

Human Resource and Leadership Journal (HRLJ)

**Factors Affecting Employee's Perception on Job Satisfaction: Case
of United States International University (USIU)**



**CARI
Journals**

Factors Affecting Employee's Perception on Job Satisfaction: Case of United States International University (USIU)

 ^{1*}Wanyama Shikuku, ²Dr. Zachary Mosoti

^{1,2}Chandaria School of Business, United States International University

P. O. Box 14634 - 00800 Nairobi, Kenya

Accepted: 23rd Dec 2023 Received in Revised Form: 2nd Jan 2024 Published: 18th Jan 2024



Abstract

Purpose: This study sought to establish the factors that affect employee's perception on job satisfaction in USIU. Specifically, the study assessed the effect of employee's perception of personal factors, social factors, and organizational factors on job satisfaction.

Methodology: The research design was descriptive in nature, across-sectional survey based on selection of elements regarding the population of interest and presented in frequency and percentage distributions. The population in this study comprised 365 full time employees (both academic and administrative). A sample of 79 full time employees was targeted to represent the population of interest. The sampling technique used consisted of a non-probability sampling technique that was purposive sampling based on the population of interest. Questionnaires were tested through a pilot testing process and thereafter were distributed to 79 full time employees. The data was coded and entered in Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS), and analyzed via descriptive statistics then presented in tables for clarity and ease of understanding.

Results: With respect to personal factors and job satisfaction, this study concluded that employees with strategic management styles were more characterized by conscientiousness and openness to experience, while those with strong interpersonal management styles were most characterized by extraversion, agreeableness, and high emotional stability. Thus, all Big Five traits should be given attention in the study and application of organizational behavior. In addition, social factors and job satisfaction, the study concluded that job satisfaction is affected by the demographic similarity between supervisors and subordinates by the way in which supervisors assign tasks, the extent to which subordinates and supervisors like and respect each other, and the role of fairness in the workplace. And final, in regard to the organizational factors and its effect on job satisfaction, the research study concluded that organizational reward system must be as objective and as fair as possible and be administered contingently on the employee's exhibiting critical performance behaviors. Thus, employees should be rewarded in accordance to their contribution in the achievement of organization goal and observation.

Unique contribution to theory, practice and policy: The study made several recommendations among them that employer (USIU) ought to give attention to all Big Five traits in the study and application of organizational behavior. It also recommended that USIU human resource department should propose organizational restructuring that influences the natures of interactions at work which affect coworker relationships and which in turn affect job satisfaction. It further recommended that USIU should go through a trial-and-error approach before they settle into unique reward systems that works best for their full-time employees.

Key Words: *Personal Factors, Social Factors, Organizational Factors, and Job Satisfaction*

Background of the Study

Many job-related attitudes have been studied by psychologists, but the two most commonly studied are job satisfaction and organizational commitment. These two job attitudes are different work-related attitudes but they are highly correlated because they result in similar employee behaviors. Meta-analysis indicate that satisfied employees tend to be committed to an organization, and employees who are satisfied and committed are more likely to attend to work, stay with an organization, arrive at work on time, perform well, and engage in behavior helpful to the organization than are employees who are not satisfied or committed. Therefore, before a person commits himself or herself, one has to be satisfied with the job (Luthans and Stajkovic, 2009). Job satisfaction has long been viewed as relevant for organizational effectiveness – it is an aspect of the attitude – behavior link but in an applied setting. Job satisfaction is something that everyone seems both interested in and an expert on. This is because some people insist that the key to job satisfaction is money, others claim that its working conditions, still others believe that its employee participation (Bono, 2010). The list goes on and on. But according to Locke (2006), job satisfaction can be defined as a pleasurable, positive emotional state resulting from the cognitive appraisal of one's job or job experiences. Locke (2006) further noted that job satisfaction stems from one perception. That is people tend to be satisfied in their jobs if they believe that they are getting what they want out of them. The first antecedent of job satisfaction is personal factors where a sizable body of research suggests that people have stable characteristics that predispose them to respond positively or negatively to job context (Barber et al, 2009).

Dwyer and Ganster (2006) have argued that the stability in job satisfaction scores overtime stems from affective disposition or tendency to respond to classes of environmental stimuli in predetermined affect-based ways. Judge and his colleagues (Judge and Bono, 2010) have demonstrated relationship between some Big Five factors and job satisfaction. For instance, those employees who are high on extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness tend to be more satisfied at work, whereas those high on neuroticism tend to be less satisfied. Another group of researchers have taken a slightly different perspective, focusing on genetic differences as an explanation for the stability in job satisfaction. In particular, they argue that genetic factors might influence the way in which individuals respond to their work contexts (Barricks and Mount, 2008). On self-esteem, some attention has been paid to the idea that individuals with high self-esteem tend to be satisfied with their jobs (Mossholder et al, 2007). In a recent study, researchers examined the role played by core self- evaluation in both job satisfaction and life satisfaction (Judge and Bono, 2010). By core self- evaluation the authors mean the fundamental evaluations that we make about ourselves – a concept that includes self-esteem and generalized self-efficacy. Judge and Bono (2010) concluded that core evaluation of the self-have consistent effects on job satisfaction regardless of the job. In other word how people view (or evaluate) themselves directly affects how they experience their jobs and their lives.

