

The Nature Of Job Satisfaction And The Effect Of Marital Status On Job Satisfaction In Organisations In Ghana

Francis Duah¹, Kyeremeh Kofi², Owusu Frank³

Abstract

The paper investigates the satisfaction level of employees in organisations concerning job satisfaction variables. The sample size for the study consists of 139 employees of public and private institutions in Ghana. The results indicate a high level of satisfaction of the variables examined, with the three most satisfying variables been respect for workers, devotion to work, and learning from colleagues respectively. Also, marital status differences exist in job satisfaction of the respondent's satisfaction of the variables. The research influences the future performance of an organisation by paying attention to job satisfaction variables within the institutions to positively influence the motivation of workers to improve productivity. Future studies should examine the effect of demographic factors on job satisfaction variables and also the effect of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction variables. Also, the association between employee's motivation and job satisfaction variables as well as job performance and job satisfaction variables should be examined. Causal studies in these areas are worth embarking on.

Keywords: Salary, Respect for workers, devotion to work, Clear Authority, Participation in Decision making.

Author Affiliation: ¹Department of Management, Box 206, Registry, Sunyani Technical University.

²Department of Management, Box 206, Registry, Sunyani Technical University.

³Department of Management, Box 206, Registry, Sunyani Technical University.

Corresponding Author: Francis Duah, Department of Management, Box 206, Registry, Sunyani Technical University.

Email: franduah12@gmail.com

How to cite this article: Francis Duah. The Impact Of Human Resource Management (Hrm) Practices On Employee Satisfaction Level And Performance 79-88. Retrieved from <https://jms.eleyon.com/index.php/jms/article/view/546>

Received: 19 November 2021 **Revised:** 17 December 2021 **Accepted:** 10 January 2022

1. INTRODUCTION

Job satisfaction is explained differently by different employees and different authors.^[1,2] According^[2], employees' perceptions of attainment and accomplishment constitutes job satisfaction. To some employees, doing the type of work they like, and doing it well and also been appropriately rewarded after doing the work makes them satisfy.^[3]

Researches^[4,5,6] indicate that worker productivity, and motivation are related job satisfaction of employees and this has generated continuous interest in research in the area of job satisfaction in both public and private organisations in various economies by researchers in different fields such as Psychology, management and in economics. Job satisfaction of employees continues to be an empirical issue that needs to be evaluated consistently since organisations constantly employ workers who assess their satisfaction level differently using different variables in the organisation. The current study is very important in the face of the current COVID-19 pandemic, to examine the nature and the level of employee's satisfaction [8,9,10] Empirical studies during the current pandemic have produced mixed findings concerning job satisfaction. Some studies indicate higher satisfaction, whereas some also show lower satisfaction level.^[11,12,13] There is the need to ensure workers are satisfied in this time of pandemic to get them motivated to increase output. The study assesses the level of job satisfaction among the employees of both public and private organisations. Specifically, the study examines the nature of the satisfaction level and the ranks of the satisfaction

variables. The assumption underlying the research is that the job satisfaction level of the employees is high and are differently ranked by the respondents. The research did not consider the role of demographic variables in job satisfaction, but only the nature and the ranks of the satisfaction variables. Issues of causal analysis are not dealt with in the current study. Some respondents might be economical with some of their responses to the questions asked.

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1. The Nature and Ranks of job Satisfaction Factors

The empirical research findings on the nature of job satisfaction in organisations are found in various works in the literature.^[14-22] For example,^[14] studied the variables of job satisfaction and reported that the variables are evaluation, progress toward goals, goals, future, working conditions, physical environment, job information and status, emotional involvement in the job, liking for the job, interest in the job, finances, advances, security, association with the employer, relation with co-workers, and mental and physical exertion.

Smith^[23] examined job satisfaction variables and reported that job satisfaction variables in their study are the work itself, promotional opportunities, pay, co-workers, and supervision.

Spector^[24] explored the job satisfaction variables in a study and revealed that job satisfaction variables

in the study are communication, nature of work, co-workers, operating procedures, contingent rewards, benefits, supervision, promotional opportunities, and pay.

Churchill, Ford, and Walker^[25] assessed the job satisfaction variables in a study and indicated that job satisfaction variables in their study are customers, promotion/advancement, company salaries and benefits, top management and the company, sales training and home office support, supervision, fellow workers, and the job itself.

