

## The Relationship between Job Satisfaction and Performance of Administrative Staff in South West Nigeria Universities

J.B. Ayodele\* and E.O. Olorunsola\*\*

*\*Department of Educational Foundations and Management, \*\*Institute of Education, University of Ado-Ekiti, Nigeria*

*\*\*E-mail: funmiladebayo@yahoo.com*

**KEYWORDS** Job Satisfaction. Job Performance. Motivation. Components. Variables

**ABSTRACT** The study investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and performance as well as the relationship between the components of job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff in South West Nigeria Universities. The research employed a descriptive research of the survey type. The sample consisted of 400 respondents selected from four Universities based on stratified random sampling technique. Two hypotheses were generated and tested at 0.05 level of significance, using Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient and Correlation Matrix. The result of the analysis showed that there was a very high and significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. It was also revealed that there were significant relationships between the components of job satisfaction and job performance. Based on these findings, recommendations were made that since a relationship has been established between job satisfaction and performance, the University management should take cognisance of those variables that promotes job satisfaction, which invariably leads to performance of workers and include such in the University policy. Also the components of job satisfaction should be improved upon so that maximum performance will be got from the workers for the achievement of educational goals.

### INTRODUCTION

The University is made up of two strong bodies known as the academics and the administrators. The satisfaction or dissatisfaction of these two great bodies may enhance or mar the achievement of the organizational goals. Research has shown a lot of work done on the academic staff in the Universities while not much work or researches were conducted on the administrative staff in the Universities until over the last three decades when many researchers and studies have attempted to identify the variables and sources of administrative staff satisfaction and what could lead to effective job performance and achievement of educational goals (Dinham and Scott 2000, 2002). According to the majority of these researchers, workers satisfaction is dependent on the levels of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation enjoyed by the workers.

Riggio (2000) perceived job satisfaction as the amount of overall positive feelings that individuals have toward their jobs while Rose (2001) introduced a bi-dimensional concept consisting of intrinsic and extrinsic satisfaction dimensions. Intrinsic sources of satisfaction depend on individual characteristics of the person such as ability to use initiative, relations with supervisors, or the work

that the person actually performs. These are symbolic or qualitative facets of the job. Extrinsic source of satisfaction is situational and depends on the environment such as salary or pay, promotion, working condition and job security. These are financial and other material rewards or advantage of a job. While McShane and Glinow (2005) saw performance as goal oriented behaviours under the individual's control that support organizational objectives, Mullins (2005) opined that job performance depends upon the perceived expectation regarding efforts expended and achieving the desired outcome.

On the contrary, administrators viewed job dissatisfaction as principally contributed to by work overload, hostile environment, poor pay and university characteristics (Spear et al. 2000). Rasmussen (2002) reiterated that job satisfaction results in increased performance. He further concluded that both job satisfaction and job performance are too closely linked to one another, and that they affect each other. Brewer (2005) is of the opinion that the relationship between job satisfaction and performance is somewhat controversial as job satisfaction is more prominent and important in the public sector and is more linked to organizational performance.

Studies have shown that positive mood including job satisfaction is linked with altruistic

motives and pro-social behaviour such as organization service motivation, organizational citizenship behaviour (Brewer 2001; Organ 1977). Luthans (2005) asserted that there is no strong linkage between satisfaction and performance while Koys (2001) affirmed that a recent research evidence gave a support showing that satisfaction influences performance rather than vice versa. Olorunsola (2010) opined that there was a significant relationship between the components of job satisfaction and job performance. She further submitted that these components are necessary ingredients that motivate workers to do effective work.

### Purpose of the Study

The purpose of the study was to examine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff in South West Nigeria Universities. The study also examined the relationship between the components of job satisfaction and job performance of the workers.

### Research Questions

Two research questions were raised to guide the study:

1. Is there any relationship between job satisfaction and performance of the administrative staff?
2. Is there any relationship between the components of job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff?

### Research Hypotheses

These hypotheses were tested at 0.05 level of significance

- I. There is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff in South West Nigeria.
- II. There is no significant relationship between the components of job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff.

## RESEARCH METHOD

A descriptive research of the survey type was used for the study. The sample consisted of 400 respondents selected from four universities based on stratified random sampling technique. The strata recognized two state and two federal universities.

### Research Instrument

Two types of questionnaire were constructed to elicit data on the topic. Job Satisfaction Questionnaire (JSQ) contained 42 items while Job Performance Questionnaire (JPQ) contained 58 items.

