

The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance

Sandra Rassam

Faculty of administrative science and economics

Ishik University

Abstract

In this study, the aim is to identify the impact of job satisfaction on employees' performance in two private universities. In addition, to examine the level of both job satisfaction and job performance in the two private universities. For this purpose, in the beginning, main job satisfaction theories and job satisfaction factors as well as job performance factors and job performance theories are considered in the literature. After a general literature review, job performance and Satisfaction questionnaire Survey is conducted to explain the main factors for the employees of these two organizations and to determine the satisfaction levels of these factors. This survey is covered to employees that are assistant experts and experts having BS, MS or PHD degrees in the private universities. A sample of 94 employees was collected, and they were handed out the question and they asked to fill them in. Later, SPSS software program is utilized for analysis of data considering demographic properties.

Key words: job satisfaction, job performance, employee, SPSS

1. Introduction and background of the study

In today's developed world most of the organizations pay more attention for the human capital in order to increase their productivity as the employee are the most significant part of organizational elements. It is likely to claim that job satisfaction is interpreted as a psychological situation of how an employee feels about his/her job, to put it differently, it is the individual's feelings and attitudes toward the differences of internal and external elements toward jobs and there work place where they perform their works in. In addition, (Rue & Byars, 1992) claims that satisfaction in job is a mental state of workers toward their job. Furthermore, job satisfaction means a mission that is clearly associated with the amount of how much an employee's personal needs are satisfied (Simatwa, 2011). Job satisfaction is an important manner to be studied as it is related to productivity. Therefore, companies with high quality of human capital are likely to be attaining revenues more than the companies that have lower level of human capital quality. In fact, Pay, promotion, work nature, supervision and relationship with colleagues are key element factors interrelated to the job satisfaction and it increases it (Michael, 2006). All the way through the past of developed/organizational notice, the correlation between job satisfaction and job performance was considered comprehensively (Bono et al., 2001). The feelings and attitude of the employee has a direct effect on the performance as well as its steadiness (Milliman et al., 2008). Therefore, when the employee are happy and satisfied with their job they are more likely

to accomplish the best of their qualifications in order to attain the goal of the organization.

In the current times, many of organizations are obviously aware that increasing the performance of the employees is one of the most important aspects to insure the organizational success. Accordingly, the workers with great level of performance get promotions more easily and they have better job chances than the ones with small performance level (Van Scotter et al., 2000). Performance of an employee is measured by how much and how proficient the output is (Mathis & Jackson, 2009). On the other hand, (Campbell et al., 1993) claim that performance is not determined by the result of behavior, but it is the behavior itself.

The purpose of this study is to examine and analyze the relationship between job satisfaction and performance of employees as well as to evaluate the impact of job satisfaction on the employees of two private universities performance.

2. Job satisfaction

The expression of job satisfaction is commonly used in the organizational and industrial life. It is the central attention point of the psychology of organizations and business. The best definition for job satisfaction is reference to (Locke, 1976) who describes it as “pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences”. The evaluation of job satisfaction consist of numerous components related to the job itself for example, wages, job circumstances, fellow workers, and the manager and, certainly the natural characteristic of the profession itself (Arnold et al., 1998).

Job satisfaction is about what an employee feel toward the job and how these feelings are linked to the outcomes. (Simatwa, 2011) Argue that, job satisfaction is a task that is clearly associated with how individual’s internal desires that are resulted from job performance are pleased. Job satisfaction is a very important issue to be taken seriously because productivity of employee depends on how satisfied they are. Accordingly, the satisfaction of employee has a significant impact on the successfulness of the organization, as they are the ones who lead it. Therefore, companies or organizations must pay further attention to the issue of job satisfaction specially the talented and creative worker because (McCrea, 2001) point out that the customer loyalty is decreasing and it is not as it was 30 years ago. This considerations lead us to realize that satisfied employees give their best and work harder to insure the organizations achieve their goal. In contrast, dissatisfied employees who do not feel comfortable with their working environment they perform less, so they leave the organization. In addition, job satisfaction is influenced by a various number of factors that will influence the outcome of the employee in result. Examples of these factors include, cultural factors, promotion, rewards/pay, working condition factors, relationship with co-workers, relationship with supervisors, working environment and disposition factors (Opkara, 2002).