Steijn^[26] assessed job satisfaction and human resource management and indicated that resources (paper, files, printers, and computers) and work conditions (light, temperature, workspace, noise level) explained job satisfaction in their study. Workers are dissatisfied with their job when their expectations concerning these are not met.

In a Chinese study^[27] analysed the job satisfaction level of workers and to rank the variables of job satisfaction. Their research findings indicate that the most ranked variables were salary, welfare's, job itself, promotion, relationships with co-workers and supervision.

Alina and Simona^[28] examined the factors that influence the job satisfaction of workers. Their research findings indicate that the variables that influence job satisfaction in their study are school policy, colleagues, promotion, working conditions, promotion Criteria, and wage. Murad, Zayed, and Mukul^[29] analysed job satisfaction variables in a study and identified eight variables of job satisfaction as pay, job status and security, recognition and promotion, management policy, working condition, job nature, supervisor behaviour, decision process and communication, and pay. They reported that pay and working conditions are the two most influencing job satisfaction variables. Azumah, Mohammed and Tetteh examined a job satisfaction level of university workers and reported that respondents were satisfied with the element of job satisfaction investigated. They indicated that respondents were more satisfied with salary, workload, and relationships with co-workers.

In job satisfaction study,^[30] investigated a job satisfaction influencers and reported that job satisfaction variables in order of ranks are personal growth, salary, welfare, work itself, interpersonal relation, leader behaviour, and job competence. Sheikh^[19] examined the job satisfaction among employees and reported that the satisfaction level of the employees in their study was higher when there is no epidemic and lower when there is an epidemic. Various variables were identified to influence job satisfaction such as association with colleagues, work recognition and anti-epidemic work fulfilment, salaries, workload working environment and work conditions.

In the study by Bagie'nska and Anna^[20] on job satisfaction, they indicated that job satisfaction is related to positive employee association and that trust plays an important role in this relationship. They recommended a mechanism that will shape a supportive work environment in the face of a pandemic. Petcu^[31] investigated the nature of job satisfaction among the workers and reported that job satisfaction is associated with factors such as organisational climate, job autonomy, skills level, emotions, relationship with colleagues and supervisors.

2.2 Marital Status and Job Satisfaction

Marital status as a demographic variable is found empirically to influence the overall satisfaction of employees

and the different job satisfaction factors. However, empirical works are little according to the literature.^[32] The findings are reported in the works of various researchers^[32,38] though the findings are also mixed. According to Azim^[32], the literature reports that married employees are more satisfied than unmarried employees, which might result from additional responsibilities married employees are faced with, and hence they put a high premium on their job. Mwamwenda^[39] explored the association between marital status and job satisfaction among teachers and reported that married employees were more satisfied with their job than unmarried employees. This they explained might results from the fact that life satisfaction, mental well-being, and physical health are functions of marriage. Married employees might share work experiences with their partners who also support them with their work. Unmarried employees may not benefit in these ways.

Gazioglu and Tansel^[40] examined the impact of marital status on job satisfaction among employees. Their research findings indicate a lower satisfaction level for married employees than unmarried employees. This implied marital difference exists in their study.

Fitzmaurice^[41] assessed the association between marital status and job satisfaction level among employees in a survey study. The research findings of the study show that unmarried employees were more satisfied with their job than married. The findings suggest the existence of marital differences in job satisfaction. Anyango, Ojera and Ochieng^[37] studied the link between marital status and job satisfaction among employees. Their study findings show that marital status differences did not exist in job satisfaction in their study since there is no significant effect in job satisfaction between married and unmarried employees.^[42]

Azim et al.^[32] investigated the effect of marital status on job satisfaction among employees and reported that marital status significantly does not affect job satisfaction in their study, though married and unmarried employees were moderately satisfied with their job. Saner and Eyüpoğlu investigated the association between marital status and job satisfaction among employees and reported that married employees are more satisfied than unmarried employees, which indicate marital differences in job satisfaction in their study. Mocheche et al.^[38] investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and marital status. Their study findings revealed that married employees are more satisfied with their job than unmarried employees, indicating marital differences significantly exist in job satisfaction in their study.

The review indicates that employee's perception of job satisfaction variables is different. On the ranks also the findings are mixed since the variables are ranked differently by the employees in the studies reviewed.

3. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The study design is a quantitative research design. The perception of workers on job satisfaction variables is quantified in the study. The study is descriptive and also a cross-sectional study in which data was collected from the respondents once for analysis.

The target population for the study is the employees of public and private organisations in Sunyani Township.

The sample size for the study is 139. The sample was selected through the convenience sample method. This method was used since the sample frame is not known.

Both primary and secondary data were used in the study. The sources of the secondary data are the journal articles and books used, mainly obtained from the internet. The primary data are the data collected from the respondents using the questionnaire designed and administered by the researchers. The questionnaire was administered to the respondents at their workplaces. The items on the subject matter of the study (job satisfaction variables) were developed in the 5-point Likert scale format. On the scoring of the items, strongly agree was=5; agree=4; neutral=3; disagree=2; and strongly disagree=1. In all the subject questions were 20.

Data collected were analysed using percentages, frequencies, mean, and standard deviation using the SPSS version 26. Results were presented in Tables. Diagnostic tests such as reliability test, normality test, and dimensionality test were performed.

4. EMPIRICAL RESULTS

4.1 Background Information on Respondents

Table 1 depicts the demographic features of the study respondents. The results in Table 1 indicate majority (58%) of the respondents are females; most of the respondents (39%) are in the age group of 30-39 years; the majority of the respondents (62%) holds first degree/diploma certificates; most respondents (51%) are married; and on experience proxied by the length of service in current position, most respondents (33%) have worked between 3-5 years.

4.2 Test of Reliability/Dimensionality

4.2.1 Reliability Test Results

The reliability test results are shown in Table 2. The results indicate higher internal consistency since the Cronbach alpha coefficient value of 0.892 is higher than 0.70. According to Cronbach (1951), this indicates the items on the questionnaire are adequate and reliable for analysis.

4.2.2 Test for Dimensionality

After the reliability test, the dimensionality test was carried out to determine the nature of dimensionality (either uni-dimensional or multidimensional). The results are shown in Table 3, for the job satisfaction scale, and Table 4 for the demographic scales. The results in Table 3 indicate multidimensionality of the scales since 4 components explain about 67% of the variance in the components using the initial Eigenvalues, and uni-dimensionality of scale in Table 4, since 1 component explains about 46% of the variance in the components using the initial Eigenvalues. In all, four (4) components were extracted in Table 3 and one (1) component extracted in Table 4.

4.2.3 Normality Test

Kolmogorov-Smirnova and Shapiro-Wilk tests were used to examine the nature of normality of the data collected from the respondents. Table 5 shows the results. According to the results, the data used is not normally distributed, since the Sig. values of the test results are not more than 0.05.

4.4 Analysis of Job Satisfaction Domains

Table 6 shows the frequency of job satisfaction variables under review. There were 20 variables in the study. Respondents were satisfied with all the job satisfaction variables. The majority of the respondents were significantly satisfied with variables such as respect for workers (79.3%); devotion to work (72.9%), and learning from colleagues (70.7%). Other variables that respondents were highly satisfied with were clear authority (68.6%); clear responsibility (67.2%); problem-solving (67.1%); performance appraisal (66.4%); the behaviour of supervisor towards employees (63.6%); work schedule (62.9%); and physical facilities provided to the workers (62.8%).

4.5 Results on the Ranks of Respondents satisfaction with different Job Satisfaction Variables

Table 7 indicates the results of the descriptive statistics performed. The values of the mean and the standard deviations for the 20 variables of job satisfaction are identified. The results indicate respondents job performance level is high. The results also indicate the ranks of the variable investigated. The three most satisfying job satisfaction variables are respect for workers, devotion to work, and learning from colleagues respectively. The three most unsatisfied job satisfaction variables respectively are sports facilities, personal office, and transportation facilities.

4.6. Marital Status and Job

The results of the ANOVA test on the significance differences in marital status and job satisfaction of the different satisfaction factors are shown in Table 8. The results indicate significance difference in ten (10) of the job satisfaction variables, which are devotion to work [$F=3.370$, $P=0.037$]; leg-pulling sincerity [$F=3.758$, $P=0.026$]; problem solving [$F=4.520$, $P=0.013$]; work schedule [$F=4.113$, $P=0.018$]; performance appraisal [$F=3.312$, $P=0.039$]; clear authority [$F=2.410$, $P=0.094$]; clear responsibility [$F=2.878$, $P=0.060$]; medical facilities [$F=2.746$; $P=0.068$]; transportation facilities [$F=2.646$, $P=0.075$]; and internet facilities [$F=2.973$, $P=0.054$].