Copies of the questionnaire were given to experts in Test and Measurement, and Management to ensure face and content validity as well as suitability for the target sample. The reliability of the instruments was ensured through a test-re-test method while the responses were subjected to satisfied data using Cronbach Alpha to test the internal consistency. A reliability coefficient of 0.920 and 0.916 were obtained respectively.

The two sets of questionnaire were administered by the researcher personally with the aid of some research assistants who helped the respondents in the proper filling of the questionnaire.

## RESULTS

*(a) Hypothesis 1:* There is no significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff.

Data were analysed using Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient and the summary presented in the Table 1.

**Table 1: Correlation between job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff**

Variable	N	r-cal	r-table
Job satisfaction	301	0.74	0.195
Job performance	301		

$P < 0.05$  (Significant result)

The table shows that r-calculated was 0.74 while its corresponding table value at 0.05 level of significance was 0.195. Since the r-calculated is greater than the r-table, it implies that there is a significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff. Hence, the null hypothesis was rejected. Therefore, there is a very high and significant relationship between job satisfaction and job performance.

*(b) Hypothesis 2:* There is no significant relationship between the components of job satisfaction and job performance of administrative staff

Data were analysed using Correlation Matrix as presented in the Table 2.

**Table 2: Correlation between job satisfaction components and job performance of administrative staff**

<i>Components of job satisfaction</i>	<i>Job performance</i>	<i>R</i>	<i>Remark</i>	<i>Table</i>
University and administrative policies	0.293	0.293	Significant	
Supervision	0.318	0.318	Significant	
Salary	0.499	0.499	Significant	
Interpersonal relations	0.395	0.395	Significant	0.196
Working condition	0.529	0.529	Significant	
Work itself	0.338	0.338	Significant	
Achievement	0.270	0.270	Significant	
Recognition	0.567	0.567	Significant	
Advancement	0.254	0.254	Significant	

P<0.05 (Significant result)

The table shows the correlation between job satisfaction components and job performance as follows. Data were analysed showing that r-calculated for administrative policies and job performance was very low (0.293) but still very significant. There was a very low but significant relationship between supervision and job performance as r-calculated was 0.318, there was a significant relationship between salary and job performance and the r-calculated was 0.499, there was a moderate but significant relationship between interpersonal relations and performance, the r-calculated was 0.395, a moderate relationship was also established between working condition and job performance as the r-calculated was 0.529, there was a poor but significant relationship between work itself and job performance the r-calculated was 0.338, poor but significant relationship existed between achievement and job performance, the r-calculated was 0.270, there was a very poor but significant relationship between recognition and performance, the r-calculated was 0.567, a poor but significant relationship was established between advancement and job performance, the r-calculated was 0.254.

In summary, the data showed a significant relationship existed between components of job satisfaction and job performance.

## DISCUSSION

The study showed that there was a significant relationship between job satisfaction and performance of administrative staff in South West Nigeria Universities as the coefficient of correlation was high. This signifies high relationship between the

two variables. A deduction could be made from the hypothesis tested that job satisfaction would enhance performance when workers are dissatisfied or where workers perceive or judge their workplace hostile and unfavourable, there would be poor performance. The study contradicts the findings of Luthans (2005) who asserted that there was no strong linkage between job satisfaction and job performance, while the study was in line with Rasmussen (2002) who opined that job satisfaction and job performance are too closely linked, that they affect each other.

Judge et al. (2001) found a much stronger relationship between job satisfaction and performance.

This study also revealed that there was a significant relationship between the components of job satisfaction and performance. As r-calculated were positive and significant at 0.05 level of significance as depicted in Table 2. It could be deduced that the administrative policies of the university are favourable to the workers such policies include staff welfare scheme, opportunity for growth and advancement on the job, conducive working conditions, security and good plans for retirement benefits. This finding was in line with Denga (2005) who asserted that workers will derive contentment from organization policy with financial and other instrumental sources that can meet their basic luxury needs. The study further discovered a positive relationship between Supervision and Performance. This implies that there was harmony and cordial relationship between the supervisor and the subordinate. This finding agreed with Kaldenberg and Regrut (1999) who reiterated that all fair treatment received from the supervisor could stimulate workers to great job performance.

Another finding from the study showed that Salary and Performance are significantly related. Sharon (2000) also supported this view that money serves as a reward for people's labour, and money is more important to workers than anything else their organization could offer them.

Working condition positively had a significant relationship with performance. This finding was in line with Charles (2007) who itemized working conditions for employees as those conveniences enjoyed by workers in their work place which have stimulating effects on their performances such as clean work environment void of dangerous and unhealthy materials, well ventilated offices, toilets and rest rooms etc. Lawler and Porter (1967) took an opposing stand that a high satisfaction in a workplace could lead to a low turnover and

absenteeism because the satisfied individual may selectively be motivated to work hard.

