

# Research Article

# A Study of Job Satisfaction and Its Effect on the Performance of Employees Working in Private Sector Organizations, Peshawar

# Wasaf Inayat <sup>b</sup> and Muhammad Jahanzeb Khan<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>College of Home Economics, University of Peshawar, Peshawar, Pakistan <sup>2</sup>Professor of Psychology Department, University of Peshawar, Peshawar, Pakistan

Correspondence should be addressed to Wasaf Inayat; wasafinayat@uop.edu.pk

Received 13 April 2021; Accepted 19 July 2021; Published 5 August 2021

Academic Editor: Ehsan Namaziandost

Copyright © 2021 Wasaf Inayat and Muhammad Jahanzeb Khan. This is an open access article distributed under the Creative Commons Attribution License, which permits unrestricted use, distribution, and reproduction in any medium, provided the original work is properly cited.

The aim of the present research was to study the effect of job satisfaction on the performance of employees working in private sector organizations of Peshawar, Pakistan. For that purpose, one hundred and eighty employees (N=180) were selected as a sample from private organizations of Peshawar. An equal number of employees, i.e., (n=60), were selected through random sampling method from three types of organizations, viz., hospitals, banks, and universities. A Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form) developed by Weiss et al. (1967) and a self-constructed Performance Evaluation Form (PRF) were used as instruments for the study. Initially, the reliability statistics of both the instruments was calculated to know the significance of the scales. According to the findings of the study, the type of occupation has been shown significant correlation with job satisfaction. Similarly, the positive relationship of job satisfaction with performance as compared to dissatisfied employees, thus contributing significant role in the uplifting of their organizations. As there are unstable economic and political conditions of Peshawar, it is therefore necessary for every organization to make their employees motivated and satisfied towards high performance by adopting different techniques and methods.

# 1. Introduction

Job is one of the important elements of people's life. Their living style and their social lives depend on their jobs. Therefore, it is necessary for every organization to have satisfied workforce. Nowadays, private sector plays significant role in uplifting the economy of Pakistan. They are not only providing good services but are also providing job opportunities to a large group of people. Keeping in view the contribution of private sector in the society and the significant role of job satisfaction in order to improve the employees' performance, the aim of the present study is to know the job satisfaction of employees and its relationship with the performance level.

There is a general understanding that the overall productivity and success of an organization depends on the effective and efficient performance of employees [1, 2] and that better performance depends on the employees' job satisfaction [3–5]. For that purpose, researchers have identified various aspects of job satisfaction, its relative importance, and its relationship with performance and productivity.

Job satisfaction is the positive and negative feelings of an employee towards his job or it is the amount of happiness connected with the job [4]. Therefore, job satisfaction is one of the most widely spread researched topics in the field of organizational psychology [6]. According to Locke [7], job satisfaction is the positive and enjoyable feeling that results from the evaluation of one's job or job experience.

It is observed from the previous studies that when an employee is satisfied, he will perform at his level best to achieve the organizational objectives [8]. Employees who are highly satisfied are usually regular and punctual, more productive, more committed, and more satisfied in their lives [9]. For that purpose, to boost the level of job satisfaction in order to improve performance, employees should be given the opportunities of advancement, i.e., pay scales, participation of employee in policy making, and taking efforts to increase organizational commitment [10]. Similarly, safety and good relationships with supervisor and coworkers are the biggest satisfiers [11]; nature of the job, way of supervision, job security, recognition, and advancement are important factors for employees' organizational commitment [12]. Likewise, participation of employees in pension, profit-sharing plans [13], and job security [14] are positively correlated with job satisfaction, whereas many studies have recommended opportunity for professional development as the biggest determinant of job satisfaction [15].

Job satisfaction is one of the complex areas, consisting various kinds of feelings and conditions. As environment becomes competitive and complex day by day, the importance of job satisfaction and its relationship with employees' performance also increases. The aim of the present research is therefore to study the satisfaction and performance level of three major professions, i.e., doctors, bankers, and university teachers of Peshawar. Health, which is one of the essential industries of both public and private sectors, greatly contributes in the overall growth of nation [16]. As far as job satisfaction of doctors is concerned, Pakistan is facing various issues. Due to limited research in such industry, the present study is intended to explore the satisfaction and performance level of medical doctors working in private sector. The study conducted on doctors in Pakistan found that most of the doctors working in teaching hospitals were dissatisfied [17] due to factors, such as poor working conditions, unsatisfactory salary packages, work load, etc.

Similarly, the banking sector also plays an important role in financial and economic development of Pakistan. Few years ago, only public banks were serving the people of the country, but now with the wave of challenging, competitive market and globalization, private banks also entered in Pakistani market [18]. As banking industry is one of the most demanding industries, the employees working in banks are under constant pressure to meet the challenges of the dynamic environment. Job satisfaction is the only way to motivate them towards high level performance [18].

As far as university teachers are concerned, who are considered the backbone of country are also going through constant stress due to unclear political, economic, and educational policies. In Pakistan, teachers are facing a lot of issues which are not properly addressed due to which job dissatisfaction and poor performance result. Many studies confirmed that higher job satisfaction can only lead towards higher performance [19–21].

Hence, managers, human resource department, or employers must develop strategies that provide good working environment to increase job satisfaction which in turn leads towards highest level of performance and productivity.

