

HEZBERG'S THEORY OF JOB SATISFACTION AS PREDICTOR OF JOB PERFORMANCE

Sarminah Samad
Faculty of Business Management
Universiti Teknologi MARA, 40450 Shah Alam, Selangor

Abstract: This paper presents the findings of a study, which investigated how perception of Herzberg's two factor theory: motivational and hygiene factors played a significant role in employees' job performance. A total of 584 staff from the managerial level in Telekom Malaysia (TM) were studied. The study used self administered questionnaire as the research instrument. The data obtained were then analyzed using correlation and regression analysis at .05 level of significance. The results hypothesized that both motivational and hygiene factors perceptions are positively related to job performance. Among all the facets, conducive working condition appeared to be the most significant predictor of job performance. The study reported both motivational and hygiene factors made significant contributions to employees' job performance

Keywords: Job performance, Motivational factor, Hygiene factor

INTRODUCTION

Job performance and job satisfaction have been attracted a great deal of interest in the current literature as evidenced by many writings and research carried out on this subject. Literatures have documented that satisfied employees will perform better that contribute towards organizational efficiency and effectiveness. Consequently, employees will be more likely to engage in extra role behaviors that could lead in reduction of withdrawal behaviors such as absenteeism, job performance and turnover (William and Anderson, 1996) [19]. This is very much true especially among Telecommunication organizations that are so dependent on the skilled employees, where the market is very tight.

Job Performance

Job performance has always been referred to as how successful a role achievement (behavior) is accomplished and this has long been emerged as a major concept in business schools of management (Benkhoff, 1997) [1]. Performance is the end result of the application effort. Porter and Lawler (1968) [14] reveal that it is the aspect of an employee's behavior which organizations are most desirous of measuring and influencing. Mitchell (1986) [10] defines job performance as a combination of knowledge, skills and attitude of individuals in organization. Robbins (1996) [15], suggests four factors for individuals to be a better performer : know what is required to be done (role expectations), be motivated to do what is required, have the ability to do what is required and work in a conducive environment.

Job performance is related with individual performance and organizational performance (Cranny et al., 1992) [3]. Individual performance is a result of the aggregation of individual motives to achieve the relevant goals (Nathan, 1998) [12]. Nathan identified employees' satisfaction, effectiveness and efficiency as dimensions of organizational performance. Job performance can be measured in various ways. Among these are the use of ratings by supervisors, output measures and self-evaluation. The usual method of measuring performance in most studies has been to obtain the supervisors rating on selected criteria such as quality and productivity (Porter & Lawler, 1968) [14], or quality and quantity, output creativity and other criteria (Fletcher and Williams [5], 1996 and Benkhoff, 1997 [2]).

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the extent to which an employee feels about his or her job (Odom et al., 1990) [13]. Demir (2002) [4] refers job satisfaction to employees' feel of contentment and discontentment for a job. Cranny et al. (1992) [3] concluded that job satisfaction is a contribution of cognitive and affective reactions to the differential perceptions of what an employee wants to receive compared with what he or she actually receives.

There are a number of job satisfaction theories in the organizational studies. The popular theory that always been referred in organizational behavior studies is Herzberg's two factor theory (1973) [6]. Herzberg's theory, based on two basis types of needs: 1) the need for psychological growth or motivating factors and 2) the need to avoid pain or hygiene factors. The motivating factors such as work itself, possibility for growth, responsibility, achievement, recognition for achievement and advancement are assumed to be the predictor of job satisfaction and motivation. Hygiene factors like company policies and administration, quality of supervision, working condition, salary, relationship with peers and supervisors, status and job security are negative elements that could cause dissatisfaction at work.

Job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction in Herzberg's theory are totally separate dimension. Therefore, improving a hygiene factor such as working conditions will not make people satisfied with their needs, instead it will only preventing them from being dissatisfied. Generally, Herzberg's theory emphasizes the importance of individual in organization to advance. The advancement indirectly will change individual's needs. In consequential, it will help individuals to put extra effort to continuously achieve their needs and satisfaction and affect their behavior in organization. Based on this theory, the study attempted to investigate the relationship between Herzberg's job satisfaction theory and its contribution towards job performance.

Job Satisfaction and Job Performance

Previous literatures have revealed that job satisfaction is related to job performance. Steers (1997) [17] hypothesized that job satisfaction is related to performance because satisfied employees are likely to expend greater effort on the job. Similarly, Keisler (1991) [9] stresses that job satisfaction motivates people or compels them to act. Therefore, it can be assumed that satisfied employees perform better because they have higher levels of effort and motivation (Katerberg and Blau, 1993) [8].

