



Impact of Psychosocial Work Environment on Job Performance of Senior Staff Administrators

Samuel Kwame Anyan¹ & Sarah Takyi² & Ernest Kingsley Enyan³ & Iddrisu Abubakar⁴
& Sampson Kofi Asare⁵ & Monica Boateng⁶

^{1,3,5} Directorate of Internal Audit, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

² Department of Education and Psychology, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

⁴ Directorate of Finance, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

⁶ Campus Internal Audit, Akenten Appiah Menkah University of Skills Training and Entrepreneurial Development, Mampong, Ghana

Correspondence: Samuel Kwame Anyan, University of Cape Coast, Ghana

Email: samuel.anyan@ucc.edu.gh

DOI: 10.53103/cjess.v5i1.310

Abstract

A variety of factors, including the psychosocial work environment can influence an organisation's production level. An employee's job performance can be high or low depending on the working environment. Using correlational research design, the impact of the psychosocial work environment (task demand, role clarity, degree of freedom, job happiness, and performance feedback) on senior staff administrative workers' job performance (contextual and task performance) on the UCC campus was explored in this study. Preliminary analysis showed that Males were 58 and females were 50. The relationship between the variables was investigated using the correlational research design. The data was analysed using the Pearson moment correlation and independent sample t-test. The results revealed a statistically significant relationship between psychosocial work environment and job performance $r(106) = .59, p < .01$. The results also indicated that males and females differed in the psychosocial work environment $t(106) = -3.34, p < .01$. Employers should strive to create a humane working atmosphere free of stress, and threats, and danger. Employers must also provide the necessary resources to assist employees in improving their job performance.

Keywords: Work Environment, Psychosocial Work Environment, Job Performance, Staff Administrators

Introduction

The psychosocial work environment has been a frequently investigated topic in the last ten decades. A pertinent aspect of an employee's job performance is their psychosocial work environment. Employers and organisations usually require optimal performance from

their employees yet some of them trivialise the psychosocial factors of their work milieu which largely affect the optimal performance of these employees or workers. An effective psychosocial work environment enables employees to be elated, and comfortable and it ultimately influences their work performance and contribution; thereby affecting productivity and economic growth.

The term psychosocial work environment concerns the employees' work and working conditions. The psychological variables include our views and interpretations of work-related issues, whereas the social factors comprise the social milieu's effect and interpersonal factors. The psychological work environment of an employee can take many different forms and frequently consists of a wide range of elements, including leadership support, job demands, work control, organisational climate and culture, etc. Alfredsson et al. (1982) define a psychosocial work environment as the interaction between the individual's personal experiences and the characters of the workplace. This means there exists a reciprocal interaction between the employee and his workplace. Whether or not an employee's job performance would be optimal largely depends on the constituents in his psychosocial work environment. Therefore, employers must endeavour to create a humane psychosocial work environment devoid of stress and anything that can be deleterious to the productiveness of an employee.

Individual job performance is an important subject in the study of Industrial and Organisational Psychology and Business (Sonnetag & Frese, 2002). Despite its central role in most human resource decisions, there is still no complete theory of job performance (Campbell, 1990; Deadrick & Gardner, 2008). Job performance is defined as an individual's overall expected value to an organisation over a specific period. This is a drastically changed version of a previous definition of performance that was offered in conjunction with a concept of individual variances in task and contextual performance (Motowidlo et al., 1997). Job performance is also a multidimensional construct that includes individuals, contextual (or situational), and control variables (DeNisi & Kluger, 2000; Sonnetag & Frese, 2002). Some factors (such as motivation and job contentment) that influence performance, rather than just personal attributes, should be included when evaluating one's performance. Individual job performance may be influenced by task characteristics (the amount of knowledge and experience required of individuals for the task) and the working environment.

A healthy workplace is assumed to create a work environment that contributes to employees' job performance. A work environment where tasks and responsibilities can be accomplished within the time available results from an interplay between an individual's psychological and social aspects. These factors such as job satisfaction, role clarity, physical environment, work demand and the interaction between workers work hand in hand to determine how healthy the work environment would be. An improper and unfavourable psychosocial work environment can lead to stress and its related conditions

which go a long run to affect the productivity of an employee.