*1.1. Significance of the Study.* The meaning of employment for people in Pakistan has changed over the past decades. Today employees not only need extrinsic satisfaction but also

demand psychological or intrinsic satisfaction from their jobs. This study will greatly help the readers to know the satisfaction and performance level of employees of private organizations, Peshawar, by using Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form) and Performance Evaluation Form (PEF). More, importantly, the present research was the first attempt to study highly educated employees from three different organizational setups of private sector, viz., hospitals, banks, and universities of Peshawar, Pakistan. The reason behind the selection of such type of professions was that, in cities like Peshawar, which is one of the underdeveloped and conservative cities, the abovementioned professions are considered the most prestigious and respected professions. The people belonging to these fields are highly educated, having good conduct and well-groomed personalities; therefore, the researcher has preferred to compare their job satisfaction in relation to performance. Furthermore, their educational background is somewhat same, therefore it is more preferable to select these professions rather than other office workers who have different educational setup. The findings of the present study are expected to show the positive correlation of job satisfaction with employees' performance.

- 1.2. Objectives of the Study
  - (1) To study the job satisfaction of employees in relation to three types of occupation
  - (2) To know the positive effect of job satisfaction on performance of employees working in private organizations of Peshawar

#### 1.3. Hypothesis of the Study

- (1) Satisfied employees tend to perform more efficiently at work place as compared to dissatisfied employees
- (2) Type of occupation affects the satisfaction level of employees

## 2. Method

2.1. Sample. Employees of private organizations, Peshawar, i.e., hospitals, banks, and universities, were selected as a sample for conducting the study. As mentioned before that these three professions are considered the cream of the society, their level of education, scale, salary packages, and other benefits are somewhat alike as compared to other office workers. The sample comprised 180 employees (N = 180) of private organizations of Peshawar which were selected on the basis of random sampling technique. Equal number of employees were randomly selected from each type of organization, n = 60. Both the genders were equally represented in the study, i.e., n = 30 males and n = 30 females. There are a number of private organizations serving in Peshawar, Pakistan, but the reason behind the selection of such a small sample was that, only registered private organizations were selected for the study. Along with that, employees having 1 to 10 years of job experience with

minimum age of 25 to 40 years and having education of sixteen years or more were included in the sample which also shrinks the size of the sample. Another reason of selecting such a small sample was that, Peshawar is comparatively a small city with extremely unstable economic and political environment; in such circumstances, it was very difficult to approach employees and their respective boss/employers of different organizations for collecting the data. As the sample was belonging to an educated class, the questionnaires were properly filled by them.

#### 2.2. Measuring Instruments

2.2.1. Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-Short Form). Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form) is a standardized scale and is especially designed to measure intrinsic and extrinsic job factors of employees [6, 22]. MSQ-short form was developed by Weiss, Dawis, England, and Lofquist in 1967. MSQ-short form has 20 items included, activity, responsibility, variety, social status, supervision of human relations, technical supervision, moral values, security, social service, authority, ability utilization, company policy, compensation, advancement, independence, creativity, working conditions, coworkers, recognition, and achievement. MSQ-short form is a 5-point Likert scale, responses of which range from 1 (very satisfied) to 5 (very dissatisfied). Reliability value of the scale is reported under results section.

2.2.2. Performance Evaluation Form. To measure the performance of employees, a self-constructed Performance Evaluation Form was developed by the researcher while considering standard scale construction procedure outlined in psychometric literature. The final draft consisted of factors including quality, knowledge of the job, productivity, adaptability and flexibility, initiative and resourcefulness, dependability, judgment and policy making, interpersonal relations, leadership abilities, and other performance factors. The items were rated with 5-point Likert scale. It has also consisted demographic data sheet which is as follows:

(1) Demographic Data Sheet. Demographic data comprise of information regarding age, gender, occupation, educational background, experience, family type, and marital status.

2.3. Procedure. Initially, formal permission was taken from the heads of the organizations to allow the researcher to access the employees of the stated organizations. Then, the subjects were randomly selected and consent was obtained.

After sample selection, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ-short form) was administered on the employees while Performance Evaluation Form (PRF) was administered on their respective heads/administrators of the organizations. Both of the scales were personally distributed among the employees and their immediate heads. While collecting the questionnaires from the respondents, the surety was given that the name of the employees as well as organization was treated confidential.

## 3. Results

Results along with description of tables are presented as follows:

In order to calculate the reliability statistics, Guttman split-half coefficient computed and found robust,  $r^2 = 0.903$ . The obtained mean value for the two forms  $[M_{part 1} = 4.01]$  and  $M_{part 2} = 3.98]$  showed negligible variance and high correlation coefficient of the two forms,  $r^2 = 8.45$ . Therefore, it is found that the scale is highly reliable.

Table 1 shows the reliability statistics of self-constructed Performance Evaluation Form developed by the researcher. According to the result, Guttman split-half coefficient computed and found robust,  $r^2 = 0.903$ . The mean value obtained for the two forms [ $M_{\text{part 1}} = 4.01$  and  $M_{\text{part 2}} = 3.98$ ] obtained negligible variance and high correlation coefficient of the two forms,  $r^2 = 8.45$ . Therefore, it is safely concluded that the scale is found highly reliable.

Table 2 presents the descriptive statistics and difference between the means on age and experience of satisfied and dissatisfied population. Although there exists a slight difference between the mean ages of the satisfied and dissatisfied individuals, yet this difference is not found statistically significant [t (178, 180)1.759, p > 0.05]. On the other hand, when the two groups were compared on experience, satisfied individuals were significantly more experienced than dissatisfied population [t (178, 180)2.786, p < 0.05].