The second antecedent of job satisfaction is social factors where the relationship that employees have with their supervisors and coworkers seem to be indicators of whether these employees are satisfied with their jobs. Research indicates that job satisfaction is affected by the demographic similarity between supervisors and subordinates, by the way in which supervisors assign tasks, and the extent to which subordinates and supervisors like and respect each other (Toulouse, 2008). Role variables also affect job satisfaction. For instance, if one had a job in which he or she was not completely sure of what were his or her roles or functions in the organization were, can affect job satisfaction. Another variable is organizational justice. By organizational justice means the role of fairness in the workplace. Employee's perceptions of the fairness of policies, procedures, and treatment affect their attitudes, behavior and performance (Cohen-Charash and Spector, 2003). The third and final antecedent of job satisfaction is organizational factors where one study has demonstrated that employees' satisfaction with their pay, benefits, and training and development are significant predictors of job satisfaction (Eisenberger et al., 2008). Another study shows that attitudes about pay are better predictors of job satisfaction than attitudes about benefits, although both make significant contributors to predicting satisfaction. About the work-family issue (the conflict or stress one experience as a function of valuing both one's family and one's job affects both job and life satisfaction). According to Cropanzano, (2007), employees with high levels of conflict tend to be less satisfied with their jobs and their lives in general than employees with low levels of conflict. Other findings suggest that this relationship is slightly stronger for men than for women and considerably stronger for dual-career couples than for single-career couples.

Statement of the Problem

Sometimes performance is not a function of job satisfaction at all but instead is determined by the constraints one perceive at work; the skills one possess to do a particular task; the health problem of one's children which prevent employees from getting any sleep the night before employees misunderstanding of what is expected with respect to particular tasks; and employees lack of motivation resulting from the company's new policy to limit salary increase (Bono, 2010). Thus what has been done on this topic are on those employees who develop withdrawal behaviors such as: one, absenteeism – the closest predictor to attendance is attendance motivation. Scott et al., (2008) argued that the best predictor of a behavior is the attention to exhibit that behavior. Scott et al., (2008) says that attitude leads to intention which affects behavior much like satisfaction leads to attendance motivation, which then influences attendance. Two, lateness – Steers and Rhodes model of absence has also been applied to lateness; here the results indicate that job satisfaction has a small direct effect on attendance but that both motivation to be on time and ability to be on time are important determinants of lateness (Eisenberger et al., 2007). Third and final, turnover – one approach to turnover, develop by Lee et al., (2006) include job satisfaction at the beginning of Steers and Rhodes model and quitting or staying at the end. Along one path to turnover, job satisfaction affects the extent to which an individual begins thinking about quitting; a second path

leads from job satisfaction to a job search and comparison of alternatives. Both paths eventually result in a decision to stay or go.

Apart from withdrawal behaviors, also when employees are dissatisfied, he or she can engage in counterproductive behaviors such as antisocial and dysfunctional behaviors (Greenberg and Roberts, 2004). Spector (2008) has presented a model of antisocial behaviors in which frustration is the centerpiece. He argues that when employee is frustrated and thus dissatisfied, his or her potential for antisocial behaviors is increased. Luthans and Stajkovic (2009) found that young, dissatisfied employees are more likely to engage in counterproductive work behaviors, and Locke (2006) demonstrated that individual low on conscientiousness tended to be most likely to exhibit counterproductive behaviors. Therefore, what has not been done on the effect employee's perception on job satisfaction has long been controversial among employers and employees. For instance, "a satisfied worker is a productive worker," as the old axiom goes, but what if that satisfied worker is incapable of doing what is required on his or her job? What if despite his or her satisfaction, the norm at work is to do just enough to get by? What if he or she is really pleased with his or her job, but this satisfaction does not lead to an intention to work hard because his or her supervisor does not require much effort to get a favorable performance review? (Kirkman and Shapiro, 2011). At United States International University (USIU), despite the concerns outlined, little had been done to establish the effect of personal factors, social factors, and organizational factors on job satisfaction. Therefore, this study sought to establish how employees view quality of work life. This was because the end result of quality of work life was the overall satisfaction one receives from a job.

Research Questions

- i What determines the effect of personal factors on job satisfaction?
- ii What determines the effect of social factors on job satisfaction?
- iii What determines the effect of organizational factors on job satisfaction?

Literature Review

Personal Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction

i. Affective Disposition

Some researchers in this area have argued that stability in job satisfaction scores overtime stems from affective disposition or the tendency to respond to classes of environmental stimuli in predetermined affect-based ways (Judge and Bono, 2010). Quite a few studies conducted by Judge and his colleagues have demonstrated that one's affective disposition is related to one's level of job satisfaction. In other words, some individuals respond to the world in a favorable way, while others respond in an unfavorable way. The idea that job satisfaction may be caused in part by personality can be traced back to the Hawthorne Studies. The Hawthorne researchers noticed that certain individuals, whom they called the chronic kickers, were continually complaining about the

job. No matter what the researchers did for them, the chronic kickers always had new complaints (Mitchell and Wood, 2007). Barrick and Mount (2008) noted in a longitudinal study that job satisfaction seemed very stable overtime and they speculated that it might be the product of personality traits. But Dwyer and Ganster (2006) have demonstrated relationship between some Big Five factors and job satisfaction. They said that employees who are high on extraversion, agreeableness, and conscientiousness tend to be more satisfied at work. Whereas, those high on neuroticism tend to be less satisfied. Although personality traits, long-term predisposition for behavior have been generally down played and even totally discounted in recent years, there is now considerable support for a five- factor traits based theory of personality called the Five-Factor Model (FFM) or in the field of organizational behavior and human resource management, the “Big Five,” these traits have help up as accounting for personality in many analysis over the years and even across cultures (Levy, 2006).