According to Opperman (2002), the psychosocial work environment is the procedures, systems, structures, tools, and situations at work that influence an individual's performance positively or negatively. Policies, rules, work cultures, resources, work relationships, and other internal and external elements that influence how individuals do their jobs are also included. Most studies on psychosocial work environments were done in Western countries such as America, Europe, and Asia which lie in a different ecological jurisdiction than Africa, specifically Ghana. For example, Adwi et al. (2018) conducted a study on the influence of psychosocial work environment on the job performance of Nurses and Its Implication on turnover Intention in Bahteramas Hospital of Southeast Sulawesi Province and found a link between psychosocial work environment and job performance. This research intended to see if it could attain a similar result. Furthermore, research on the impact of gender on job performance is mixed; some studies demonstrate that women are more productive and have higher job performance than men (Green et al., 2018). Contrary to this, the American Times Use Survey (2018) posited that males are a bit more likely to be productive and have high job performance levels as compared to the opposite sex. This paper examined the impact of the psychosocial work environment on employee performance in the confines of the University of Cape Coast, Ghana using senior staff administrators. It also explored which gender among the senior staff administrators have higher job performance levels.

This paper would give useful information on measures to curb psychosocial risk factors at the workplace. Also, it would make way for administrators to voice out their ratings about their daily, monthly, or annual work performance and what they think is the contributing factor of such ratings. Finally, it would guide organisations and employers to implement strategies to curb psychosocial risk factors in the workplace. The following research questions and hypotheses were discussed.

Research Questions

Research question 1: What is the level of psychosocial work environment among senior staff administrators in UCC?

Research question 2: What is the level of job performance among senior staff administrative workers on UCC Campus?

Research Hypotheses

1. **H₁:** There is a significant relationship between the psychosocial work environment and job performance among senior staff administrators in UCC.
2. **H₁:** There is a significant gender difference in the psychosocial work environment

among UCC senior staff administrators.

Theoretical Background

It has been proven that employee motivation has a direct link to job performance. Several management theories, such as Henry Gantt's (1913) work on works, wages, and profits, have supported this assumption; consequently, it is ideal to apply pertinent motivational theory in industrial and organisational psychology to support this study.

The Goal – Setting Theory

Locke (1968) proposed the goal-setting theory. Goals, according to this theory, have a vital role in motivating employees to achieve higher levels of performance. According to goal-setting theory, establishing specific, measurable goals is more successful than establishing vague ones. Employees are more motivated by well-defined goals and constructive feedback, according to Locke, and are more likely to achieve these goals if they are clear and measurable. The key here is human-to-human engagement, with each employee given personalised assistance and encouragement (Salaman et al., 2005). Employee performance is a multifaceted concept that attempts to achieve goals and is closely linked to an organisation's strategic objectives (Abbas & Yaqoob, 2009). Performance is a multi-character component that aims to produce outcomes and is closely linked to the organisation's strategic goals (Sabir et al., 2012). This notion gives employees a sense of pride and purpose in their jobs by providing them with a pleasant, comfortable, gratifying, and exciting work environment. How people feel, as well as their work performance, loyalty to their employer, and the development of new knowledge in the workplace, are all influenced by how the workplace is designed and filled (Taiwo, 2009). Management of the University of Cape Coast can get the best out of their employees when they set clear and specific goals devoid of ambiguity. Also, they must provide clear roles for employees and give them regular feedback to ensure that their work is carried out successfully. Role clarity and regular feedback can cause motivation which may lead to job satisfaction and can affect employees' job performance.

McGregor Theory X and Theory Y

McGregor (1960) developed a human behaviour-based theory of motivation. He asserts that certain presumptions about human nature are necessary to motivate others. Theory X and Theory Y are two sets of presumptions regarding human nature. People who lack motivation and would rather be led, those who desire stability, and those who detest labour and try to avoid it are all taken into account by Theory X. The management

implications for Theory X employees were that a firm would have to implement a system of control, punishment, and coercion to achieve organisational goals. Theory Y considers work effort to be similar to leisure or play for persons who are not dissatisfied with their occupations. Depending on the working conditions, those who want responsibility may see work as a source of fulfilment or punishment (if they are motivated). Rewards of various kinds are likely to be the most popular incentive for accomplishing organisational objectives, which has management implications for Theory X staff. With Theory Y personnel, the challenge for management is to create a work environment (or culture) that enables individuals to express and develop their creativity. Employees must identify who their workers are in relationship to their level of commitment and attitude when it comes to achieving organisational objectives. Some workers have a high need for achievement. This means that they are not lazy, they put in their maximum effort when a task is placed in front of them. Others may have to be motivated to achieve the set goals and targets of an organisation. Therefore, they may need some form of support which could be in the form of motivation, rewards, persuasion or even punishment to get them to work.