Table 3 shows the satisfaction level of employees based on qualification. According to the findings, almost half of the satisfied respondents (47.8%) had completed approximately sixteen years of education (MA/MSc/MBBS) and were identified satisfied. However, only 27.2% of the respondents having sixteen years of education (MA/MSc/MBBS) were identified as dissatisfied. Similarly, 16.7% of the respondents who had completed more than sixteen years of education (MS/M.Phil/Ph.D) or any higher degree was satisfied from their jobs while 8.3% of the respondents who had completed more than sixteen years of education (MS/M.Phil/Ph.D or any higher degree) were dissatisfied from their jobs. Though the percentage of satisfied employees who have completed sixteen years of education was high as compared to those employees who had higher degree, yet this difference is not found significant as the chi-square value does not fall in the critical region at alpha 0.05. It is, therefore, concluded that qualification of employees has insignificant relationship with job satisfaction. So, the critical region value for chi-square is 0.129 with level of difference = 1. Therefore, the null hypothesis is accepted and the data shows insignificant results,  $X^2$  (1, n = 180)0.129, p > 0.01.

Table 4 shows the level of satisfaction based on occupation. According to the results, the percentage of satisfied respondents working in hospitals (doctors) was 33.3% which means that all of the respondents were satisfied in their jobs. However, 27.2% of the teachers working in universities were identified as satisfied in their jobs, whereas 6.1% of the university teachers were dissatisfied. Likewise, 22.8% of the respondents working in banks were found satisfied in their jobs, while 10.6% of the bankers were dissatisfied. Therefore, it is concluded that

|        |       |                  | 1110112 11 1 |                  |                           |                                |  |  |  |  |
|--------|-------|------------------|--------------|------------------|---------------------------|--------------------------------|--|--|--|--|
| Scales | Itomo | Scale statistics |              |                  | Reliability statistics    |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Scales | Items | Mean             | Variance     | Cronbach's alpha | Correlation between forms | Guttman split-half coefficient |  |  |  |  |
| Part 1 | 18    | 4.011            | 0.626        | 0.929            | 0.845                     | 0.903                          |  |  |  |  |
| Part 2 | 18    | 3.983            | 0.894        |                  |                           |                                |  |  |  |  |
| Part 2 | 36    | 3.997            | 0.562        |                  |                           |                                |  |  |  |  |

TABLE 1: Reliability statistics of Performance Evaluation Form.

TABLE 2: Descriptive statistics and difference between the mean on age and experience by job satisfaction.

|                        | Groups based on satisfaction | N   | Mean  | Std. deviation | Diff. between the means | <i>t</i> -value | Sig   |
|------------------------|------------------------------|-----|-------|----------------|-------------------------|-----------------|-------|
| A as of smalleres      | Satisfied                    | 116 | 31.51 | 6.317          | 1.571                   | 1.759           | 0.080 |
| Age of employee        | Dissatisfied                 | 64  | 29.94 | 4.486          |                         |                 |       |
| Employees' or enter as | Satisfied                    | 116 | 4.91  | 3.434          | 1.405                   | 2.786           | 0.006 |
| Employees' experience  | Dissatisfied                 | 64  | 3.50  | 2.851          |                         |                 |       |

TABLE 3: Level of job satisfaction in relation to qualification of the employees.

|                         |  | Groups base  | d on satisfaction   | T-4-1  |
|-------------------------|--|--|---|--|
|                         |  | Groups based on satisfactionSatisfiedDissatisfied864947.827.2301516.78.311664  | Dissatisfied  | Total  |
| MA /MC -/MDDC           | Count                                  | 86   | 49  | 135  |
| MA/MSC/MBBS             | % of total                             | 47.8   | 27.2  | 75.0   |
|                         | Count                                  | 30   | 15  | 45   |
| MS/M.Phil/higher degree | % of total                             | 16.7   | 8.3   | 25.0   |
|                         | Count                                  | 116  | 64  | 180  |
|                         | % of total                             | 64.4   | 35.6  | 100.0  |
|                         | MA/MSc/MBBS<br>MS/M.Phil/higher degree | MA/MSc/MBBS % of total<br>MS/M.Phil/higher degree % of total<br>Count<br>Count | Satisfied   MA/MSc/MBBS Count 86   % of total 47.8   MS/M.Phil/higher degree Count 30   % of total 16.7   Count 116 | SatisfiedDissatisfiedMA/MSc/MBBSCount8649% of total47.827.2MS/M.Phil/higher degreeCount3015% of total16.78.3Count116 |

 $X^2$  (1, n = 180)0.129, p > 0.01.

| TABLE 4: Level of job satisfaction in relation to occupation of the em | ployees. |
|--|----------|
|--|----------|

|                                  |         |            | Groups base | d on satisfaction | T-4-1 |
|----------------------------------|---------|------------|-------------|-------------------|-------|
|                                  |         |            | Satisfied   | Dissatisfied      | Total |
| Occupation of employees<br>Total | Doctor  | Count      | 60          | 0                 | 60    |
|                                  |         | % of total | 33.3        | 0.0               | 33.3  |
|                                  | Teacher | Count      | 49          | 11                | 60    |
| Occupation of employees          |         | % of total | 27.2        | 6.1               | 33.3  |
|                                  | D l     | Count      | 41          | 19                | 60    |
|                                  | Banker  | % of total | 22.8        | 10.6              | 33.3  |
| Total                            |         | Count      | 150         | 30                | 180   |
| Iotal                            |         | % of total | 83.3        | 16.7              | 100.0 |

 $X^2$  (2, n = 180)11.316, p < 0.01.

the percentage of doctors regarding job satisfaction is greater as compared to other two groups. Thus, the difference is found significant, as the chi-square value does not fall in the critical region at alpha 0.05. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore, the critical region value for chi-square is 21.840 with the level of difference = 2 which shows the significant results,  $X^2$  (2, n = 180)11.316, p < 0.01.