Blumberg and Pringle (1982) [2] identify two factors that influence of individual's job performance: the ability, traits and interests of individuals and task characteristics associated with the structural context to provide differential opportunities for performance. Moses's (1997) [11] study of employees in electrical and electronic industries in Klang Valley indicated that job satisfaction in terms of extrinsic and extrinsic factors is related to job performance and at the same time be a significant predictor of job performance. This finding is consistent with a study conducted among a representative of employed Americans by Katerberg and Blau (1993) [8]. Based on the above literature, the present study seeks to test the following hypotheses:

H₁ : Perceived motivational factors are positively related to job performance

H₂ : Perceived hygiene factors are positively related to job performance

Purpose of The Study

The main purpose of this study was to empirically examine the relationship between job satisfaction factors and job performance and the extent these variables can be the determinant or predictor of job performance among managerial employees in Telekom Malaysia.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

The data for this study were collected from 584 employees of managerial level at Telekom Malaysia (TM). The study adopted stratified random sampling, which covered managers of TM in six regions mainly southern, eastern, western and northern part of Malaysia Peninsular and Sabah and Sarawak. The background profiles of the subjects are presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Background Characteristics Of The Respondents

	Mean	SD	n	%
Age	35.04	6.57	-	-
Experience in the organization	11.30	6.91	-	-
Total job experience	5.56	3.29	-	-
Male	-	-	374	64
Female	-	-	210	36
Married	-	-	392	67.1
Single	-	-	192	32.1

Research Instruments

Data were collected by means of a closed questionnaire. The independent variable of this study is job satisfaction. The questionnaire of job satisfaction was adapted from Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) (Weiss et al., 1967) [18] and Seegmiller's (1977)[16]. This instrument measures the various facets of Herzberg's job satisfaction theory mainly on motivational and hygiene factors. Motivational factors include: work itself, achievement, possibility for growth, responsibility, advancement and recognition for achievement. Hygiene factors are status, relationship with supervisor, relationship with peers, quality of supervision, policy and administration, job security, working condition and salary. For each of this facet contains 5 items or statements. The response options for these items were 7 point Likert-scale ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The reliability coefficient for job satisfaction factors scale was .91.

The dependent variable of the study is job performance. Job performance was measured based on adapted instrument developed by Hind and Baruch (1997) [7] which measured overall job performance based on supervisor ratings. The instrument contains statements that cover aspects of work effort, quality, efficiency, creativity and devotion to tasks. The response options for these items were 7 point Likert-scale, ranged from strongly disagree to strongly agree. The reliability for this scale was .89

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Correlational analyses were done to determine the extent of associations among motivational and hygiene factors in job performance among employees in TM. Table 2 presents the zero-order correlations among the facets of the variables. All of the correlations were in the expected directions indicate low, moderate and high magnitude.

Consistent with expectations, there were significant and positive correlations among motivational factors (work itself, achievement, possibility for growth, responsibility, advancement and recognition for achievement) and hygiene factors (status, relationship with supervisors, relationship with peers, quality of supervision, policy and administration, job security, working condition and salary) with job performance. These findings are consistent with past studies. The results of the study tend to suggest that all facets of motivational and hygiene factors were perceived as the stimulator for employees in TM to excel in their job performance.

Table 2: Intercorrelations Among Dependent and Independent Variables

1	2	3	4	5	6	7	8	9	10	11	12	13	14	
1														
2	*0.14													
3	*0.22	*0.66												
4	*0.23	*0.43	*0.21											
5	*0.14	*0.79	*0.24	*0.41										
6	*0.44	*0.49	*0.19	*0.13	*0.43									
7	*0.45	*0.82	*0.32	*0.61	*0.35	*0.59								
8	*0.52	*0.74	*0.26	*0.52	*0.45	*0.43	*0.63							
9	*0.41	*0.57	*0.18	*0.47	*0.33	*0.34	*0.47	*0.65						
10	*0.29	*0.23	*0.11	*0.24	*0.29	*0.12	*0.59	*0.48	*0.49					
11	*0.23	*0.42	*0.36	*0.27	*0.15	*0.36	*0.32	*0.36	*0.45	*0.27				
12	*0.31	*0.42	*0.16	*0.31	*0.14	*0.38	*0.49	*0.61	*0.61	*0.49	*0.49			
13	*0.46	*0.57	*0.21	*0.19	*0.56	*0.34	*0.84	*0.75	*0.77	*0.64	*0.67	*0.34		
14	*0.56	*0.68	*0.22	*0.48	*0.49	*0.41	*0.62	*0.85	*0.81	*0.77	*0.51	*0.37	*0.59	
15	*0.48	*0.65	*0.25	*0.44	*0.46	*0.45	*0.51	*0.81	*0.79	*0.65	*0.52	*0.43	*0.58	*0.79

* p < .05

1. work itself 2. achievement 3. possibility for growth 4. responsibility 5. advancement 6. recognition 7. status 8. relationship with supervisor 9. relationship with peers 10. quality of supervision 11. policy and administration 12. job security 13. working condition 14. salary 15. job performance

The Effect of Motivational And Hygiene Factors On Job Performance (H₁ and H₂)