The means response for single, married, and divorced respondents in the study are shown in Table 9. In all the job satisfaction variables studied, single employees are satisfied than married and divorced employees with divorced employees have been less satisfied.

4.7. Discussions

The research studied respondents' satisfaction of 20 job satisfaction variables among the employees of institutions. Respondents were satisfied with all the 20 variables with the three most satisfying variables been respect for workers, devotion to work, and learning from colleagues. The three less satisfied variables were sports facilities, personal office, and transportation services. The findings of the study concerning the job satisfaction variables identified are in line with that of prior research such, [19,20,27-31] who identified these variables as job satisfaction variables.

The current research findings on the ranks of the job satisfaction variables are not in line with that of previous research findings such [27] who ranked salary, welfare, and

job itself as the three most satisfying variables. The current findings of the paper are also not in support of that of [28] who reported that pay and working conditions are the two most influencing job satisfaction variables in their study. The findings are also not in agreement with that of study findings in which they reported that the most satisfying variables are salary, workload, and relationship with co-workers. The present research findings are also not in line with that of Lee study findings in which they reported that the three most ranked variables are personal growth, salary, and welfare.

The current research findings indicate that marital status significantly influences employee's satisfaction of job satisfaction variables and that single employees are more satisfied with the satisfaction variables, followed by married employees and divorced employees. The findings are not

in support of previous research findings. The findings are, however, in support, who reported that unmarried employees are more satisfied with their job than married employees. The findings are also contrary to that study that reported insignificant marital status differences in job satisfaction among employees.

In these modern times, the management of employees is more difficult than before since workers are more educated and know their rights and their responsibilities at their job places. It has become necessary that management identify variables that affect the job satisfaction level of their workers so that productivity will not be negatively affected. Employees should not be dissatisfied by policies of management concerning job satisfaction variables.^[43-48]

Table 1 Distribution of Demographic Features of Respondents

| Variables | Frequency/Percentage (%) |
|--------------------------|--------------------------|
| Gender | |
| Female | 59(42.1) |
| Male | 81(57.9) |
| Total | 140(100.0) |
| Age | |
| 20-29 | 37(26.4) |
| 30-39 | 55(39.3) |
| 40-49 | 38(27.1) |
| 50-59 | 10(7.1) |
| Total | 140(100.0) |
| Educational status | |
| First Degree/HND/Diploma | 87(62.1) |
| Masters | 41(29.3) |
| PhD | 12(8.6) |
| Total | 140(100.0) |
| Marital status | |
| Single | 62(44.3) |
| Married | 71(50.7) |
| Divorced | 7(5.0) |
| Total | 140(100.0) |
| Experience | |
| 2years and less | 40(28.6) |
| 3-5years | 46(32.9) |
| 6-8years | 26(18.6) |
| 9years and above | 28(20.0) |
| Total | 140(100.0) |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021

Table 2 Results of Reliability analysis for Job Satisfaction

| Categories of Statements | Cronbach's alpha | No. of Items | Conclusion |
|---|------------------|--------------|------------------|
| Demographics features and Job Satisfaction dimensions | 0.892 | 25 | High reliability |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021

Table 3 Test Results for Dimensionality for Job Satisfaction Scales

| Initial Eigenvalues | | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|---------------------|--------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Components | Totals | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 8.321 | 41.603 | 41.603 | 8.321 | 41.603 | 41.603 |
| 2 | 2.773 | 13.864 | 55.467 | 2.773 | 13.864 | 55.467 |
| 3 | 1.625 | 8.124 | 63.591 | 1.625 | 8.124 | 63.591 |
| 4 | 1.104 | 5.520 | 69.112 | 1.104 | 5.520 | 69.112 |
| 5 | 0.967 | 4.833 | 73.944 | | | |
| 6 | 0.782 | 3.908 | 77.853 | | | |
| 7 | 0.686 | 3.429 | 81.282 | | | |
| 8 | 0.518 | 2.591 | 83.873 | | | |
| 9 | 0.476 | 2.379 | 86.252 | | | |
| 10 | 0.444 | 2.221 | 88.474 | | | |
| 11 | 0.363 | 1.814 | 90.288 | | | |
| 12 | 0.341 | 1.704 | 91.991 | | | |
| 13 | 0.294 | 1.469 | 93.461 | | | |
| 14 | 0.258 | 1.289 | 94.750 | | | |
| 15 | 0.227 | 1.136 | 95.886 | | | |
| 16 | 0.206 | 1.029 | 96.915 | | | |
| 17 | 0.174 | 0.871 | 97.785 | | | |
| 18 | 0.156 | 0.782 | 98.567 | | | |
| 19 | 0.146 | 0.730 | 99.298 | | | |
| 20 | 0.140 | 0.702 | 100.000 | | | |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 4 Test Results for Dimensionality for Demographic Variables