Table 5 reveals that 38.9% of the married people were found satisfied in their jobs while 21.7% of the married respondents were dissatisfied. Similarly, 25.6% of the unmarried people were identified as satisfied in their respective jobs while 13.9% were dissatisfied. Yet, this difference is not found significant, as the chi-square value does not fall in the critical region at alpha 0.05. The critical region value for chi-square is 0.006 with difference level = 1. Hence, the null

hypothesis is accepted. Therefore, it is concluded that marital status of the employee had no significant relationship with their marital status,  $X^2$  (1, n = 180)0.006, p > 0.05.

In the study, Table 6 identifies the percentage of satisfied and dissatisfied respondents belonging to different family systems. According to the findings, 26.7% of the respondents belonging to the nuclear families were considered satisfied in their jobs while 12.8% of the respondents were found dissatisfied. Likewise, 37.8% of the respondents belonging to the joint family system were satisfied in their respective jobs and 22.8% of the respondents were dissatisfied. Though more employees belonging to the joint family system were found satisfied in their jobs as compared to the employees who belong to the nuclear family system, yet this difference is not found significant. As the chi-square value does not fall in the critical region at alpha 0.05, therefore the critical

|                             | ,         |            |                         |                   |       |
|-----------------------------|-----------|------------|-------------------------|-------------------|-------|
|                             |           |            | Groups base             | d on satisfaction | T-+-1 |
|                             |           |            | Satisfied<br>70<br>38.9 | Dissatisfied      | Total |
|                             | Mauriad   | Count      | 70                      | 39                | 109   |
|                             | Married   | % of total | 38.9                    | 21.7              | 60.6  |
| Marital status of employees | · · · · 1 | Count      | 46                      | 25                | 71    |
|                             | Unmarried | % of total | 25.6                    | 13.9              | 39.4  |
| T-+-1                       |           | Count      | 116                     | 64                | 180   |
| Total                       |           | % of total | 64.4                    | 35.6              | 100.0 |
| 2                           |           |            |                         |                   |       |

TABLE 5: Level of job satisfaction in relation to marital status of the employees.

 $X^2$  (1, n = 180)0.006, p > 0.05.

TABLE 6: Level of job satisfaction in relation to family system of employees.

|                            |                |            | Groups base  | d on satisfaction | T-+-1 |
|----------------------------|----------------|------------|--|-------------------|-------|
|                            |                |            | Groups based on satisfactionSatisfiedDissatisfied482326.712.8684137.822.811664 | Total             |       |
|                            | Nuclear family | Count      | 48   | 23                | 71    |
|                            |                | % of total | 26.7   | 12.8              | 39.4  |
| Family system of employees | Joint family   | Count      | 68   | 41                | 109   |
|                            |                | % of total | 37.8   | 22.8              | 60.6  |
| T-+-1                      |                | Count      | 116  | 64                | 180   |
| Total                      |                | % of total | 64.4   | 35.6              | 100.0 |

 $X^2$  (1, n = 180)0.511, p > 0.05.

region value for chi-square is 0.511 with difference level = 1. Hence, the data show insignificant results,  $X^2$  (1, n = 180).511, p > 0.05 with the acceptance of null hypothesis.

According to Table 7, the percentage of male employees who were satisfied in their jobs was 31.1% while 18.9% of the male employees were dissatisfied in their jobs. Similarly, most of the female population (33.3%) were satisfied in their jobs while 16.7% of the female respondents were identified as dissatisfied. Although more women than men were found satisfied in their respective jobs, yet this difference is not found significant. As the chi-square value does not fall in the critical region at alpha 0.05, it is, therefore, concluded that both men and women were equally satisfied in their respective jobs. Hence, the null hypothesis is accepted. The critical region value for chi-square is 0.388 with difference level = 1 which shows that there is no significant relationship of employees' gender with level of satisfaction,  $X^2$  (1, n = 180) 0.388, p > 0.05.

Table 8 shows the descriptive statistics of the components of Performance Evaluation Form by level of job satisfaction. According to the result, box's test of equality of covariance matrices showed the observed covariance matrices of the dependent variables that are not found equal across groups, F (df<sub>1</sub> = 55, df<sub>2</sub> = 56737.944, n = 180) 1.362, p < 0.05. Therefore, when performance markers were accounted for and analyzed for groups classified on the level of job satisfaction, there a very partial standard deviation difference between each of the performance components within groups was found.