Multiple regression analyses using enter method were also performed in the present study to determine which of the independent variables predict the job performance of employees in TM. Results of the analyses are shown in Table 3. Data in Table 3 shows that facets of motivational factors accounted for 29.2% of variance and hygiene factors accounted for 33.3% in job performance. Among the motivational factors responsibility, advancement and recognition for achievement turned out to be the significant predictors of job performance. While among the hygiene factors status, relationship with supervisor, working condition and salary emerged to be the significant predictors of job performance. The study revealed that hygiene factor of working condition was the most significant predictor or contributor to the dependent variable. Generally, findings in this study emphasized the importance of maintaining elements of job responsibility, career advancement, recognition for achievement, status, relationship with supervisor, conducive working condition and good salary within organization as prerequisite to maintaining and achieving employees' job performance.

Table 3: Regression Results: Predicting Job Performance By Motivational and Hygiene Factors

Independent variables p	Beta	t	R ²	f
<i>Motivational factors</i> .000*		.292		39.62
Work itself	.02	0.02		.695
Achievement	.05	0.05		.349
Possibility for growth	.01	0.04		.968
Responsibility .000*	.25	5.73		
Advancement .000*	.28	5.86		
Recognition for achievement .000*	.40	6.03		
<i>Hygiene factors</i> .000*		.333		37.33
Status .001*	.22	3.33		
Relationship with supervisor .018*	.14	2.37		
Relationship with peers	.01	0.19		.851
Quality of supervision	.04	0.93		.353
Policy and administration	.08	1.94		.102
Job security	.01	0.09		.927
Working condition .000*	.79	7.51		
Salary .001*	.33	3.48		

* p < 0.05

CONCLUSION

The study proposed to understand the relationship of motivational and hygiene factors with job performance. Results of the bivariate analyses indicated that facets of motivational and hygiene factors are significantly related to employees' job performance. The results were in the hypothesized direction as both perceived that motivational and hygiene factors contributed to employees' job performance. The results are in line with the findings reported by Moscs (1997) [11] and Katerberg and Blau (1993) [8] which reported that both motivational and hygiene factors affected employees' job performance. Therefore, the present study validates the result obtained by those researchers and generalized it to the other groups of employees. This study has contributed to the existing theory of organizational behavior and is useful for TM in their future planning and employee training and development programs

REFERENCES

1. Benkhoff, B. (1997). Ignoring commitment is costly. New approaches establish the missing link between commitment and performance. *Human Relations*, 506, 701-726
2. Blumberg, M and Pringle, C.D (1982). The missing opportunity in organizational research: Some implications for a theory of work performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 7, 560-569.
3. Cranny, C.J., Smith, R.C. & Stone, E.F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington.
4. Demir, M.C. (2002). Job satisfaction of nurses, working at Turkish Military Forces Hospitals. *Military Medicine*, 167, 402-404.
5. Fletcher, C. & Williams, R. (1996). Performance management, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *British Journal of Management*, 7, 169-179.
6. Herzberg, F. (1973). *Motivation: Management of success*. Elk Grove Village, Illinois: Advanced System Inc.
7. Hind, P and Baruch, Y (1997). Gender variations in perceptions of job performance appraisal. *Women in Management Review*, 12 (6), 1-17
8. Katerberg, R. & Blau, G J. (1993). An examination of level and direction of effort and job performance. *Academy of Management Journal*, 26,249-257.
9. Keisler, C.A (1991). *The psychology of organizational attitudes: Experiments linking behavior to belief*. New York: Academic Press.
10. Mitchell, T.R. (1986). *Motivation: New direction for theory research and practice*. England: Gower Publishing.
11. Moscs, M.R.L. (1993). *Organizational commitment and job performance among operators of selected electrical and electronic industries in Kalang Valley*. Unpublished Phd dissertation : Universiti Putra Malaysia.
12. Nathan, B. (1998). Does work group cohesiveness affect individuals' performance and organizational commitment?: A cross-level examination. *Small Group Research*, 29(4), 472-494
13. Odom, R.Y., Boxx, W.R. & Dunn, M.G. (1990). Organizational cultures, commitment, satisfaction and cohesion. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 14, 157-168.
14. Porter, L.W. & Lawler, E.E. (1968). *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, Illinois:Irwin
15. Robbins, S.P. (1996). *Organizational behavior*. 6th ed. Elglewood Cliffs, New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
16. Seegmiller, J.P. (1977). *Job satisfaction of faculty and staff at the College of Eastern Utah*. Unpublished Phd dissertation: College of Eastern Utah.
17. Steers, R.M. (1997). *Organizational effectiveness: a behavioral view*. Santa Monica: Goodyear Publishing Co.
18. Weiss, D.J, David, G.W & Lofquist, L.H. (1967). *Manual for the Mannesota Satisfaction Questionnaire*. Work Adjustment, Industrial Relations Center: University of Minnesota.
19. William, L.J. & Anderson, S.E. (1996). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17, 611-617