statistical tests have been performed.

Table 1. Profile of the source-study respondents (N = 286)

Characteristic	Source-reported distribution	Interpretation
Age	Up to 21 years: 26.60%; 21–35 years: 34.30%; 35–50 years: 32.50%; above 50 years: 6.60%	The sample is concentrated in the 21–50 age groups; results may reflect the experience of working-age adults more than older workers.
Gender	Male: 47.60%; female: 52.40%	The reported sample is relatively

		balanced by gender, but balance alone does not establish representativeness.
Education	Illiterate: 24.10%; SSLC: 75.90%	The reported education profile suggests that accessible communication and worker-friendly research instruments are important.
Marital status	Married: 67.50%; unmarried: 32.50%	Family responsibilities may be relevant to work-life balance, but the chapter does not report a tested association.
Family status	Head of family: 38.50%; family member: 61.50%	Many respondents are reported as family members rather than household heads; this should be interpreted cautiously without further context.
Monthly family income	Up to ₹15,000: 23.40%; ₹15,001–₹25,000: 45.10%; above ₹25,000: 31.50%	The largest reported group falls in the middle income band; these are family-income categories, not necessarily individual wages.
Occupation	Other occupations: 57.30%; plumbers: 21.70%; painters: 12.60%; masons: 8.40%	The broad 'other' category limits detailed sector-level comparison; future studies should disaggregate occupations more precisely.
Language	Hindi: 52.40%; other languages: 47.60%	The language profile supports the need for multilingual information and consent procedures.

Interpretation: The sample profile shows variation in age, gender, family income, occupation and language. However, convenience sampling and the broad occupational category limit generalisation. The income variable is described as family income in the source table and should not be re-labelled as individual earnings. Future analysis should examine whether satisfaction differs by sector, language,

gender and contract conditions, but those comparisons cannot be calculated from the published summary alone.

Table 2. Factorability and Overall Factor-Analysis Results

Statistic	Reported result	Interpretation
Sample size	286 respondents	A moderate sample for exploratory analysis, but adequacy also depends on item quality, communalities and model complexity.
Kaiser–Meyer–Olkin measure	0.870	The source reports a value generally considered supportive of factor analysis.
Bartlett's test of sphericity	$\chi^2 = 2550.781$; df = 190; p reported as .000	The result should be written as $p < .001$, not $p = .000$; it indicates that the correlation matrix differs from an identity matrix.
Number of components	5	The source retains five components; the chapter excerpt does not establish whether parallel analysis or a scree plot was used to choose this number.
Cumulative variance explained	68.076%	The five-component solution summarises a substantial share of observed item variance in this sample; explained variance is not equivalent to causal importance.

Interpretation: The reported KMO value of 0.870 and Bartlett's test ($\chi^2 = 2550.781$, df = 190, $p < .001$) support the source authors' decision to explore a factor structure. Nonetheless, factorability statistics do not prove that the retained components are stable or valid.

A stronger report should state the extraction method, rotation, retention criteria and any item exclusions. The cumulative 68.076% figure describes variance accounted for by the reported solution, not the percentage of job satisfaction explained causally.

Table 3. Rotated component matrix: leading loadings reported in the source

Component	Reported items and loadings	Source-reported variance	Interpretation
1	Recognition/appreciation .820; colleague relationships .766; work-life balance .706; job motivation .663; schedule flexibility .519	39.546 %	The first component is dominated by recognition and social/psychological experience, with work-life balance also prominent.
2	Fair treatment .733; job stability .704; availability of facilities .685; training/skill development .620; commuting/work location .618; growth opportunities .540	9.360 %	The pattern combines fair treatment, stability and access to resources or development.
3	Workload .764; employer support .710; wages/benefits .584; communication with management .555	8.532 %	The component associates job demands with employer support and material/communication conditions.
4	Work environment .822; job security .752	5.618 %	Work environment and job security form a distinct reported component.
5	Work pressure .721; health and safety measures .688; workplace inclusion .626	5.020 %	The component groups pressure with safety protections and inclusion.

Interpretation: Recognition/appreciation has the largest loading shown in Component 1 (.820), while work environment (.822) is the largest loading shown in Component 4. Workload (.764) is prominent in Component 3, and work pressure (.721) appears in Component 5. These values describe the strength of item association with a component under the reported solution. They should not be compared as if they were regression coefficients, and a high loading does not by itself establish that the item has the largest causal effect on satisfaction.

Table 4. Integrated interpretation and managerial response

Evidence pattern	Analytical implication	Practical response to evaluate
Recognition, colleague relationships and work-life balance load on Component 1	Job satisfaction may involve dignity and the quality of everyday work experience, not only economic reward.	Test transparent recognition practices, respectful supervision, predictable schedules and channels for worker feedback.
Fair treatment, stability and development items load on Component 2	Workers may evaluate fairness and future prospects together with the immediate employment relationship.	Review written employment terms, consistent rules, skills training and clear pathways for progression.
Workload, employer support, wages and management communication load on Component 3	Demands may be experienced differently depending on whether resources, pay and communication are adequate.	Assess workload and pay together; create accessible supervisor communication and grievance procedures.
Work environment and job security load on Component 4	Physical conditions and continuity of employment may be distinct but related concerns.	Audit workplace conditions and communicate employment terms accurately; do not promise security that cannot be guaranteed.
Work pressure, safety and inclusion load on Component 5	Worker well-being requires attention to both job demands and protections against harm or exclusion.	Implement safety procedures, incident reporting, non-discrimination measures and worker consultation.

Interpretation: The table translates the reported component patterns into possible management responses. These are recommendations to evaluate, not interventions proven effective by the source data. Employers should monitor outcomes after implementation and involve migrant workers in designing changes.