Mean score on quality of work was 7.61 with SD = 1.763 for satisfied respondents while for dissatisfied respondents, mean score was 6.23 with SD = 1.581. Similarly, satisfied employees scored highest on the knowledge of job with mean of 7.94 and SD of 1.500, mean score on knowledge of job for

TABLE 7: Level of job satisfaction in relation to gender of employees.

|           |        |               | Groups<br>satis | Total        |       |
|-----------|--------|---------------|-----------------|--------------|-------|
|           |        |               | Satisfied       | Dissatisfied |       |
|           | Male   | Count         | 56              | 34           | 90    |
| Gender of |        | % of<br>total | 31.1            | 18.9         | 50.0  |
| employees | Female | Count         | 60              | 30           | 90    |
| _         |        | % of<br>total | 33.3            | 16.7         | 50.0  |
|           |        | Count         | 116             | 64           | 180   |
| Total     |        | % of<br>total | 64.4            | 35.6         | 100.0 |

 $X^2$  (1, n = 180)0.388, p > 0.05.

dissatisfied was 6.25 with SD = 1.533. Similarly, mean score on productivity was 22.89 with SD = 3.736. While dissatisfied population obtained mean of 18.8 and SD of 4.668 on the basis of productivity. Likewise, adaptability variable of satisfied respondents was followed by the mean score of 11.34 with SD of 1.921. Mean score on adaptability for dissatisfied population was 8.59 with SD of 2.422. Mean score on dependability obtained by satisfied respondents was 11.68 with SD = 2.244. Mean score for dissatisfied employees was 8.89 with SD = 2.385. Likewise, satisfied employees scored highest on the quality of judgment with mean of 10.98 with score of SD, 2.246. While mean score of "judgment" for dissatisfied was identified as 9.06 and SD = 2.468. The score of mean on initiative and resourcefulness for satisfied respondents was 15.16 with SD = 2.955. While for dissatisfied respondents, the mean score was 11.97 with SD = 3.266. The observed mean score on leadership qualities for satisfied individuals was 18.79 with SD = 3.194. Similarly, the identified mean score for dissatisfied respondents was 15.00 with SD = 3.625. Similarly,

|                                | Groups based on satisfaction | Mean  | Std. deviation | Ν   |
|--------------------------------|------------------------------|-------|----------------|-----|
|                                | Satisfied                    | 7.61  | 1.763          | 116 |
| Quality of work                | Dissatisfied                 | 6.23  | 1.581          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 7.12  | 1.821          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 7.94  | 1.500          | 116 |
| Knowledge of job               | Dissatisfied                 | 6.25  | 1.533          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 7.34  | 1.711          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 22.89 | 3.736          | 116 |
| Productivity                   | Dissatisfied                 | 18.08 | 4.668          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 21.18 | 4.687          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 11.34 | 1.921          | 116 |
| Adaptability                   | Dissatisfied                 | 8.59  | 2.422          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 10.37 | 2.485          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 11.68 | 2.244          | 116 |
| Dependability                  | Dissatisfied                 | 8.89  | 2.385          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 10.69 | 2.652          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 10.98 | 2.246          | 116 |
| Judgment                       | Dissatisfied                 | 9.06  | 2.468          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 10.30 | 2.497          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 15.16 | 2.955          | 116 |
| Initiative and resourcefulness | Dissatisfied                 | 11.97 | 3.266          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 14.03 | 3.423          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 18.79 | 3.194          | 116 |
| Leadership qualities           | Dissatisfied                 | 15.00 | 3.625          | 64  |
|                                | Total                        | 17.44 | 3.807          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 11.48 | 2.024          | 116 |
| Interpersonal relations        | Dissatisfied                 | 9.33  | 2.101          | 64  |
| -                              | Total                        | 10.72 | 2.292          | 180 |
|                                | Satisfied                    | 19.49 | 3.128          | 116 |
| Other performance factors      | Dissatisfied                 | 15.27 | 4.044          | 64  |
| *                              | Total                        | 17.99 | 4.019          | 180 |

TABLE 8: Descriptive statistics on components of Performance Evaluation Form by level of job satisfaction for N = 180.

Box's test of equality of covariance matrices,  $F(df_1 = 55, df_2 = 56737.944, n = 180)$  1.362, p < 0.05.

satisfied employees scored highest on interpersonal relations with mean = 11.48, SD = 2.024, while mean score for dissatisfied individuals was identified as 9.33 with SD = 2.101, respectively. Mean score on other performance factors for satisfied respondents was 19.49 with SD = 3.128. Mean score of dissatisfied respondents was 15.27 with SD, 4.044 as shown by the study.

The *N* column in Table 9 represents descriptive statistics which shows unequal cell sizes. Therefore, Leven's test was applied to estimate equality of error variance of the dependent variable which remained constant across the cells, defined by level of job satisfaction. Since the significant values of the test (quality of work, performance) are less than 0.05, therefore the assumption of equal variances is violated. Hence, the small differences in SD observed in the descriptive statistics in the table were due to random variation.

Table 10 shows the *K* matrix which represents the mean difference on Performance Evaluation Form by level of job satisfaction. The mean differences obtained on all of the components of Performance Rating Scale (PRS) by level of job satisfaction of the two groups was found significant at alpha 0.01 and thus strongly confirmed the hypothesis that satisfied employees would perform efficiently at work place if were compared to nonsatisfied employees.

Table 11 shows the multivariate testing technique to determine the mean difference of Performance Evaluation Form by level of job satisfaction; the analyses of multivariate test yielded four alpha values to show the difference between the means. The value of Wilks' lambda was found robust, determining that an overall significant difference was observed on the level of performance of employees by the level of job satisfaction, *F* (10,180)9.526, p < 0.01; Wilk's lambda = 0.640.