| Initial Eigenvalues | | | | Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings | | |
|---------------------|--------|---------------|--------------|-------------------------------------|---------------|--------------|
| Components | Totals | % of Variance | Cumulative % | Total | % of Variance | Cumulative % |
| 1 | 2.298 | 45.966 | 45.966 | 2.298 | 45.966 | 45.966 |
| 2 | 1.000 | 19.999 | 65.966 | | | |
| 3 | 0.760 | 15.195 | 81.161 | | | |
| 4 | 0.549 | 10.983 | 92.144 | | | |
| 5 | 0.393 | 7.856 | 100.000 | | | |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021: Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis

Table 5 Results of Normality Test

| Scales | Kolmogorov-Smirnova | | | Shapiro-Wilk | | |
|---|---------------------|-----|-------|--------------|-----|-------|
| | Statistic | Df | Sig. | Statistic | df | Sig. |
| Respect for workers | 0.243 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.788 | 139 | 0.000 |
| Salary | 0.205 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.895 | 139 | 0.000 |
| participation in decision making | 0.233 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.888 | 139 | 0.000 |
| devotion to work | 0.285 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.849 | 139 | 0.000 |
| the behaviour of supervisor towards employees | 0.250 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.863 | 139 | 0.000 |
| learning from colleagues | 0.265 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.857 | 139 | 0.000 |
| leg-pulling sincerity | 0.237 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.889 | 139 | 0.000 |
| physical facilities provided to the workers | 0.281 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.868 | 139 | 0.000 |
| equality in benefits | 0.216 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.878 | 139 | 0.000 |
| problems solving | 0.277 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.860 | 139 | 0.000 |
| work schedule | 0.262 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.873 | 139 | 0.000 |
| performance appraisal | 0.271 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.855 | 139 | 0.000 |
| clear authority | 0.292 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.846 | 139 | 0.000 |
| clear responsibility | 0.290 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.857 | 139 | 0.000 |
| medical facilities | 0.237 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.890 | 139 | 0.000 |
| transportation services | 0.196 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.899 | 139 | 0.000 |
| personal office | 0.210 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.904 | 139 | 0.000 |
| sports facilities | 0.194 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.912 | 139 | 0.000 |
| internet facilities | 0.230 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.896 | 139 | 0.000 |
| working conditions | 0.194 | 139 | 0.000 | 0.909 | 139 | 0.000 |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021

Table 7 Results on the Ranks of Job Satisfaction Variables

| Job Satisfaction Variables | N | Mean | Standard deviation | Ranks |
|--|----------|-------------|---------------------------|--------------|
| respect for workers | 139 | 4.1367 | 0.9795 | 1 |
| Salary | 139 | 3.5468 | 0.9723 | 14 |
| participation in decision making | 139 | 3.6475 | 0.9621 | 10 |
| devotion to work | 139 | 3.8849 | 0.8935 | 2 |
| the behaviour of supervisors towards employees | 139 | 3.7410 | 0.9274 | 5 |
| learning from colleagues | 139 | 3.8777 | 0.9205 | 3 |
| leg-pulling sincerity | 139 | 3.5468 | 1.0372 | 13 |
| physical facilities provided to the workers | 139 | 3.6187 | 1.0029 | 11 |
| equality in benefits | 139 | 3.5755 | 1.0142 | 12 |
| problems solving | 139 | 3.7410 | 1.0169 | 7 |
| work schedule | 139 | 3.6691 | 1.0028 | 9 |
| performance appraisal | 139 | 3.7410 | 1.0025 | 6 |
| clear authority | 139 | 3.7626 | 0.9214 | 4 |
| clear responsibility | 139 | 3.7338 | 0.9214 | 8 |
| medical facilities | 139 | 3.5252 | 0.9951 | 15 |
| transportation services | 139 | 3.3309 | 1.0243 | 18 |
| personal office | 139 | 3.2230 | 1.1167 | 19 |
| sports facilities | 139 | 3.0504 | 1.0789 | 20 |
| internet facilities | 139 | 3.3957 | 1.1204 | 16 |
| working conditions | 139 | 3.3309 | 1.1124 | 17 |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021