Table 5. Methodological appraisal and reporting priorities

Issue	What the source excerpt reports	Priority for a stronger study
Sampling	Convenience sampling	Define the sampling frame, recruitment sites and response rate; consider stratification by sector and employment type.
Measurement instrument	Questionnaire and qualitative methods are described; complete item wording is not provided in the excerpt	Publish the questionnaire, response scale, language versions and evidence of content validity.
Factor retention	Five components and rotated loadings are presented	Report extraction and rotation methods, eigenvalues, scree plot or parallel analysis, communalities and cross-loadings.
Reliability and validity	Reliability coefficients and confirmatory validity evidence are not visible in the provided results excerpt	Report scale reliability and convergent/discriminant validity where relevant.
Inference	Descriptive and factor-analysis results are reported	Avoid causal claims; use new data and suitable models to test associations and group differences.
Generalisability	A district-level convenience sample with broad occupation categories	Replicate across sectors, locations, languages and employment arrangements; describe limitations explicitly.

Interpretation: The source provides useful exploratory evidence but the available chapter excerpt does not include all details required for a full reproducibility assessment. A higher-standard submission should not fill these gaps by assumption. It should state them transparently and address them in the next study.

VIII. DISCUSSION

The reported findings support a multidimensional reading of migrant-worker job satisfaction. Recognition and appreciation have a strong loading in the first component, alongside relationships with colleagues and work-life balance. This suggests that social and psychological aspects of work should be considered alongside material conditions. The finding is consistent with a broad

motivation perspective, but the factor analysis itself does not establish a theoretical mechanism.

The second component combines fair treatment, job stability, facilities, training and growth opportunities. This grouping has practical relevance because formal employment conditions and prospects for development can shape workers' expectations of the employer. However, the source's cross-sectional structure cannot establish whether development opportunities increase satisfaction, whether satisfied workers evaluate opportunities more favourably, or whether both reflect another factor.

The third component links workload with employer support, wages and management communication. A reasonable interpretation is that work demands should be assessed together with the resources and responsiveness available to workers. Components four and five also show that job environment, job security, work pressure, safety and inclusion are important parts of the reported structure. Taken together, the results argue against a narrow wage-only response to job satisfaction.

The strongest methodological caution is that factor analysis identifies patterns in a particular sample and instrument. Convenience sampling limits population-level inference, and a reported component solution should be validated before being treated as a stable model for all migrant workers in Coimbatore. Qualitative interviews can add context to the statistical structure, especially around language barriers, contract terms, wage practices, recruitment intermediaries and access to social protection.

Implications for Employers and Policymakers

- Use multilingual employment information covering wages, working hours, leave, deductions, safety rules, complaint routes and contract terms.
- Make recognition and feedback practices transparent so that appreciation is not restricted to a favoured group or dependent on informal relationships.
- Review working hours, workload, rest breaks and schedule predictability in consultation with workers.
- Provide task-relevant training and explain eligibility for advancement without implying that all jobs offer identical promotion paths.
- Strengthen occupational health and safety, incident reporting and access to protective equipment.
- Offer a grievance mechanism that is confidential, accessible, timely and protected against retaliation.
- Coordinate with relevant public agencies and worker-support organisations on legal awareness and access to applicable social-protection provisions.
- Evaluate interventions using repeat surveys and operational indicators rather than assuming that a policy announcement improves satisfaction.

Limitations and Future Research

This paper is a source-grounded analytical extension of a published chapter, not an independent empirical survey. It

relies on summary tables and component loadings presented in the supplied document. The underlying dataset and full questionnaire were not available for reanalysis. The source's convenience sampling, broad occupational categories and the limited measurement details visible in the chapter excerpt restrict generalisability and independent reproducibility.

Future research should collect a new, well-documented sample across Coimbatore's industrial and service sectors. It should test whether the five-component structure replicates and whether factor scores differ across language groups, gender, occupation, employment arrangement, tenure and income. Where feasible, a mixed-method design should connect quantitative patterns with confidential worker interviews. Longitudinal evidence would be useful for determining whether changes in workplace practices precede changes in satisfaction, rather than merely co-occurring with them.

IX. CONCLUSION

The supplied study presents job satisfaction among migrant workers in Coimbatore as a multidimensional experience involving recognition, relationships, work-life balance, fairness, job stability, development, workload, employer support, work environment, safety and inclusion. Its reported five-component solution explains 68.076% of variance, with the first component accounting for 39.546%. These findings provide a useful exploratory map of workers' perceptions, but they should not be treated as causal estimates or automatically generalised to all migrant workers.

A higher-standard research agenda should preserve the value of this evidence while strengthening sampling, measurement transparency, reproducibility and worker protection. The practical implication is to assess pay and job security together with the everyday conditions through which workers experience dignity, support and safety. The next step is independent replication using a clearly documented instrument and sample.

REFERENCES

1. Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. World Publishing Company.
2. Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396. <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0054346>
3. International Labour Organization. (2021). The migrant worker-related policy and rights context should be cited using the exact ILO report consulted by the researcher; the supplied chapter lists ILO (2021) but does not provide enough bibliographic detail in the excerpt to verify a unique title.
4. Jaya Prakash, N., & Velmurugan, R. (2026). Job satisfaction among migrant workers in Coimbatore District. In M. Raja, S. Subrahmanyam, R. Raja Subramanian, & J. Karthikeyan (Eds.), *Adaptive*

Technologies for Sustainable Growth (chapter 98, pp. 612–?). CRC Press.

<https://doi.org/10.1201/9781003739937-98>