# 4. Discussion

The present research was conducted to study the relationship of job satisfaction with performance of employees of private organizations, Peshawar. In past human resource, the essential asset of every organization is ignored which leads towards job dissatisfaction. As a result, the performance of employees as well as the overall productivity of an organization had been affected. Therefore, it is necessary that employer/administrator should know the ways or reasons of job satisfaction in order to motivate the employees towards the effective and efficient performance. Hence, limited studies have been conducted on satisfaction and its effect on the performance of employees in Pakistan, especially in

#### Education Research International

|                                | F     | df1 | df2 | Sig.  |
|--------------------------------|-------|-----|-----|-------|
| Quality of work                | 3.928 | 1   | 178 | 0.049 |
| Knowledge of job               | 0.018 | 1   | 178 | 0.893 |
| Productivity                   | 2.078 | 1   | 178 | 0.151 |
| Adaptability                   | 1.523 | 1   | 178 | 0.219 |
| Dependability                  | 0.007 | 1   | 178 | 0.935 |
| Judgment                       | 0.172 | 1   | 178 | 0.679 |
| Initiative and resourcefulness | 0.074 | 1   | 178 | 0.786 |
| Leadership qualities           | 1.290 | 1   | 178 | 0.258 |
| Interpersonal relations        | 0.036 | 1   | 178 | 0.849 |
| Performance                    | 3.770 | 1   | 178 | 0.054 |

TABLE 9: Levene's test of equality of error variances for Performance Evaluation Form by level of job satisfaction.

TABLE 10: K matrix representing difference between the means on Performance Evaluation Form by level of job satisfaction for N = 180.

| Groups based      | on satisfaction, simple c                     | ontrast        | Dependent variable |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |        |
|-------------------|---|----------------|--------------------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|--------|
|                   |   |                | QW                 | KJ     | Р      | Α      | D      | J      | IR     | LQ     | IPR    | PF     |
| Contrast estimate |   |                | -1.378             | -1.690 | -4.810 | -2.751 | -2.790 | -1.920 | -3.195 | -3.793 | -2.155 | -4.226 |
|                   | Hypothesized value                            |                | 0                  | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      | 0      |
|                   | Difference<br>(estimate – hypothesized)       |                | -1.378             | -1.690 | -4.810 | -2.751 | -2.790 | -1.920 | -3.195 | -3.793 | -2.155 | -4.226 |
| Dissatisfied vs.  | Std. error                                    | Std. error     |                    | 0.235  | 0.637  | 0.329  | 0.357  | 0.362  | 0.478  | 0.522  | 0.319  | .542   |
| satisfied         | Sig.  |                | 0.000              | 0.000  | 0.000  | 0.000  | 0.000  | 0.000  | 0.000  | 0.000  | 0.000  | .000   |
|                   | 95% confidence b<br>interval for difference U | Lower<br>bound | -1.900             | -2.154 | -6.067 | -3.400 | -3.496 | -2.635 | -4.138 | -4.823 | -2.785 | -5.295 |
|                   |   | Upper<br>bound | -0.855             | -1.225 | -3.553 | -2.102 | -2.085 | -1.205 | -2.252 | -2.763 | -1.524 | -3.156 |

Reference category = key; QW = quality of work; KJ = knowledge of job; P = productivity; A = adaptability; D = dependability; J = judgment; IR = initiative and resourcefulness; LQ = leadership qualities; IPR = interpersonal relations; PF = other performance factors.

TABLE 11: Multivariate test results for Performance Evaluation Form by level of job satisfaction.

|                    | Value | F     | Hypothesis df | Error df | Sig. | Partial squared | Eta |
|--------------------|-------|-------|---------------|----------|------|-----------------|-----|
| Pillai's trace     | 0.360 | 9.526 | 10.000        | 169.000  | 0.00 | 0.360           |     |
| Wilks' lambda      | 0.640 | 9.526 | 10.000        | 169.000  | 0.00 | 0.360           |     |
| Hoteling's trace   | 0.564 | 9.526 | 10.000        | 169.000  | 0.00 | 0.360           |     |
| Roy's largest root | 0.564 | 9.526 | 10.000        | 169.000  | 0.00 | 0.360           |     |

Peshawar, which is one of the prime issues of today's organizations working in a competitive environment. Therefore, the main objective of the present study is to examine employees' job satisfaction in relation to the performance of employees of private organizations, Peshawar.

Due to the increasing participation of private sector in the economy, the present research focused only on private organizations of Peshawar. For that reason, three types of organizations from private sector are selected, i.e., hospitals, banks, and universities, which is also one of the major aspects of the present research. The study consists of 180 professionals (teachers, bankers, and doctors), who were selected randomly from different private sector organizations of Peshawar.

Initially, the validity and reliability of the self-administered scale, i.e., Performance Evaluation Form (PEF), were assessed. The results have shown that Cronbach's alpha of PEF is 0.929 which shows the reliability of the scale. Another selected scale, Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQshort form), is a standardized scale which is used to measure the job satisfaction of employees.