3. Job performance

Performance of an employee is related to how much the output is, the timing of the output, the value of the output, involvement to the job and efficiency and effectiveness of the finished work (Mathis & Jackson, 2009). In other words, performance means when an individual is assigned to accomplish a task, the task is performed professionally (Campbell et al., 1993). Therefore, performance of an employee is judged and evaluated by; how well the output is, not by how they went to accomplish the work assigned (Ilgen & Schneider, 1991; Motowidlo et al., 1997). Subsequently, the employee's performance is measured by the anticipated value and amount of job completed.

In contrast, it represents the attitudes and activities that are conducted by workers which takes a part in achieving in organization's objectives (Rotundo & Sackett, 2002). In other words, the performance concept refers to the set of employee's behavior not what outcome they attain. Moreover, (Jex, 2002) define job performance as "all the behaviors employees engage in while at work". However, (Motowidlo et al., 1997) propose that performance is behaviors with evaluative characteristics rather than being merely a behavior. In addition, they draw the attention to this evaluative in determining the performance field. Furthermore, the definition of job performance extends from generic to specific and from qualitative to quantitative dimensions. (Milkovich & Wigdor, 1991) Say that, there are three methods to define job performance dimension: "as a function of outcomes, as a function of behavior and as a function of personal traits".

4. Impact of job satisfaction on performance

Skilled, trained and qualified employees are very much desirable in the labor market. In other word, attaining high level performance and productive employee is a prior objective for organizations. In fact, performance of organization workers indicates the output and productivity it (Currall et al., 2005). It was evidenced that, job satisfaction will result in superior performance (Sousa-Poza & Sousa-Poza, 2000).

According to (Nanda & Browne, 1977), it is essential to point out the employees' performance at the employing stage. Also, they concluded that job satisfaction has an impact the productivity as well. In fact, high performers demand for compensations from employers, so it is the employers' duty to preserve them. In fact, the level of satisfaction amongst the employee differs from one to another also from a position to another. This means, different level of performance depending on the position and the employee hi/herself. When job satisfaction level is low, it will affect employee's commitment negatively. Subsequently, it will affect the organization's goal achievement and performance (Meyer, 1999). Organization that pay well, make available promotion, create good working environment as well as other factors, will lead to high level of performance.

5. Research methods

A quantitative survey method was adopted to collect data. The research design consisted of a questionnaire to evaluate employees' job satisfaction performance.

5.1 research sample

Employees of two private universities were chosen as a population for this study. 100 questionnaires were handed out for the sample, but 94 were returned. They were 58 out of 60 respondents from university 1, and 36 out of 40 respondents from university 2.

5.2 Instrument

The questionnaire utilized is consisting of three parts. First, the demographic questions. Second, Job Satisfaction Survey, JSS part has been developed by (Spector, 1985), and the JSS is used freely for research purposes. Third, the job performance questions that have been developed by (Koopmans et al., 2014). The JSS is comprised of 36 items. Whereas, the performance questionnaire is a total of 13 items, 5 of them are task performance items and 8 are contextual performance items.

5.3 Reliability

The reliability coefficient, Cronbach's Alpha ranged from .640 for (job satisfaction) to .868 for (job performance) showed appropriate. Overall, the Alpha Coefficient was .70.

6. Profile of the respondents

The results of the demographic questions shows, the highest percentage of the respondents were aged between 26-35 years, Male, Master holders, Married, Job experience was between 1-10 years and Lectures.

7. Results

the overall mean of the job satisfaction in the two universities is (3.840027778) indicates that there is high level of job satisfaction. The overall mean of the job performance in the two universities is (3.727538462) indicates that there is high level of job performance. The correlation between job satisfaction and job performance is a positive weak relationship as the pearson $R=.225$ and it is statistically significant at .029. Moreover, job performance is 32.203 when job satisfaction is zero. For each 1 unit increase in job satisfaction (the independent variable), job performance (the dependent variable) will increase by .0131 units. Thus, we can conclude that, job satisfaction has an impact on job performance.

8. Conclusion

In this study, the aim is to identify the impact of job satisfaction on employees' performance in two private universities. In addition, to examine the level of both job satisfaction and job performance in the two private universities. According (Simatwa, 2011), job satisfaction is a task that is clearly associated with how individual's internal desires that are resulted from job performance are pleased. Whilst, job Performance of an employee is related to how much the output is, the timing of the output, the value of the output, involvement to the job and efficiency and effectiveness of the finished work (Mathis & Jackson, 2009).