Table 8 Marital Status and Job Satisfaction Variables

| Job Satisfaction Variables | F-Value | P-Value |
|--|---------|---------|
| respect for workers | 1.754 | 0.177 |
| Salary | 1.003 | 0.370 |
| participation in decision making | 1.185 | 0.309 |
| devotion to work | 3.370 | 0.037** |
| the behaviour of supervisors towards employees | 1.435 | 0.242 |
| learning from colleagues | 1.352 | 0.262 |
| leg-pulling sincerity | 3.758 | 0.026** |
| physical facilities provided to the workers | 0.090 | 0.914 |
| equality in benefits | 2.184 | 0.116 |
| problems solving | 4.520 | 0.013** |
| work schedule | 4.113 | 0.018** |
| performance appraisal | 3.312 | 0.039** |
| clear authority | 2.410 | 0.094* |
| clear responsibility | 2.878 | 0.060* |
| medical facilities | 2.746 | 0.068* |
| transportation services | 2.646 | 0.075* |
| personal office | 1.016 | 0.365 |
| sports facilities | 1.518 | 0.223 |
| internet facilities | 2.973 | 0.054* |
| working conditions | 0.864 | 0.424 |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021:

Note: ** and * denote significance at 5%, and 10% levels

Table 9 Mean Scores on the Job Satisfaction Variables based on Marital Status

| Job Satisfaction Variables | Single Mean | Married Mean | Divorced Mean |
|--|-------------|--------------|---------------|
| respect for workers | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| Salary | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| participation in decision making | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| devotion to work | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| the behaviour of supervisors towards employees | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| learning from colleagues | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| leg-pulling sincerity | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| physical facilities provided to the workers | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| equality in benefits | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| problems solving | 4.2903 | 4.0429 | 3.7143 |
| work schedule | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| performance appraisal | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| clear authority | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| clear responsibility | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| medical facilities | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| transportation services | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| personal office | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| sports facilities | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| internet facilities | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |
| working conditions | 3.9032 | 3.5286 | 3.0000 |

Sources: Author's field survey, June 2021

5. CONCLUSIONS

The paper has investigated the satisfaction level of employees in organisations concerning job satisfaction variables. The results indicate a high level of satisfaction of the variables examined, with the three most satisfying variables being respect for workers, devotion to work, and learning from colleagues respectively. The study contributes to knowledge as the results create awareness about the variables of job satisfaction and the ranks of the satisfaction variables since the ranks are not in line with that of previous studies.

The research influences the future performance of an organisation by paying attention to job satisfaction variables within the institutions to positively influence the motivation of workers to improve productivity. The benefits of ensuring job satisfaction of employees are providing a good working environment to the employees are enormous for the employee and the organisation. Management should also pay attention to the satisfaction variables of single employees in their organisations so that they can contribute to the output of the organisation. Future studies should examine the effect of demographic factors on job satisfaction variables and also the effect of emotional intelligence on job satisfaction variables. Also, the association between employee's motivation and job satisfaction variables as well as job performance and job satisfaction variables should be examined. Causal studies in these areas are worth embarking on.

Acknowledgement

Nil

Funding

No funding was received to carry out this study.