The results of the present study identify that there is no significant correlation between the qualification as well as ages of employees with their job satisfaction. Unlike the study by Sukhani and Jain [23], which shows the positive relationship of qualification with job satisfaction, the present study shows no relationship of qualification with job satisfaction. Similarly, the study by Cark et al. [24] has shown U- shaped relationship between age and job satisfaction. On the other hand, when the two groups were compared on experience, it is observed that experienced employees were significantly more satisfied in their jobs. The observed percentage of satisfied professionals working in hospitals was high as compared to the bankers and teachers and hence shows the positive correlation of occupation with satisfaction of individuals. Thus, the present research greatly supports the findings of Yusoff et al. [25], who identified that satisfaction level can vary among different occupational groups. Like the study by Azim et al. [26], who observed no statistical significance between marital status and job satisfaction, present research also concluded that marital status of the employee had no significant relationship with their job satisfaction. The present study also shows the insignificant relation of family system with job satisfaction. One of the important data shows that in private organizations of Peshawar, there is no significant relationship of employees' gender with level of satisfaction. Hence, descriptive statistics of the current study reveals the components of Performance Evaluation Form or PRF by level of job satisfaction which shows differences in mean and standard deviation.

Researches, conducted on job satisfaction and motivation, reveal positive relationship of job satisfaction with performance of employees [27, 28]. The results of the present study also have confirmed that performance of satisfied employees is more effective as compared to dissatisfied employees and so do not compromise on work quality. Similarly, research study by Fatehi et al. [29] also shows positive correlation of work quality with job satisfaction of employees. Most of the satisfied professionals were comparatively more competent, having good quality knowledge of their tasks. Therefore, the present study agreed with the results of Loher et al. [30] who claimed that ability of doing variety of things for task completion or having task-related knowledge is closely related with the job satisfaction of individuals.

The present study also confirmed that satisfied respondents were comparatively more productive, spent their personal resources in a more effective and constructive manner than dissatisfied employees. Therefore, the present research agreed with the study of Latif et al. [31], who also reveal positive relationship of productivity and satisfaction.

Furthermore, results of the study identified that happy employees were self-motivated and creative, having the skills of managing stressful situation properly and performing things in variety of ways. The research findings of Camelia and Marius [32] confirmed the positive relationship of employee's ability to judge and handle stressful situation with job satisfaction. Moreover, satisfied employees have the ability to initiate new ways, ideas, and programs in order to achieve organizational goals successfully. The result findings of [33] are that lack of creativity and resourcefulness have negative effect on the efficiency of an employee.

Hence, the observed mean difference of the two groups obtained on all of the components of PEF (Performance Evaluation Form) by level of job satisfaction evaluated that the performance of satisfied respondents was more effective and efficient as compared to dissatisfied employees. Thus, we confirmed that performance decreases with the decrease in job satisfaction and increases with the increase in job satisfaction.

# 5. Conclusion

The study was conducted to find out the link between job satisfaction and performance of employees working in private organizations of Peshawar, Pakistan. While studying the relationship of job satisfaction with different variables such as qualification, gender, occupation, family system, and marital status, it is concluded that job satisfaction has no significant association with gender, qualification, and family system, as well as marital status. It is determined from the study that job satisfaction is significantly correlated with the occupation of employees. Hence, medical doctors are more satisfied in their jobs as compared to teachers and bankers. Furthermore, it is also concluded from the above results that the performance of satisfied employees is superior as compared to dissatisfied employees. Hence, the above results suggested that in order to improve the performance of employees such as quality of work, productivity, and leadership qualities, organizations should consider obvious factors of job satisfaction.

5.1. Implications. Based on the information provided by the present study, it may be helpful for the HR department to make strategies regarding job satisfaction and improved performance. Analysis of employees' job satisfaction and its relationship with performance through MSQ and PEF can be used by the employer/administrator in order to make various organizational decisions and policies while considering their internal weaknesses and external opportunities. The present study will not only measure the job satisfaction and performance but also provide broad vision to the boss/employer about the effective utilization of their human resource.

#### **Data Availability**

The data collected from three types of private organizations of Peshawar, Pakistan, are available within the article.

## **Conflicts of Interest**

The authors declare that they have no conflicts of interest.

#### References

- P. Green, "The perceived influence on organizational productivity: a perspective of a public entity," *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 339–347, 2016.
- [2] A. B. Shmailan, "The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: an explorative study," *Business Management and Economics*, vol. 4, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2016.
- [3] A. Hira and I. Waqas, "A study of job satisfaction and its impact on the performance in banking industry of Pakistan," *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, vol. 3, no. 19, pp. 174–179, 2012.
- [4] J. K. Singh and M. Jain, "A study of employees' job satisfaction and its impact on their performance," *Journal of Indian Research*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 105–111, 2013.
- [5] R. Shahu and S. V. Gole, "Effect of job stress and job satisfaction on performance: an empirical study," AIMS International Journal of Management, vol. 2, pp. 237–246, 2008.
- [6] P. E. Spector, Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Causes, and Consequences, SAGE, Thousand Oaks, CA, USA, 1997.
- [7] E. Locke, "The nature and causes of job satisfaction," in *Hand Book of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, M. D. Dunnette, Ed., pp. 1297–1349, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL, USA, 1976.
- [8] R. Jalagat, "Job Performance, job satisfaction and motivation: a critical review of their relationship," *International Journal of Management and Economics*, vol. 5, no. 6, pp. 36–43, 2016.