ii. Genetic disposition

Many genes are responsible for various aspects of people’s temperament and those genes appear to interact with each in complicate ways that influence several traits at once. That is hundreds of genes do at least slightly influence the personality traits, but so does the environment. Thus, it is not nature or nurture but nature and nurture that contribute to one’s personality. Therefore, the genes affect brains functions that in turn affect how people interact with their environment and thus their personalities (Kolb et al., 2007). As to neuropsychology, recent breakthrough in brain-scanning technology called Functional Magnetic Resonance Imaging (fMRI), allow measurement of brain activity by mapping specific regions that are linked to specialized roles. Thus, the frontal lobes are part of the brain that anticipates events and weighs the consequences of behavior, while deeper brain regions including the seahorse-shaped hippocampus and the nearby amygdale are associated with such things as memory, mood, and motivation (Luthans and Stajkovic, 2009). Besides the left and right regions, fMRIs are also able to detect that the amygdale part of the brain has to do with the emotion of the individual. Thus, discoveries in neuroscience reveal that talent and better quality performance involve not just the frontal lobes-the decision making brain circuitry that houses intellect-but also the amygdale- in tough economic times, talent and emotional engagement are the only natural competitive advantages (Luthans and Stajkovic, 2009). But Scott et al., (2008) suggests that job satisfaction not only may be fairly stable across jobs but also may be genetically determined. Scott (2008) and his colleagues arrived at this conclusion by comparing the levels of job satisfaction of 34 sets of identical twins that were separated from each other at early age. But such a finding does not mean that there is a “job satisfaction gene.” Instead, inherited personality traits such as negative affectivity (the tendency to have negative emotions such as fear, hostility, and anger) are related to our tendency to be satisfied with jobs. Kirkman and Shapiro (2010) argued that it may be that some people will probably not be satisfied with any job, and supervisors should not lose sleep over the fact that these employees are not happy or motivated.

One way to increase the overall level of job satisfaction in an organization would be to hire only those applicants who show high levels of overall job and life satisfaction.

iii. Core Self-Evaluation

Whether the consistency in job satisfaction is due to genetic or environmental factors, a series of personality variables appear to be related to job satisfaction. That is, certain types of personalities are associated with the tendency to be satisfied or dissatisfied with one's job (Baron, 2007). Judge and Bono (2010) have hypothesized that four personality variables are related to people's predisposition to be satisfied with life and with their jobs: emotional stability, self-esteem, self-efficacy (perceived ability to master their environment). That is people prone to be satisfied with their jobs and with life in general have high self-esteem and a feeling of being competent are emotionally stable, and believe they have control over their lives. Self-esteem has obvious implications for organizational behavior called Organization-Based Self-Esteem (OBSE) which is known as the self-perceived value that individuals have of themselves as organization members acting within an organization context. Those who score high on OBSE view themselves positively, and those who score low view themselves negatively. Thus, a meta-analysis found a significant positive relationship with performance and satisfaction on the job (Cropanzano, 2007). Kreitner and Kinicki (2009), confirm that employees with high self-esteem feel unique, competent, secure, empowered, and connected to the people around them. But if employee's self-esteem is low and they are not confident in their thinking ability, they would fear decision making, lack negotiation, and interpersonal skills, and would be reluctant or unable to change. But Mossholder et al., (2007) argue that supervisors can overcome self-esteem problems of their employees by practicing procedural fairness and rewarding for a job well done. Greengrass (2005) argue that emotional stability and extraversion are the most significantly related to job and life satisfaction.

Social Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction

i. Supervisors and Coworker Relationship

Research indicates that people who are enjoying working with their supervisors and coworkers will be more satisfied with their jobs. Also it indicated that job satisfaction is affected by the demographic similarity between supervisors and subordinates by the way in which supervisors assign tasks, and by the extent to which subordinates and supervisors like and respect each other (Toulouse, 2008). Research definitely supports the importance of coworker reactions as an antecedent to job satisfaction: according to one study the extent to which individuals are satisfied with their pay levels is partly determined by their comparisons with as well as beliefs and attitudes about their coworkers (Mitchell and Wood, 2007). But another study proposed that organizational restructuring that influences the nature of interactions at work affect coworker relationships which in turn affect job satisfaction (Schwartz and Rock, 2007). Indeed, this study found that after the departments in organizations were restructured, attitudes about coworkers predicted job, as well

as life satisfaction. Leadership is not restricted to the executive suite. Anyone in the organization may be a leader in various ways and at various times. This view is known as shared leadership. It does not operate out of one formally assigned position or role. Instead, a team or work unit may have several leaders at the same time. One team member might champion the introduction of new technology, while a co-worker keeps the work unit focused on key performance indicators. Thus, shared leadership calls for a collaborative rather than internally competitive culture because employees take on shared leadership roles when co-worker supports them for their initiative. Also, shared leadership lacks formal authority, so it operates best when employees learn to influence others through their enthusiasm, logical analysis, and involvement of co-workers in their idea or vision (McShane and Glinov, 2011). Supervisors should not only become transactional but transformational leaders. Transactional leader guide or motivate employees in the direction of established goals by clarifying role and task requirements. Transformational leaders pay attention to the concerns and developmental needs of employees; they change employees' awareness of issues by helping them look at old problems in new ways; and they excite, arouse, and inspire followers to put out extra effort to achieve group goal. Moreover, transformational supervisor is more than charisma – this lead to lower turnover rates, higher productivity, and higher employee's satisfaction (Distenfino and Pryer, 2009).

ii. Role Variables

Two specific variables have been prominent in this research – role ambiguity is the extent to which employees are uncertain about what their job functions and responsibilities are. Many supervisors fail to provide clear guidelines and directions for their subordinates, leading to ambiguity about what the employee is supposed to do. Role conflict arises when people experience incompatible demands either at work (intra-role) or between work and non-work (extra-role) (Locke, 2006). For role ambiguity, the meta-analysis by Kristof (2005) clearly demonstrates the importance of fit. Employees who perceive a good fit with their organization, job, coworker, and supervisor tend to be satisfied with their jobs, identify with the organization, remain with the organization, perform better and engage in organizational citizenship behaviors. Management guru Warren Bennis put it, "leaders do not avoid, repress, or deny conflict, but rather see it as an opportunity" – that is conflict can lead to better decision, and better relationships. Gully (2012) suggests that employers investing in building a culture that support constructive conflict and discourage destructive conflict improve organizational performance. Thus employers who reward employees who engage in constructive conflict help to reduce employees' fears of ridicule or rejection. Assigning one or more employees to play the role of devil's advocate can help to generate constructive conflict by providing a safer environment for the introduction of different perspectives. The dialectical method in which multiple groups discuss issues separately and then together to better synthesize different viewpoints into a common framework can help to reduce conflict by ensuring that multiple perspectives are incorporated into decisions. Studies have found that employees who report high

levels of role conflict had lower job satisfaction than their counterparts with low levels of conflicts. Also the same studies found a correlation between role conflict and job satisfaction for men but not for women (Lord et al., 2002). Men consider their own jobs to be more important than women consider their own jobs to be.