References

1. M.D.C. Gimenez Espert, V. Prado Gasc, A. Soto Rubio, Psychosocial Risks, Work Engagement, and Job Satisfaction of Nurses During COVID-19 Pandemic, *Front Public Health*, 8 (2020) 1-10.
2. S.T. Dziuba, M. Ingaldi, M. Zhuravskaya, 'Employees' Job Satisfaction and their Work Performance as Elements Influencing Work Safety,' *System Safety: Human-Technical Facility-Environment*, 2(1) (2020) 18-25.
3. B.S. Kaliski, *Encyclopedia of Business and Finance*, Second edition, Thompson Gale, Detroit, (2007).
4. C. Ostroff, The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes, and performance: An organizational level analysis, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6) (1992) 963-974.
5. T.A. Judge, C.J. Thoresen, J.E. Bono, G.K. Patton, The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: a qualitative and quantitative review, *Psychol Bull*, 127(3) (2001) 376-407.
6. J.M. George, G.R. Jones, *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behaviour*, Fifth Edition, Pearson/Prentice Hall, New Jersey, (2008).
7. H.R. Kelidbari, M.R. Dizgah, A. Yusefi, The relationship between organization commitment and job performance of employees of Guilan Province social security organization, *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, 3(6) (2011) 555.
8. Y.Z. Yalabik, P. Popaitoon, J.A. Chowne, B.A. Rayton, Work engagement as a mediator between employee attitudes and outcomes, *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24 (2013) 2799-2823.
9. H.J. Brenninger, Employee satisfaction and its impact on company value, Doctoral thesis, The University of Latvia, Faculty of Economics and Management, Riga Latvia, (2015).
10. A. Raziq, R. Maulabakhsh, Impact of work environment on job satisfaction, *Procedia Economics and Finance*, 23(1) (2015) 717- 725.
11. A.S.B. Shmailan, The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: An explorative study, *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 4(1) (2016) 1-8.
12. Z. Abidin, Improving teacher health performance by strengthening organizational improving teacher health performance by strengthening organizational culture, personality and job satisfaction in Covid-19 situation. *International Journal of Pharmaceutical Research*, 12 (2020) 4466-4477.
13. A. Hawani, A.B. Chikha, The professional satisfaction of Tunisian secondary school teachers after the deconfinement of the COVID-19 epidemic, *Advances in Research*, 21(11) (2020) 28-37.
14. L.J.L. Rn, J. Alexis, A.D. L.S. Rn, Fear of COVID-19, psychological distress, work satisfaction and turnover intention among frontline nurses, *J Nurs Manag*, 29(3) (2020) 395-403.
15. N. Chanana, Sangeeta, Employee engagement practices during COVID-19 lockdown, *Journal of public affairs*, e2508, Advance online publication, (2020).
16. M.S. Ali, A. Education, E. Faisalabad, Online teaching, psychological state, and job satisfaction: Teachers perspective during COVID-19 pandemic, *EEO*, 20(2) (2021) 358-364.
17. T. Hidayat, R. Fahmy, D.K. Sari, F. Mergeresa, Y. Fernando, COVID-19 outbreak effects on leadership, job satisfaction and turnover intention: A mediating model of Indonesian banking sector, *International Journal of Industrial Management*, 10(1) (2021) 113-128.
18. R.M. Said, D.A. El shafei, Occupational stress, job satisfaction, and intent to leave: Nurses working on front lines during COVID-19 pandemic in Zagazig City, Egypt. *Environ Sci Pollut Res Int*, 28(7) (2021) 8791-8801.
19. G.H. Johnson, An Instrument for the Measurement of Job Satisfaction, *Pers, Psychol*, 8(1) (1955) 27-37.
20. C. P. Finn, Autonomy: An Important Component for Nurses' Job Satisfaction, *International Journal of Nursing Studies*, 38(3) (2001) 349-357.
21. P. Boxall, K. Macky, Research and theory on high-performance work systems: progressing the high-involvement stream, *Human Resource Management Journal*, 19(1) (2009) 1-21.
22. B. Fabi, R. Lacoursiere, L. Raymond, Impact of high-performance work systems on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and intention to quit in Canadian organizations, *International Journal of Manpower*, Bradford, 36(5) (2015) 772-790.
23. T.J. Chen, C.C. Lin, C.M. Wu, High-Performance Work System, Psychological Efficacy, Job Satisfaction and Task Performance in the Hotel Workplace, *Open Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(7) (2016) 76-81.