- [9] S. H. Lease, "Annual review, 1993-1997: work attitudes and outcomes," *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 154–183, 1998.
- [10] A. H. Feinstein and D. Vondrasek, "A study of relationship between job satisfaction and organizational commitment among restaurant employees," *Journal of Hospitality, Tourism and Leisure Science*, vol. 1, no. 4, pp. 1–20, 2001.
- [11] J. F. Volkwein and Y. Zhou, "Testing a model of administrative job satisfaction," *Research in Higher Education*, vol. 44, no. 2, pp. 149–171, 2003.
- [12] Mosadeghard, "A study of the relationship between job satisfaction, organizational commitment and turnover intention among hospital employees," *Health Services Management Research*, vol. 21, pp. 211–217, 2008.
- [13] K. A. Bender and J. S. Heywood, "Job satisfaction of the highly educated: the role of gender, academic tenure, and earnings," *Scottish Journal of Political Economy*, vol. 53, no. 2, pp. 253–279, 2006.
- [14] P. A. Stephen, "The job satisfaction of English academics and their intentions to quit academe," 2005, (Viewed at http://129. 3.20.41/eps/lab/papers/0512/0512005.pdf)).
- [15] A. F. Sirin, "Analysis of relationship between job satisfaction and attitude," *Journal of Theory and Practice in Education*, vol. 5, no. 1, pp. 85–104, 2009.
- [16] A. Siddiq, K. Takreem, and K. Iqbal, "Job satisfaction and organizational commitment: a case study of hospitals in Pakistan," *Peshawar Journal of Psychology and Behavioral Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 195–212, 2016.
- [17] A. A. Sohag, S. Memon, M. Rahman, and M. H. Rao, "A comparative study on factors causing job dissatisfaction among serving doctors at teaching hospitals of Hyderabad, Pakistan," *Pakistan Journal of Medical Sciences*, vol. 28, no. 4, pp. 710–715, 2012.
- [18] M. Batool and R. Ullah, "Impact of job satisfaction on organizational commitment in banking sector: study of commercial banks in district Peshawar," *International Review of Basic and Applied Sciences*, vol. 1, no. 2, pp. 12–22, 2013.
- [19] Q. B. Baloch, "Effects of job satisfaction on employees motivation & turn over intentions," *Journal of Managerial Sciences*, vol. 2, no. 1, pp. 223–234, 2009.
- [20] M. A. Salim and M. Imran, "Relationship between job satisfaction and job performance: a case study of universities of peshawar district (KPK) Pakistan," *European Journal of Business and Management*, vol. 6, no. 31, pp. 314–321, 2014.
- [21] A. Sattar and A. Nawaz, "Investigating the demographic impacts on the job satisfaction of district officers in the province of KPK, Pakistan," *International Research Journal of Management and Business Studies*, vol. 1, no. 3, pp. 68–75, 2011.
- [22] J. H. Buitendach and S. Rothmann, "The validation of the minnesota job satisfaction questionnaire in selected organizations in South Africa," SA Journal of Human Resource Management/SA, vol. 7, no. 1, pp. 1–8, 2009.
- [23] R. Sukhani and A. Jain, "Assessing the impact of education qualification on job satisfaction of employees," *Shodh Sarita*, vol. 7, no. 26, pp. 105–110, 2020.
- [24] A. Clark, A. Oswald, and P. Warr, "Is job satisfaction U-shaped in age?" *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, vol. 69, no. 1, pp. 57–81, 1996.
- [25] W. F. W. Yusoff, T. S. Kian, and M. T. M. Idris, "Herzberg's two factor theory on work motivation: does its work for today's environment," *Global Journal of Commerce and Management Perspective*, vol. 2, no. 5, pp. 18–21, 2013.

- [26] M. T. Azim, M. M. Haque, and R. A. Chowdhury, "Gender, marital status and job satisfaction: an empirical study," *International Review of Management and Business Research*, vol. 2, no. 2, pp. 488–495, 2013.
- [27] V. Indermun, "The job satisfaction- employee performance relationship: a theoretical perspective," *International Journal* of *Innovative Research in Management*, vol. 11, no. 2, pp. 1–8, 2013.
- [28] J. S. Skibba, Personality and Job Satisfaction. Menomonie. Applied Psychology, University of Wisconsin-Stout, Menomonie, Wisconsin, 2002.
- [29] B. Fatehi, I. Amini, A. Karimi, and B. Azizi, "Impact of quality of work life on job satisfaction," *Research Journal of Sport Sciences*, vol. 3, no. 1, pp. 15–22, 2015.
- [30] B. T. Loher, R. A. Noe, N. L. Moeller, and M. P. Fitzgerald, "A meta-analysis of the relation of job characteristics to job satisfaction," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, vol. 70, no. 2, pp. 280–289, 1985.
- [31] M. S. Latif, M. Ahmad, M. Qasim, M. Mushtaq, A. Ferdoos, and H. Naeeem, "Impact of employees' job satisfaction on organizational performance," *European Journal of Business* and Management, vol. 5, no. 5, pp. 166–169, 2013.
- [32] B. M. Camelia and B. Marius, "Stress management and work performance- a case study," *Journal of Engineering Studies and Research*, vol. 17, no. 3, pp. 11–17, 2011.
- [33] M. Nadim, M. S. Chaudhry, M. N. Kalyar, and T. Riaz, "Effects of motivational factors on teachers' job satisfaction: a study on public sector degree colleges of Punjab, Pakistan," *The Journal* of Commerce, vol. 4, no. 4, pp. 2220–6043, 2012.