iii. Organizational Justice

Organizational justice means the role of fairness in the workplace. The question is whether employees' perception of the fairness of policies, procedures, and treatments affects their attitudes, behaviors, and performance. But because the relationships between perceptions of justice and employee attitudes and behavior are so strong: it is essential that employers be open about how decisions are made, take time to develop fair procedures, and provide feedback to employees who might not be happy with decisions that are made (Liao and Rupp, 2006). But according to Cohen-Charash and Spector (2003), employees can reduce perceived inequity by first changing their inputs. They can either stop working hard or avoid working overtime. A second way is by changing the outcomes. Employees can present his or her concerns to the employer by asking for a rise, a promotion, additional benefits or more recognition. A third way is by altering perception. An employee can convince himself or herself that his or her ratio is about the same as his or her coworker. But this is reasonably successful in the short term helping to reduce the tension that arises from perceived inequity. Also Ferrin and Dirks (2008) developed equity sensitivity to account for the notion that people differ in terms of their sensitivity to over-reward or under-reward situations. This construct has been quite useful in predicting attitudes and behavior as a function of various inequitable situations. Depending on how employees score on equity sensitivity measures, they are classified as benevolent, who tend to be more tolerant of under-reward inequity; as entitled, who always want over-reward; or as equity sensitive, who truly desire the state of equity or balance.

Organizational Factors that Affect Job Satisfaction

i. Money as Organizational Rewards

Money provides a rich basis for studying behavior at work because it offers explanations for why people act as they do. Ferrin and Dirks (2008) noted that money is a prime factor in the foundation of commerce that is people organize and start business to make money. Money is also associated with four of the important symbolic attributes for which humans strive: achievement and recognition; status and respect; freedom and control; and power. In particular, money helps people attain both physical (clothing, automobiles, houses) and psychological (status, self-esteem, a feeling of achievement) objectives. Barber et al., (2009) says that a money maker Donald Trump argues that money was never a big motivation for him except as the way to keep score. The real excitement is to play the game. Thus money has been of interest to organizational behavior theorists and researchers who have studied the linkages between pay and performance by seeking

answers to questions such as: how much of a motivator is money? How long lasting is its effects? What are some strategies to employ in using money as job satisfaction? In order for money to be effective in the organizational reward system, the system must be as objective and fair as possible and be administered contingently on the employee's exhibiting critical performance behaviors. Kreitner and Kinicki (2009) noted that an effective pay system for rewarding people has to address three considerations. First, the organization must ask itself what outcomes it is seeking-higher profits increased sales, and greater market share. Second, the enterprise must be able to measure these results. Third, the organization must tie its rewards to these outcomes. The problem for many of today's organizations is that they do still not know what they want to achieve or are unable to measure the results. But Luthans and Stajkovic (2009) argue that the criteria for determining merits are often nebulous because the organization the organization does not clearly spell out the conditions for earning this pay. Thus, first unless the criteria for „best“ are objectively spelled out, most of those who do not get merit money will feel left out because they believe they are among the best. Second, merit pay can end up being „catch-up“ – everyone is given a 2percent across the board raise and those whose pay is low are given merit to get them closer to market value. Therefore, unless the longer-tenured employees are given more money they might look for jobs at companies that are willing to pay them more based on their job experience.

ii. Recognition as Organizational Reward

Research shows that there are many types of recognition that can lead to enhanced performance and job satisfaction. One of these that is receiving increased attention is recognition of the fact that many employees have work and family responsibilities and when the organization helps them deal with these obligations loyalty and job satisfaction increases. This finding is particularly important in that a survey found that 25 percent of the most sought often employees (highly educated, high income professionals) reported they would change jobs for a 10 percent increase in salary and 50 percent would move for a 20 percent raise (Nelson and Quick, 2010). Formal recognition is vital part of the reward system that makes up the environmental component of the social cognitive framework for understanding and effectively managing organizational behavior. Thus, these reward systems are designed to reward effective employee performance behavior and enhance employee's satisfaction and commitment. Also, they are designed to meet the specific and changing needs of the employees. This is why many firms have gone through a trial-and-error approach before they have settled into unique systems that works best today for their employees (Mitchell and Wood, 2007).

Recognizing creativity is becoming increasingly necessary for competitive advantage. Thus, the professionals (e.g. software developers and other knowledge workers) whose primary responsibilities include innovating, designing, and problem solving, make up an increasing percentage of the workforce. Therefore, for organizations to get peak performance from its creative workforce, they can reward excellence with challenges, values the work over the tools, and

minimizes hassles (Kolb et al., 2007). But Ferrin and Dirks (2008), urged that recognition as a reward does not have to be sophisticated or time consuming. Instead recognize system should be basic and easy to implement program. Thus, recognition should be part of the performance management process, so that everyone begins to use it; organization should have site-specific recognition ceremonies that are featured in the company's communication outlets such as the weekly newsletter and the bimonthly magazine; let everyone know the steps that managers are taking to use recognition effectively; and solicit recognition ideas from both employees and managers, as they are the one who are most likely to know what works well and what does not.