24. M.K. Sheikh, N. Chaudahry, A. Ghogare, Depression in teachers due to cyberbullying who are working in COVID-19 pandemic: A cross-sectional study, *International Journal of Current Research and Review*, 12(20) (2020) 98-102.
25. H. Bagienska, B.S. Anna, The role of employee relations in shaping job satisfaction as an element promoting positive mental health at work in the era of COVID-19, *International Journal of Environmental Research and Public Health*, 18 (2021) 2-18.
26. E. Brunelle, J.A. Fortin, Distance Makes the Heart Grow Fonder: An Examination of Teleworkers' and Office Workers' Job Satisfaction Through the Lens of Self-Determination Theory, *SAGE Open*, 11(1) (2021) 1-11.
27. D. DortaAfonso, M. Gonzalez de la Rosa, F.J. Garcia Rodriguez, L. Romero Dominguez, Effects of High-Performance Work Systems (HPWS) on Hospitality Employees' Outcomes Through Their Organizational Commitment, Motivation, and Job Satisfaction, *Sustainability*, 13(6) (2021) 1-8.
28. P.C. Smith, L. Kendall, C.L. Hulin, *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement: A Strategy for the Study of Attitudes*; Rand McNally and Company: Chicago, IL, USA, (1969).
29. P.E. Spector, Measurement of human service staff satisfaction: Development of the Job Satisfaction Survey, *Am, J, Community Psychol*, 13(6) (1985) 693-713.
30. G.A. Churchill, N.M. Ford, O.C. Walker, Measuring the job satisfaction of industrial salesmen, *J, Mark, Res*, 11(3) (1974) 254-260.
31. X. Lee, B. Yang, W. Li, The influence factors of job satisfaction and its relationship with turnover intention: Taking early-career employees as an example, *Anales de psicología*, 33(3) (2017) 697-707.
32. T. Saner, S.Z. Eyupoglu, The Gender-Marital Status Job Satisfaction Relationship of Academics, *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 106 (2013) 2817-2821.
33. S.J. Zhang, J.Q. Liao, An empirical study on the influences of dimensions of employee job satisfaction on total job satisfaction, *Science of Science and Management*, 8 (2007) 184-188.
34. M. Alina, E. Simona, Pre-university teachers' professional satisfaction. *Procedia-Social and Behavioural Sciences*, 78 (2013) 110-114.
35. M.M.I. Murad, N.M. Zayed, A.Z.A. Mukul, A Study on Job Satisfaction: Focus on Bankers of Bangladesh, *European Journal of Business and Management*, 5(17) (2013) 14-20.
36. M.A. Petcu, M.I. Sobolevschi David, A. Anica Popa, S.C. Curea, C. Motofei, A.M. Popescu, Multidimensional Assessment of Job Satisfaction in Telework Conditions. Case Study: Romania in the COVID-19 Pandemic, *Sustainability*, 13 (2021) 2-16.
37. M.T. Azim, M. M. Haque, R.A. Chowdhury, Gender, Marital Status and Job Satisfaction, An Empirical Study, *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 2(2) (2013) 488-498.
38. J.M. Federico, P. Federico, G.W. Lundquist, Predicting women's turnover as a function of extend of met salary expectations and biodemographic data, *Personnel Psychology*, (1976) 559-66
39. K.R. Garrison, P.M. Muchinsky, Attitudinal and biographical predictors of incidental absenteeism, *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, (1977) 221 -30.
40. C.J. Watson, An evaluation and some aspects of the steers and rhodes model of employee attendance, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, (1981) 385-89.
41. D.R. Austrom, T. Baldwin, G.J. Macy, The single worker: An empirical exploration of attitudes, behaviour and well-being, *Canadian Journal of Administrative Science*, (1988) 22-29.
42. C. Anyango, P. Ojera, I. Ochieng, Employee Characteristics and Job Satisfaction, *International Journal of Science and Research*, 4(6) (2013) 2607-2611.
43. E.K. Mocheche, P.A. Raburu, J. Bosire, Is Marital Status a Predictor of Job Satisfaction of Public Secondary School Teachers? *International Journal of Psychology and behavioural Sciences*, 8(3) (2018) 51-58.
44. S. Gazioglu, A. Tansel, Job satisfaction in Britain: Individual and Job-related factors, *Journal of Applied Economics*, 38 (10) (2006) 1163-1171.
45. M. Fitzmaurice, Job Satisfaction in Ireland: An Investigation into the influence of Self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy and affect, *Journal of Education and Behavioural Sciences*, 8(3) (2012) 148-153.
46. L.J. Cronbach, Coefficient alpha and the internal structure of tests, *Psychometrika*, 16(3) (1951) 197-334.
47. T. Mwamwenda, Marital Status and Teachers' Job Satisfaction, *Psychological Reports*, 80 (1997) 521-522
48. B. Steijn, Human Resource Management and Job Satisfaction in the Dutch Public Sector, *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 24 (2004) 291-303.