Level of Psychosocial Work Environment

Studies examining the levels of psychosocial work environment among senior staff administrators are scarce. Söderberg et al. (2014) indicated that if employees perceive their psychosocial level to be low in terms of their effort and reward, they are likely to change jobs. Agervold and Mikkelsen (2006) expressed that a poor psychosocial work environment contributes to bullying and also reported that bullied employees showed more indications of stress and mental fatigue.

Onuoha et al. (2016) found that there exists high role clarity among library personnel in some selected universities in Nigeria. In their empirical studies, Donnelly and Ivancevich (1975) revealed that role clarity may be an important factor in maximising a salesman's job performance. Hassan (2013) stated that most employees reported high role clarity and that results in high job satisfaction. Pijnacker (2019) confirmed this claim that about 53% of employees receive high role clarity. There exists a positive correlation between role clarity and the general efficiency of employees (Samie et al. 2015). In a review study titled "The importance of role clarification in workgroups: Effects on perceived role clarity, work satisfaction, and turnover rates," according to Hassan (2013), offices with high levels of role clarity had higher levels of job satisfaction and lower rates of change.

On employee's degree of freedom, Dobin and Boychuk (2012) explained that high job autonomy exists among Nordic countries than the USA, Canada and Australia. Contrary to this, researchers from the University of Birmingham (2017) reported that high job autonomy exists among managers but non-managers had a low degree of freedom at

work. Wheatley (2017) expressed that higher levels of control over one's work or job and schedules have the propensity to generate significant benefits for employees. A lower level of degree of freedom is associated with lower well-being on weekdays (Ryan et al., 2010).

Job demand may trigger a variety of stress-related symptoms in employees at both somatic level and psychological level (Albertsen et al, 2001). Kokroko and Sanda (2018) revealed that there exists high job demand among Ghanaian OPD nurses. This was supported by Horttordze (2018) when he revealed in his study that there exists a high workload in Ghanaian Hospitals. According to a meta-analysis by Kluger and DeNisi (1996), employees' job performance generally improves when they receive performance feedback.

Relationship between Psychosocial Work Environment and Job Performance

According to Huges (2007), nine out of ten workers believe that the quality of the work environment affects employee attitudes, which in turn affects productivity. A dangerous and toxic work environment, according to Chandraker (2011), has an impact on employee productivity and health. Hameed and Amjad (2009) found that a serene psychosocial work environment, as well as a pleasant and ergonomic office design, encourages employees and significantly increases their productive performance in a survey of 31 bank locations. According to Adwi et al. (2018), a psychosocial work environment has a significant and favourable impact on employee job satisfaction and performance. In their survey, Oyewole and Popoola (2013) found that psychosocial characteristics like self-concept, work-family conflict, job satisfaction, and workplace stress had a substantial impact on library personnel job performance.

Furthermore, role clarity is a necessary precursor to productivity, and its absence can lead to stress and uncertainty (Pijnacker, 2019). Role clarity, according to Mukherjee and Malhotra (2005), has a favourable impact on a variety of employee outcomes, including job satisfaction, job performance, and organisational commitment. Lack of role clarity, on the other side, causes stress among employees, which can negatively affect creativity (Jackson & Schuler, 1985). When employees are clear about their jobs, they do not need to be told what to do every day and may use their spare time to come up with and implement new ideas (Ohly & Pluntke, 2006). Employees that are confused and lack role clarity, according to Onyemah (2008), spend more time figuring out what they are supposed to do instead of completing their jobs successfully. Role clarity is pertinent in determining an employee's job performance.

The exploratory study in top five companies in Bahrain by Bouguila (2019) revealed a moderate level of degree of freedom. Davidescu et al. (2020) in their study confirmed a moderate level of degree of freedom among Romanian employees. High

degree of freedom on a job could give employees time, energy, and autonomy to engage in certain behaviours, thereby improving their willingness and motivation to develop and plan further (Hackman & Oldham, 1975).