iii. Benefits as Organizational Rewards

Every permanent employee receives benefits even though they often seem to unaware and not know the usually high monetary value of these benefits. Even though employees may not be aware, the facts are that benefits constitute a large percentage of most company's expenses. Though the benefits costs are high, it is a vital part of the organization's reward system and helps attract, maintain, and retain outstanding employees. Thus, this reasoning is known as efficiency wage theory which holds that firms save money and become more productive if they pay higher wages and better benefits because they are able to hire and leverage the best talent (Levy, 2006). The benefits portion of the organizational reward system is categorized in two: the traditional and newly emerging benefits used in today's organizational reward system. The traditional ones are those that are offered because they are required by law: National Social Security Fund; Pension Benefits; and Time-off Benefit. But in recent years, a number of benefits have emerged- wellness program and assistance with family related responsibilities (Luthans and Stajkovic, 2009). According to Locke (2006), wellness programs focuses on keeping employees from becoming physically and/ or mentally ill. Thus, employees who exercise regularly and maintain or lose excess weight are less likely to take sick days and thus reduce health insurance premiums and lost productive time. This has made firms to encourage their employees to work out regularly by installing gymnasium or workout center on the premises or offering to finance at least part of the cost of joining local health club. Also employees are being encouraged to exercise by giving them a financial payment. Some encourage their people to keep their weight under control and individual who are heavy are paid to lose the extra weight.

But Barber et al., (2009) argue that without the benefits of an employee's stage of life-child care and elder care- then the employee will be productive and satisfied. Employees drop off their child at the day care center, come by and have lunch with the child, and then pick up the child after work. Thus, some firms have installed TV cameras so employees can view and keep track of their child throughout the day in the center. For elder care, referral service are used by an employee who has a disabled parent or long term health care insurance, which provides for nursing homes or at home care. Also employee assistance programs (EAP) design to assist alcoholic and drug abuse

employees; marital problems; and financial planning problem that affect job performance and job satisfaction.

iv. Promotion as Organizational Reward

Performance-based compensation is probably the most compatible with expectancy theory. That is employees should perceive a strong relationship between their performance and the rewards they receive if motivation is to be maximize. If rewards are allocated solely on non-performance factors such as seniority, job title, or across the board cost of living raises – then employees are likely to reduce their efforts (Dirks, 2008). But Bono (2010) argues that competency based compensation program reward employees on the basis of the skills, knowledge, or behaviors employees possess. These competencies may include such behaviors and skills as leadership, problem solving, decision making or strategic planning. These rewards increases in a competency-based system are awarded for growth in personal competencies as well as for the contribution one makes to the overall organization. Accordingly, an employee's rewards are tied directly to how capable he or she is of contributing to the achievement of the organization's goal and objectives.

Research Methodology

The research design used for this study was descriptive. The populations in this study were 365 full time employees of USIU. The study population was categorized on the basis of various organizational functions these included: Finance and Administration; Operations; Information Communication Technology; Student Affairs; Academic Affairs; and Institutional Planning and Advancement. To obtain the minimum population sample for this study, the study adopted a stratified sampling technique and computed the desired sample size of 79 respondents using Yamane's formula (Israel, 2002). A questionnaire was used as the primary data source in this study. To facilitate analysis of the data each variable in the questionnaire was assigned a numerical representation and responses from each respondent were coded using a defined coding scheme to facilitate in data analysis. Descriptive analysis was used to collect data. Sampling technique used was stratified random sampling where the sample was sub-categorized as heterogeneity sampling to target the selection of elements regarding the population of interest (full time employees) then the data was included and presented in frequency and percentage distributions for variables included in the questionnaires. The data collected in this study was entered into the SPSS program for statistical analysis and was graphically presented using tables.

Results

Questionnaires were used as the primary data collection tool and they were sent to 79 full time employees of USIU who represented the population of interest. The variable from these questionnaires were used to analyze each research objective separately. The researcher received 78 responses (99.99 % response rate) from the 79 questionnaires sent to the USIU employees. Out of the questionnaires sent out, only 1 was not usable as it was not completely filled out. Since 78

responses of all the returned questionnaires were usable, the researcher could use these for analysis and the results would be representative of the entire population targeted.

Descriptive Findings and Analysis

Personal Factors of Employees’ Perception on Job Satisfaction

Respondents were asked to rate how they perceived their job satisfaction of affective disposition, genetic disposition and self-evaluation. They were asked to tick the appropriate response from a five Likert Scale: Strongly Disagree (1); Disagree (2); Neutral (3); Agree (4); and Strongly Agree (5).

Conscientiousness Employees Are Dependable

The study sought to find out if the conscientiousness employees are really dependable. Of the 78 respondents 1.28% was strongly disagreed with the statement, 3.85% Disagreed, 7.69% did not give their view on the statement by ticking neutral, 44.87% agreed, and 42.31% strongly agreed with the statement. Table 1 gives a summary of the results.

Table 1: Conscientiousness Employees Are Dependable

CONSCIENTIOUSNESS EMPLOYEES	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	1.28
Disagree	3	3.85
Neutral	6	7.69
Agree	35	44.87
Strongly Agree	33	42.31
TOTAL	78	100.0

Extraversion Employees Association with Management

The study sought to establish if extraversion employees associated with management. The percentage that strongly disagreed with the statement was 16.66% of the respondents, 26.92% disagreed, 33.33% did not give their views by ticking neutral. But 11.54% of the respondents agreed, and 11.54% strongly agreed with the statement. This analysis is illustrated by table 2.

Table 2: Extraversion Employees Associate with Management

EXTRAVERSION EMPLOYEES	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	13	16.66
Disagree	21	26.92
Neutral	26	33.33
Agree	9	11.54
Strongly Agree	9	11.54
TOTAL	78	100.0

Agreeableness Employees Handle Customer Relation Effectively

The study sought to find out if agreeableness employees handle customer relation effectively. Of the respondents who answered, 5.13% strongly disagreed with the statement, 8.97% disagreed, and 2.56% did not give their views by ticking neutral. But 43.59% agreed and 39.74% strongly agreed with the statement. This is illustrated on Table 3.