Work itself was significantly related to job performance. This was in line with Judge et al. (2001), Shalley et al. (2000) who opined that challenging and interesting work would enable workers to put in their expertise and technical skills.

There was a positive correlation between achievement and performance. This finding is in accord with Bob (2002) who opined that recognition of work well done as well as commendation and praises for accomplishment will go a long way to motivate workers into higher performance.

A positive correlation was established between advancement and performance. Ibukun (2004) corroborated that promotion to a higher level in an organization involves changes in supervision, job content and even pay. Jobs that are at higher levels of an organization are likely to provide workers with more opportunity for better service. The table showed that the components of job satisfaction and performance are well connected. This means that if a change occurs in the components of job satisfaction, it will definitely affect the performance of workers.

### CONCLUSION

From the results of this study, a positive relationship was established between job satisfaction and performance of workers. Also, all the variables of job satisfaction are connected with job performance. Hence, it could be concluded that satisfaction of workers had positive effect on their job performance.

### RECOMMENDATIONS

Based on the results of this paper, the University management should maintain the relationship between the components of job satisfaction and performance. Since the components of job satisfaction acted as motivation for the performance of workers, these components should be sustained to maintain the working tempo of the workers or even be improved for higher performance.

### REFERENCES

- Bob R 2002. *Motivational and Leadership Styles*. South Carolina: Robert L. Wedd, Goose Creek.
- Brewer GA 2001. *A Portrait of Public Servant: Empirical Evidence from Comparisons with Other Citizens*. Ph.D. Dissertation, Unpublished. Georgia: The University of Georgia.
- Brewer GA 2005. In the eye of storm, frontline supervisors and federal agency performance. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 15(4): 505 – 527.
- Charles GA 2007. Analysis of Management and Employee Job Satisfaction. From <<http://www.coe.unt/allen.related-document/uamt>> (Retrieval August 24, 2010).
- Denga DI 2005. *Managerial Psychology in Business and Educational Administration: A Book for Students and Teachers of Business Management and Educational Administration, Executives, School and Business Administrators*. Jos Nigeria: Clearlines Publications Ltd.
- Dinham S, Scott C 2000. Moving into the third, outer domain of teacher satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 38(4): 379–396.
- Dinham S, Scott C 2002. The International Teacher 2000 Project: An International Study of Teacher and School Executives Satisfaction, Motivation and Health in Australia, England, USA, Malta and New Zealand. *Paper presented at the Challenging Future Conference, University of New England, Armidale, Australia*. January, 2002.
- Ibukun WO 2004. *Educational Management Theory and Practice*. Lagos: Green Line Publishers.
- Judge TA, Thoresen CJ, Bono JE, Patton GK 2001. Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(2): 88-102.
- Judge TA, Thoresen CJ, Bono JE, Patton GK 2001. The job satisfaction – job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3): 376 – 407.
- Kaldenberg DO, Regrut BA 1999. *Do Satisfied Patients Depend on Satisfied Employees? In the Satisfaction Report Newsletter*, 15(7): 9-12. South Bend, Ind: Press Ganey Associates, Inc.
- Koys DJ 2001. The effect of employee satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour and turnover on organisational effectiveness: A unit-level, longitudinal study. *Personnel Psychology*, 54: 101 – 113.
- Lawler E, Pater LE 1967. *The Effect of Performance and Job Satisfaction*. New York: Industrial Relations.
- Luthans F 2005. *Organisational Behaviour*. 7<sup>th</sup> Edition. NY Mc-Graw-Hill.
- Olorunsola EO 2010. *Job Satisfaction and Performance of Administrative Staff in South West Nigeria Universities*. Ph.D. Dissertation. University of Ado Ekiti, Ekiti State, Nigeria.
- Organ DW 1977. A reappraisal and reinterpretation of the satisfaction-causes-performance hypothesis. *Academy of Management*, 14: 547 – 557.
- Rasmussen D 2002. *Reading Hobermas*. Oxford: Blackwell.
- Shalley CE, Cailson LL, Blun TC 2000. Matching creativity requirements and the work environments: Effects on satisfaction and intentions to leave. *Academy of Management Journal*, 42: 215 - 223
- Sharon L 2000. Is America's work ethics changing? *HR Magazine*, p. 224.
- Spear M, Gould K, Lee B 2000. Who would be a teacher? *A Review of Factors Motivating and Demotivating Prospective and Practising Teachers*. Slough: NFER.