Most researches focus on these aspects of work demand: high workload (Petitta & Vecchioine, 2011; Schmidt & Diestal, 2013) time pressure (De Rijk et al., 1998; Van Doorn & Hulshegar, 2015), and work-family conflict. All of these three influence employees' job performances. Demerouti et al. (2001) postulated that as job or work demand increases, employees' psychological resources are highly drained. This causes negative work outcomes if enough requisite resources of employees are not available. Numerous empirical studies have supported the existence of this relationship. For example, Schaufeli et al. (2002) study is of the view that work demand could cause work burnout. Work demand can be negative if employees do not have the resources to respond to the demands of their work (De Spiegelaere et al. 2012). Ceschi et al. (2017) also found that work demand can cause counterproductive work behaviours through emotional exhaustion. In a case of high work demand, the constant consumption of employees' resources leaves them unable to cope with these demands. Study from Neelawala and Parent-Thirion (2021) revealed that job demands have a significant positive impact on workplace stress and job performance. Not many studies have been done on performance feedback and job performance. However, according to a meta-analysis by Kluger and DeNisi (1996), performance feedback enhances job performance on average. As confirmed by Neubert (1998), combining performance feedback with goal setting improves performance.

More than thirty research have been carried out by Kornhanuser and Sharp (1976) to determine the connection between industrial sector performance and work satisfaction. Many research investigations have shown that performance and job happiness are positively correlated. The findings of Mirvis and Lawer (1977) on the association between job happiness and performance were unequivocal. They provided arguments that satisfied tellers were less likely to show shortages and were less likely to leave their employment when attempting to measure the performance of bank tellers in terms of cash shortages. Smith and Cranny (1968) conducted a review of the literature and found that satisfaction is linked to performance, effort, dedication, and intention. The findings from the Relay Assembly test room in the Western Electric study (1966) demonstrated a dramatic trend for higher employee productivity to be associated with an improvement in job satisfaction. Porter and Lowler (1974) proposed that a worker's effort is affected by satisfaction, suggesting that increasing pleasure from performance possibilities helps to enhance performance expectations, which leads to rewards. Carroll et al. (1964) discovered that job satisfaction and productivity are intertwined and affect each other. Based on the above types of literature, we can deduce that an employee's job satisfaction affects his job performance.

Gender Differences in Psychosocial Work Environment

Westerburg and Aremelius (2000) opined women had less satisfying psychosocial work environments. Women also reported having less job control, more job strain (due to low job control and high job demands), and more co-worker support. Job insecurity was similar for men and women. (Padkapayeva et al., 2018).

Yadev and Kumar (2017) found that women had higher role clarity as compared to men. Contrary to this Busch and Bush (1978) in their article on job satisfaction, values role clarity and propensity among industrial salesforce showed that women had lower role clarity than men. The inconsistencies in these studies gave us the nod to check for the gender difference in role clarity in our study.

Concerning the degree of freedom at work or job autonomy, Adler (2005) in her logistic regression analysis revealed that there is no difference in males and females in their degree of freedom at work. This was confirmed by Ecker (2015) in his study of gender differences in job autonomy in Sweden and the United States showed that there was no significant gender difference in the degree of freedom at work in the U.S. However, the level of degree of freedom at work was lower than that of Sweden. In contrast, women experience lower job autonomy than males (Ecker 2015, Fagan & Burchell 2002). Sjorgren & Kristenson (2006) supported this finding in their study of Swedish public workers. Fagan and Burchell (2002) explained that men in European countries experienced a higher level of degree of freedom than women. This study explored the gender gaps concerning employee's degree of freedom.

Furthermore, women are systematically less likely to receive specific feedback tied to outcomes. Women receive more vague performance appraisal feedback than men, who are more likely to receive more specific feedback tied to business outcomes (Correll & Simard, 2016).

Moreover, A cross-sectional study of psychosocial work and stress in 441 Danish symphony musicians revealed that female musicians reported higher work demands and higher stress levels (Holst et al., 2012). In contradistinction, Nyberg et al. (2015) explored the psychosocial work factors, work-personal life interface and well-being between managers and non-managers in the private sector showed both males and females reported high job demand. Men have higher job demands in terms of cognitive and psychological demands than females (Borkins, 2015).