Table 3: Agreeableness Employees Handle Customer Relation Effectively

AGREEABLES EMPLOYEES	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Agree	4	5.13
Disagree	7	8.97
Neutral	2	2.56
Agree	34	43.59
Strongly Agree	31	39.74
TOTAL	78	100.0

Open to Experience Employees Make Better Decision

The study sought to establish if open to experience employees make better decision. The percentage of respondents who strongly disagreed with the statement was 5.13% and 1.28% disagreed. The percentage of respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral was 12.82%. But 37.18% agreed and 43.59% strongly agreed with the statement. Table 4 illustrates the results.

Table 4: Open to Experience Employees makes Better Decision

OPEN TO EXPERIENCE	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	4	5.13
Disagree	1	1.28
Neutral	10	12.82
Agree	29	37.18
Strongly Agree	34	43.59
TOTAL	78	100.0

Genes Determine Employees Personalities

The study aimed at establishing if genes determine employee’s personalities. The respondents who gave their view on this statement, 12.82% strongly disagreed, and 19.23% disagreed. Of the respondents who ticked neutral were 42.31%. But 15.38% agreed and 10.26% strongly agreed with the statement. This is summarized on Table 5.

Table 5: Genes Determine Employees Personalities

GENES AND PERSONALITIES	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	10	12.82
Disagree	15	19.23
Neutral	33	42.31
Agree	12	15.38
Strongly Agree	8	10.26
TOTAL	78	100.0

Employees who Score High on OBSE Experience Job Satisfaction

The study aimed at establishing if employees who score high on OBSE experience job satisfaction. The percentage that strongly disagreed with this statement was 8.97% of the respondents while 6.41% disagreed with the statement. Percentage of the respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral was 35.89%. But 38.46% agreed and 10.26% strongly agreed with the statement. The analysis is further supported by the Table 6.

Table 6: Employees who Score High on OBSE Experience Job Satisfaction

OBSE EXPERIENCE	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	7	8.97
Disagree	5	6.41
Neutral	28	35.89
Agree	30	38.46
Strongly Agree	8	10.26
TOTAL	78	100.0

Supervisor who Practice Fairness Boost Employee’s Self Esteem

The study sought to know if supervisors who practice fairness boost employee’s self-esteem. Of the respondents who answered, 1.28% strongly disagreed with the statement, and 1.28% disagreed. The percentage of respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral was 6.41%. But 39.74% of the respondents agreed and 51.28% strongly agreed with the statement. This analysis is further supported by the Table 7.

Table 7: Supervisors who Practice Fairness Boost Employee’s Self-Esteem

PRACTICE FAIRNESS	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	1.28
Disagree	1	1.28
Neutral	5	6.41
Agree	31	39.74
Strongly Agree	40	51.28
TOTAL	78	100.0

Social Factors of Employees’ Perception on Job Satisfaction

The second objective of this study was to establish the effect of social factors on job satisfaction. Respondents were asked to respond by ticking strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree to a set of statements that were given.

Subordinates Who Enjoy Working with Their Supervisors Are Satisfied

The study sought to find if subordinates who enjoy working with their supervisors are satisfied. Out the 78 respondents 1.28% strongly disagreed with the statement and 3.85% disagreed. The percentage of respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral was 1.28%. But 39.74% agreed and 53.85% strongly agreed. Table 8 summarizes the results of the analysis.

Table 8: Subordinates who Enjoy working with their Supervisors are satisfied

ENJOY WORKING	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	1.28
Disagree	3	3.85
Neutral	1	1.28
Agree	31	39.74
Strongly Agree	42	53.85
TOTAL	78	100.0

Subordinates Love Supervisors who are Transformational Leaders

The study sought to establish if subordinates love supervisors who are transformational leaders. The percentage that strongly disagreed with this statement was 6.41% of the respondents, and 11.54% disagreed. Respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral were 2.56%. But 38.46% agreed and 41.03% strongly agreed. This analysis is further supported by the Table 9.

Table 9: Subordinates Love Supervisors who are Transformational Leaders

TRANSFORMATIONAL LEADERS	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	5	6.41
Disagree	9	11.54
Neutral	2	2.56
Agree	30	38.46
Strongly	32	41.03
TOTAL	78	100.0

Supervisors Fail to Provide Clear Guidelines Leading to Ambiguity

The study aimed at establishing if supervisors fail to provide clear guidelines leading to ambiguity. Of the respondents who gave their view on this statement, 2.56% strongly disagreed, and 7.69% disagreed. The percentage of respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral was 23.08%. But 32.05% agreed and 34.62% strongly agreed. This is illustrated on Table 10.

Table 10: Supervisors Fail to Provide Clear Guidelines Leading to Ambiguity

AMBIGUITY	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	2	2.56
Disagree	6	7.69
Neutral	18	23.08
Agree	25	32.05
Strongly Agree	27	34.62
TOTAL	78	100.0

Subordinates’ perception on Good Fit with Organization Perform Better

The study sought to establish that subordinates who perceive a good fit with organization perform better. The percentage that strongly disagreed with the statement was 11.54% of the respondents and 14.10% disagreed. Of the respondents who gave their views in the study, 25.64% were neutral on this statement. But 33.33% agreed and 15.38% strongly agreed with the statement. This analysis is summarized on Table 11.

Table 11: Subordinate who perceive Good Fit with Organization Perform Better

GOOD FIT	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	9	11.54
Disagree	11	14.10
Neutral	20	25.64
Agree	26	33.33
Strongly Agree	12	15.38
TOTAL	78	100.0

Employees’ Perception of the Fairness of Policies Affect their Attitude

The researcher sought to establish if employee’s perception of the fairness of policies affect their attitude. Respondents who strongly disagree with this statement were 1.28% and 1.28% disagreed. The percentage of respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral was 1.28%. But 39.74% agreed and 56.41% strongly agreed. Table 12 illustrates this.