For this purpose, in the beginning, main job satisfaction theories and job satisfaction factors as well as job performance factors and job performance theories are considered in the literature. After a general literature review, job performance and Satisfaction questionnaire Survey is conducted to explain the main factors for the employees of these two organizations and to determine the satisfaction levels of these factors. This survey is covered to employees that are assistant experts and experts having BS, MS or PHD degrees in the private universities. A sample of 94 employees was collected, and they were handed out the question and they asked to fill them in. Later, SPSS software program is utilized for analysis of data considering demographic properties. Therefore according the results of from the analysis of SPSS software program I will sum up this study by answering the research questions:

Question 1: What is the level of employee's job satisfaction in the two universities?

From the results we determine the level of job satisfaction in these two universities. In item number 7, the majority of respondents tend to be more satisfied in terms of liking the people they work with as we see a mean of (5.046). Additionally, in item number 12 people tend to be also more satisfied with their supervisors, as they DO NOT feel that their supervisors are unfair in treating with them as we see that the mean in (2.606). Accordingly, the overall mean the job satisfaction in the two universities is (3.840027778). Respondents seems to be satisfied in terms of liking the people they work with as 49 people agreed very much with this statement. Also, employee 35 respondents disagreed very much that with statement that their supervisors are unfair them.

Question 2: What is the level of employee's performance in the two universities?

In accordance to the results, we can recognize that average mean as calculated it is (3.727538462). We can observe a high level of performance for example, 36 respondents agreed with the statement "I took on extra responsibilities." And 24 respondents agreed very much with it. In addition, 29 respondents agreed that they manage to plan to do the work on time and 36 respondents agreed very much with it.

Question 3: What is the relationship between Job satisfaction and performance of the employee?

From the results of the correlation, it was found that the relationship between the two variables, job satisfaction and job performance is these two universities was a positive weak relationship as the Pearson correlation is 0.225*. Additionally, the correlation is statistically significant at 0.29.

Question 4: How the job satisfaction does have an impact on employee's performance?

According to the results, the regression analysis shows that job satisfaction has an impact on job performance of employees of these two universities. The Pearson R which is the correlation R is equal to .225. Moreover, job performance is 32.203 when job satisfaction is zero. For each 1 unit increase in job satisfaction (the independent variable), job performance (the dependent variable) will increase by .0131 units. Thus, we can conclude that, job satisfaction has an impact on job performance.

Reference

- Arnold, J., Robertson, I. T., & Cooper, C. L. (1998). *Work Psychology: Understanding Human Behavior in Work Place* (3rd ed.). London: Pearson Education: Financial Times/Prentice Hall.
- Bono, J. E., Judge, T. A., Thoresen, C. J., & Patton, G. A. (2001). The Job Satisfaction-Job Performance Relationship: A qualitative and Quantitative Review . *Psychological Bulletin* , 376-407.
- Campbell, J. P., McCloy, R. A., Oppler, S. H., & Sager, C. E. (1993). A theory of performance.
- Currall, S. C., Towler, A. J., Judge, T. A., & Kohn, L. (2005). Pay satisfaction and organizational outcomes. *Personnel psychology*, 58, 613-640.
- Jex, S. M. (2002). *Organizational Psychology: A Scientist-Practitioner Approach*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Locke, E. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297-1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Mathis, R. L., & Jackson, J. H. (2009). *Human Resource Management*. OH,USA: Cengage Learning.
- McCrea, B. (2001). When Good Employees Retire. *Industrial Distribution*, 90(3), 63-66.
- Meyer, M. (1999). *Managing human resources development – An outcomes-based approach*. Durban: Butterworth Publishers (Pty) Ltd.
- Michael, A. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management*. London: Kogan page, ltd.
- Milkovich, G. T., & Wigdor, A. K. (1991). *Pay for performance: Evaluating performance appraisal and merit pay*. Washington, D.C.: National Academy Press.
- Motowidlo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human Performance*, 10, 71-83.
- Nanda, R., & Browne, J. (1977). Hours of work, job satisfaction and productivity. *Public Productivity Rev.*, 2(3), 46-56.
- Opkara, J. O. (2002). The Impact Of Salary Differential On Managerial Job Satisfaction: A Study of The Gender Gap And Its Implications For Management Education And Practice In A Developing Economy . *The Journal of Business in Developing Nations* , 65-92.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P. R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(1), 66-80.

Rue, I. W., & Byars, L. L. (1992). *Management : skills and application* . Irwin, Homewood, IL: Homewood, IL : Irwin, c1992.

Simatwa, E. (2011). Job Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction among Teachers in Kenya. *Kenya Journal of Education Planning Economics and Management.*, 114-123.

Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A. A. (2000). Well-being at work: a cross-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. *The journal of socio-economics*, 29(6), 517-538.

Spector, P. E. (1985). Measurement of Human Service Staff Satisfaction: Development of the job Satisfaction Survey. *American journal of community psychology*, 13(6), 693-713.

Tables:

Table 1 - Correlations

		JobPerformance	JobSatisfaction
JobPerformance	Pearson Correlation	1	.225*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.029
	N	94	94
JobSatisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.225*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.029	
	N	94	94

*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 1 - Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.225 ^a	.051	.040	8.464

a. Predictors: (Constant), JobSatisfaction

Table 2 – ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	352.630	1	352.630	4.923	.029 ^b
	Residual	6590.274	92	71.633		
	Total	6942.904	93			

a. Dependent Variable: JobPerformance

b. Predictors: (Constant), JobSatisfaction

Table 3 – Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	32.203	8.083		3.984	.000
	JobSatisfaction	.131	.059	.225	2.219	.029

a. Dependent Variable: JobPerformance

Table 5 - Descriptive Analysis of Job Satisfaction

No.	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	3.691	1.5999
2	There is really too little chance for promotion on my job.	4.011	1.4554
3	My supervisor is quite competent in doing his/her job.	4.489	1.3500
4	I am not satisfied with the benefits I receive.	3.745	1.5515
5	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition for it that I should receive.	3.872	1.6542
6	Many of our rules and procedures make doing a good job difficult.	4.128	1.5397
7	I like the people I work with.	5.064	1.2076
8	I sometimes feel my job is meaningless.	2.723	1.6422
9	Communications seem good within this organization.	4.085	1.5771
10	Raises are too few and far between.	3.989	1.4847
11	Those who do well on the job stand a fair chance of being promoted.	3.585	1.7002
12	My supervisor is unfair to me.	2.606	1.6079
13	The benefits we receive are as good as most other organizations offer.	3.596	1.5050
14	I do not feel that the work I do is appreciated.	3.436	1.6301
15	My efforts to do a good job are seldom blocked by red tape.	3.245	1.5076
16	I find I have to work harder at my job because of the incompetence of people I work with.	3.787	1.5989
17	I like doing the things I do at work.	4.489	1.4274
18	The goals of this organization are not clear to me.	3.223	1.7112
19	I feel unappreciated by the organization when I think about what they pay me.	3.617	1.5733
20	People get ahead as fast here as they do in other places.	3.351	1.3890
21	My supervisor shows too little interest in the feelings of subordinates.	3.213	1.5989
22	The benefit package we have is equitable.	3.734	1.3692
23	There are few rewards for those who work here.	4.138	1.5630
24	I have too much to do at work.	4.479	1.4497
25	I enjoy my coworkers.	4.521	1.5150
26	I often feel that I do not know what is going on with the organization.	3.745	1.7409
27	I feel a sense of pride in doing my job.	4.404	1.4834
28	I feel satisfied with my chances for salary increases.	3.755	1.5976
29	There are benefits we do not have which we should have.	4.351	1.4643
30	I like my supervisor.	4.606	1.4607
31	I have too much paperwork.	4.191	1.5881
32	I don't feel my efforts are rewarded the way they should be.	3.851	1.5723
33	I am satisfied with my chances for promotion.	3.532	1.6178
34	There is too much bickering and fighting at work.	3.053	1.6222
35	My job is enjoyable.	4.330	1.4839
36	Work assignments are not fully explained.	3.606	1.6079

Table 6 - Analysis of Job Performance Descriptive

No.	Item	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	I took on extra responsibilities.	3.681	1.1379
2	I started new tasks myself, when my old ones were finished.	3.511	1.2247
3	I took on challenging work tasks, when available.	3.745	1.1162
4	I worked at keeping my job knowledge up-to-date.	3.989	1.0826
5	I worked at keeping my job skills up-to-date.	3.819	1.2090
6	I came up with creative solutions to new problems.	3.713	1.1132
7	I kept looking for new challenges in my job.	3.628	1.1167
8	I actively participated in work meetings.	3.713	1.1228
9	I managed to plan my work so that it was done on time.	3.904	1.1366
10	My planning was optimal.	3.457	1.1701
11	I kept in mind the results that I had to achieve in my work.	3.798	1.0834
12	I was able to separate main issues from side issues at work.	3.745	1.1541
13	I was able to perform my work well with minimal time and effort.	3.755	1.0644