Studies have also confirmed that women show greater job satisfaction than males (Sloane & Williams, 2000; Zou, 2015). Kaiser (2007) reported that women have greater job satisfaction than men in female-dominated jobs. In their highly cited paper, Redmond and McGuinness (2019) opined women, on average, are more satisfied than men. On the contrary, Banerjee and Perrucci (2010) revealed that gender and race segregation does not impact job satisfaction but having supportive co-workers does. Men's sales managers had

higher extrinsic job satisfaction than females (Gustainiene, & Endriulaitiene, 2009). The gap in gender on job satisfaction has been explored in this study.

Methodology

To gather information from respondents, the study adopted a quantitative approach. The research design for this study was correlational. The goal of this study was to find out if there was a link between the psychosocial work environment and job performance and identify the gender differences in psychosocial work environments. The researcher employed a correlational research strategy to look into the link between the two variables without controlling or modifying any of them. The strength and/or orientations of a link between two or more variables might be positive, zero, or negative in correlation. A survey was used to determine the impact of the psychosocial work environment on workers' job performance. This sort of study allows the researcher to employ a variety of approaches to recruit participants, gather data, and instrument the study. Surveys are often utilised in social and psychological research. (Singleton & Straits, 2009).

A total of 594 senior administrative staff of the University of Cape Coast served as the theoretical population for this study. A total of 437 were males and 157 were females (Directorate of Human Resource, 2021). The accessible population of 150 was picked from four of the University of Cape Coast's colleges (College of Agriculture and Natural Sciences, College of Health and Allied Sciences, College of Humanities and Legal Studies and College of Education). The sample was picked from this accessible population.

The purpose of sampling was to allow the researcher to extrapolate from the sample to the entire population (Babbie, 1990). When a population is too large to accommodate all possible members, statistical testing uses samples. A sample size of 108 was chosen from the accessible population of 150 using Krechie and Morgan's (1970) sample size table. The study revealed that 58 (53.7%) of the respondents were males while 50 (46.3%) were females. This also suggested that we had more males for this study than females for this study. Concerning marital status 43.0(39.8%) were single, 61(56.5%) were married and 4(3.7%) were divorced. In relation to age the mean age was 35.7 years. In terms of highest qualification, majority of the respondents reported having HND/First degree as the highest academic qualification which is 64(59.3%). However, 3 (2.8%) participants also reported to have Ph.D. On the average participants had 6 years working experience. Simple randomised sampling was then used in the administration of questionnaire to respondents. Simple random sampling was used because of its ability to give high internal validity and external validity. Primary data was collected for this research. The instrument for collecting data is the Likert scale questionnaire which was used to elicit response from the participants – senior staff administrative workers from the four colleges in the University of Cape Coast.

Psychosocial Work Environment Scale

A twenty-five scale or items from the Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire II (2003) was adopted to measure the psychosocial work environment. The 6-point Likert-type scale instrument with five dimensions was used ranging from 1=*Strongly disagree*; 2=*Disagree*; 3= *Somewhat disagree*; 4=*Somewhat agree*; 5=*Agree* and 6=*Strongly agree* was used to score all the items under role clarity, degree of freedom at work, job demand, performance feedback and job satisfaction.

Role Clarity

Kristensen et al. (2005) found that reliability for role clarity was .77. From the analysis, adopted items for role clarity were five with a sample item, for example, *I know exactly how much say I have at work* had a reliability coefficient of .78.

Degree of Freedom

Degree of freedom from the study of Kristensen et al. (2005) gave a reliability of .68. This study adopted four items for degree of freedom had a reliability coefficient of .86. A sample item was *I can decide when I take a break*.

Job Demand

Reported reliability for job demand from Kristensen et al. (2005) was .68. Nine items were adopted for job demand in this study. A sample item was *I have to work fast*. The reliability coefficient was .63

Performance Feedback

Kristensen et al. (2005) gave a reliability of .64. Two items were adopted for performance feedback. A sample item was *my superior talks to me about how well I carry out my job*. We had a reliability of .54

Job Satisfaction

Reported reliability for job satisfaction from Kristensen et al. (2005) was .84. Items adopted for job satisfaction were five. Item sample as *I am pleased with my work prospect*. It yielded a reliability of .84

The range of the scale was used to calculate their levels of the psychosocial work

environment and were ranked low or high on the psychosocial work environment depending on their mean scores. Table 1 talks about the range for role clarity, degree of freedom at work, job demand, performance feedback, job satisfaction and the overall psychosocial work environment.