Table 12: Employees’ Perception of the Fairness of Policies Affect Their Attitude

FAIRNESS OF POLICIES	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	1.28
Disagree	1	1.28
Neutral	1	1.28
Agree	31	39.74
Strongly Agree	44	56.41
TOTAL	78	100.0

Organizational Factors of Employees’ Perception on Job Satisfaction

The third and final objective of this study was to establish the effect of organizational factors on job satisfaction. Respondents were asked to respond by ticking strongly disagree, disagree, neutral, agree, and strongly agree to set of statements that were given. The summary of the responses is given below.

Money as Reward System Must Be Objective and Fair

The study sought to find out if money as reward system must be objective and fair. Respondents were asked their perception and 1.28% was strongly disagreed with the statement, 1.28% disagreed, and 3.85% did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral. But 55.13% agreed and 38.46% strongly agreed. This is summarized on Table 13.

Table 13: Money as Reward System must be Objective and Fair

MONEY AS REWARD	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	1	1.28
Disagree	1	1.28
Neutral	3	3.85
Agree	43	55.13
Strongly Agree	30	38.46
TOTAL	78	100.0

Recognition should be Part of Performance Management

The study sought to establish if recognition should be part of performance management. The percentage of respondents that strongly disagreed with this statement was 2.56%, 3.85% disagreed,

and 12.82% did not give their view on the statement thus selected neutral. But 46.15% agreed and 34.62% strongly agreed. These results are illustrated on Table 14.

Table 14: Recognition should be Part of Performance Management

RECOGNITION AS REWARD	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Distribution
Strongly Disagree	2	2.56
Disagree	3	3.85
Neutral	10	12.82
Agree	36	46.15
Strongly Agree	27	34.62
TOTAL	78	100.0

X and Y - Generation Prefer Different kind of Benefit Systems

The study sought to establish if X and Y-Generation prefer different kind of benefit systems. Of the respondents who answered, 25.64% strongly disagreed, 32.05% disagreed with this statement, and 3.85% did not give their view on the statement thus selected neutral. But 23.08% agreed and 15.38% strongly agreed. Table 15 illustrates the results of the analysis.

Table 15: X and Y-Generation prefer Different Kind of Benefit Systems

X AND Y GENERATION	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	20	25.64
Disagree	25	32.05
Neutral	3	3.85
Agree	18	23.08
Strongly Agree	12	15.38
TOTAL	78	100.0

Promotion Reward should be on Performance Based Compensation

The study sought to find out if promotion reward should be on performance based compensation. Respondents who strongly disagreed with this statement were 6.41%, 5.13% disagreed, and the percentage of respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting neutral was 1.28%. 47.4% agreed and 39.7% strongly agreed. But the percentage of respondents who did not give their view on the statement by selecting anything was 2.0%. Table 16 summaries this analysis.

Table 16: Promotion Reward should be on Performance Based Compensation

PROMOTION AS REWARD	DISTRIBUTION	
	Frequency	Percent
Strongly Disagree	5	6.41
Disagree	4	5.13
Neutral	1	1.28
Agree	37	47.44
Strongly Disagree	31	39.74
TOTAL	78	100.0

Conclusion

The effect of Personal Characteristics on Job Satisfaction

This study established that one’s affective disposition is related to one’s level of job satisfaction. In other words, some individuals respond to the world in a favourable way, while others respond in an unfavourable way. It was concluded that whether the consistency in job satisfaction is due to genetic or environmental factors, a series of personality variables appear to be related to job satisfaction. That is, certain types of personalities are associated with the tendency to be satisfied or dissatisfied with one’s job.

The Effect of Social Factors on Job Satisfaction

The study established that two specific variables have been prominent in this research – role ambiguity is the extent to which employees are uncertain about what their job functions and responsibilities are. Role conflict arises when people experience incompatible demands either at work (intrarole) or between work and non-work (extrarole). It was concluded that employees who perceive a good fit with their organization, job, co-worker, and supervisor tend to be satisfied with their jobs, identify with the organization, remain with the organization, perform better and engage in organizational citizenship behaviors.

The Effect of Organizational Factors on Job Satisfaction

The research study also found out that an effective system for rewarding people has to address three considerations. First, the organization must ask itself what outcomes it is seeking-higher profits increased sales, and greater market share. Second, the enterprise must be able to measure these results. Third, the organization must tie its rewards to these outcomes. The study concluded that employee’s rewards are tied directly to how capable he or she is contributing to the achievement of the organization’s goals and objectives.

Recommendations

The Effect of Personal Characteristics on Job Satisfaction

It is not nature alone but nature and nurture that contribute to one's personality. Therefore, the genes affect brains functions that in turn affect how people interact with their environment and thus their personalities. Thus, all Big Five traits should be given attention in the study and application of organizational behavior.

The Effect of Social Factors on Job Satisfaction

USIU human resource department should propose organizational restructuring that influences the natures of interactions at work which affect coworker relationships and which in turn affect job satisfaction. Indeed, should departments in organization are restructured; attitudes about coworkers will predict job, as well as life satisfaction.

The Effect of Organizational Factors on Job Satisfaction

Reward systems should be designed to reward effective employee's performance and enhance employee's satisfaction and commitment. Also, they should be designed to meet the specific and changing needs of the employees. Thus, USIU should go through a trial-and-error approach before they settle into unique systems that works best for their full-time employees.

Acknowledgement

I am truly grateful to my Organizational Development Research Method lecturer, Dr. Zachary Mosoti, whose guidance, extreme patience, and help were instrumental in making this work reality. I would like to thank the United States International University full time employees that participated in this survey and graciously granted their time for interviews. I express my appreciation to every person especially Asha Suleiman, Eric Kemei, Frank Assekko, and Daudi Boaz who supported me in different ways to achieve this goal. Special thanks are reserved for my wife and family for their unyielding support and encouragement through my work.

References

- Babbie, E. (2009). *The Practice of Social Research*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Wadsworth.
- Barber, E. A., Dunham, B. R. & Formisano, A. R. (2009). The Impact of Flexible Benefits on Employee Satisfaction: A Field Study. *Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 45, pp. 55-57.
- Baron, A. R. (2007). *Behavior in Organizations*. Boston, MA: Wiley.
- Barrick, R. M. & Mount, K. M. (2008). The Big Five Personality Dimension and Job Performance: *Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 51, pp. 849-857.
- Bono, E. J. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. Los Angeles, CA: Sage Publications. Branden, N. (2008). *Self-Esteem at Work*. Boston, MA: Houghton Mifflin.

- Cohen-Charash, Y. & Spector, E. P. (2003). The Role of Justice in Organization: *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*. Vol. 86, pp.278-321.
- Cooper, D. R., & Schindler, P. (2008). *Business Research Methods*. Jersey City, NJ: Prentice- Hall.
- Cropanzano, R. (2007). The Relationship of Emotional Exhaustion to Work Attitude: *Applied Psychology*. Vol. 50, pp. 953-968.
- Dirks, T. K. (2008). The Use of Rewards to Increase and Decrease Trust: *Organization Science*. Vol. 14, pp. 18-31.
- Distenfanso, K. M. & Pryer, W. M. (2009). Perception of Leadership and Job Satisfaction: *Internal and External Employee Research*. Vol. 67, pp. 24-47.
- Dwyer, D. J. & Ganster, D. C. (2006). The Effects of Job Demands and Control on Employee Attendance and Satisfaction: *Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 12, pp. 595-608.
- Eisenberger, R., Armeli, S., Rexwinkel, B., Lynch, P., & Rhodes, L. (2007). Reciprocation of Perceived Organizational Support: *Behavioral Neuroscience*. Vol. 86, pp. 42-51.
- Ferrin, L. D. & Dirks, T. K. (2008). The Use of Rewards to Increase and Decrease Trust: *Organization Science*. Vol. 14, pp. 18-31.
- Greenberg, J. & Robert, A. B. (2004). *Behavior in Organization*. Jersey City, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Greengrass, M. (2005). Emotion and Cognition Work Together in the Brain: *Monitor on Psychology*. Vol. 33, pp. 18-25.
- Gully, H. M. (2012). *Organizational Behavior*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.
- Israel, G.D. (2002). *Determining Sample Size*. Gainesville, FL: Thomson-Wadsworth.
- Judge, A. T. & Bono, E. J. (2010). Relationship of Core Self-Evaluation Traits-With Job Satisfaction: *Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 86, pp. 80-92.
- Kirkman, L. B., & Shapiro, L. D. (2011). The Impact of Cultural Values on Job Satisfaction in Self-Managing Work Teams: *Role of Employee Resistance*. Vol. 44, pp. 557-569.
- Kolb, D., Rubin, I. & McIntyre, J. (2007). *Organizational Psychology*. Jersey City, NJ: Prentice-Hall.
- Kreitner, R. & Kinicki, A. (2009). *Organizational Behavior*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.
- Kristof, L. A. (2005). An Integrative Review of its Conceptualizations, Measurement, and Implications: *Person-Organization Fit*. Vol. 49, pp. 1-49
- Lee, T. W., Mitchel, T. R., Holtom, B. C., McDaniel, L. S. & Hill, J. W. (2006). The Unfolding Model of Voluntary Turnover: *Academy of Management*. Vol. 32, pp. 450-462.
- Levy, E. P. (2006). *Industrial/Organizational Psychology: Understanding the Workplace*. Boston,

MA: Houghton Mifflin.

Liao, H. & Rupp, D. E. (2006). The Impact of Justice Climate and Justice Orientation on Work Outcomes: *A Cross Level Multifoci Framework*. Vol. 64, pp. 224-238.

Locke, E. A. (2006). The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction: *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Vol. 12, pp. 22-36.

Lord, R. G., Klimoski, R. J., & Kanfer, R. (2002). Emotions in the Workplace: *Understanding the Structure and Role of Emotions in Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 18, pp. 341-355.

Luthans, F. & Stajkovic, D. A. (2009). Behavioral Management and Task Performance in Organization: *Personnel Psychology*. Vol. 56, pp.155-194.

McShane, L. S. & Glinov, M. V. (2011). *Organizational Behavior*. Boston, MA: McGraw-Hill.

Mitchell, R. T. & Wood, E. R. (2007). Supervisors Responses to Subordinate Poor Performance: *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. Vol. 14, pp. 123-138.

Mossholder, K. W., Bedeian, A. G., & Armenakis, A. A. (2007). Moderating Effects of Self-Esteem and Organizational Level: *Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 28, pp. 224-234.

Myers, G. D. (2008). *Social Psychology*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Nelson, L. D., & Quick, C. J. (2010). *Organizational Behavior*. Columbus, OH: South-Western.

Robertson, T. I., & Baron, H. (2009). Conscientiousness and Managerial Performance: *Occupational Psychology*. Vol. 73, pp. 171-180.

Schwartz, J. & Rock, D. (2007). The Neuroscience of Leadership: *Strategy and Business*. Vol. 43, pp. 1-10.

Scott, L., Shaw, D. J., & Duffy, K. M. (2008). Merit Pay Raises and Organization-Based Self-Esteem: *Organizational Behavior*. Vol. 29, pp. 967-980.

Spector, E. P. (2008). *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. New York, NY: John Wiley.

Toulouse, J. M. (2008). Top Executive Locus of Control: *Relationship to Strategy Making, Structure, and Environment*. Vol. 32, pp. 237-253.

USIU. (2004). *Employees Handbook*. Nairobi, KE: USIU Library.



©2024 by the Authors. This Article is an open access article distributed under the terms and conditions of the Creative Commons Attribution (CC BY) license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by/4.0/>)