Table 1: Range for variables

Variable	Low	High
Role clarity	5 – 17.5	18 – 30
Degree of freedom	4 – 14	15 – 24
Job demand	9 – 31.5	32 – 54
Performance feedback	2 – 7	8 – 12
Job satisfaction	5 – 17.5	18 – 30
Psychosocial work environment.	25 – 87.5	88 – 150

Job Performance Scale

Items for job performance were adopted from the Goodman & Svyantek (1999) job performance scale. Sixteen items were adopted from this scale. This scale has high psychometric properties with a reliability of .82 (Yusoff et al. 2013). This study adopted sixteen items for job performance with a reliability of .83. Items adopted for contextual performance for this study were seven and had a reliability of .75. A sample item was *I help employees with their work when they are absent*. This study also adopted nine items for task performance and had a reliability coefficient of .79. A sample item was *I achieve the objectives of my job*.

The 6-point Likert-type scale instrument scored on a scale from 1=Strongly disagree; 2=Disagree; 3= Somewhat disagree; 4=Somewhat agree; 5=Agree to 6=Strongly agree. Higher scores indicate higher job performance, contextual and task performance. The range was used to calculate the levels of job performance among UCC senior staff administrators and were ranked low or high depending on their mean scores. Table 2 talks about the range for job performance and the two sub-scales (contextual performance and task performance).

Table 2: Range for job performance, contextual performance and task performance

Variable	Low	High
Job performance	16 – 56	57 – 96
Contextual performance	7 – 24.5	25 – 42
Task performance	9 – 31.5	32 – 54

Before, during, and after the study, the researchers considered a variety of ethical considerations. The study used properly cited articles, journals, books, and other sources. Before the administration of the questionnaires, the respondents were informed of the study's purpose. The respondents' privacy and anonymity were protected. Respondents' identities were kept anonymous too, and they were free to participate or not at any moment. The participants for this study were chosen without any form of discrimination.

Results and Discussions

Results

Table 3: Group statistics for variables

Variable	Mean	SD
Role clarity	25.50	3.41
Degree of freedom	11.86	4.63
Job demand	37.74	4.71
Performance feedback	9.80	1.80
Job satisfaction	23.44	3.83
Contextual performance	32.03	4.20
Task performance	45.77	4.25
psychosocial work environment	107.82	12.09
Job performance	77.80	7.31

Research question one: What is the level of psychosocial work environment among senior staff administrators in UCC?

Table 1 shows the range for psychosocial work environment and the five sub – scales of psychosocial work environment and Table 4 explains the frequency and percentage of the psychosocial work environment and the sub–scale of the psychosocial work environment (role clarity, degree of freedom at work, job demand, performance feedback, job satisfaction).

Table 4: Frequency and Percentage for variables

Variable	Range	Frequency	Percentage
Role clarity	Low	3	2.80
	High	105	97.20
Total		108	100
Degree of freedom	Low	77	71.30
	High	31	28.70
Total		108	100
Job demand	Low	12	8.30
	High	96	88.90
Total		108	100
Performance feedback	Low	9	8.30
	High	99	91.70
Total		108	
Job satisfaction	Low	8	7.4
	High	100	92.6
Total		108	100
Psychosocial work environment	Low	4	3.70
	High	104	96.30
Total		108	100

From Table 4, respondents reported a high level of role clarity, job demand, performance feedback, job satisfaction and the overall psychosocial work environment. This shows that senior staff administrators at the University of Cape Coast have clearly defined roles in their work. The analysis showed that senior work of staff administrators in UCC is demanding. On performance feedback, senior staff administrators reported getting adequate feedback about their jobs and are satisfied with their jobs as well. However, respondents reported a low level of degree of freedom. Thus, senior staff administrators at UCC do not have much autonomy in their jobs.

Research question two: What is the level of job performance of senior staff administrative workers on the UCC Campus?

Table 5 presents the frequency and percentage of the job performance and the sub-scale of the (contextual performance and task performance).

Table 5: Frequency and percentage for job performance, contextual performance and task performance

Variable	Range	Frequency	Percentage
Job performance	Low	1	.09
	High	107	99.10
Total		108	100
Contextual performance	Low	8	7.40
	High	100	92.60
Total		108	100
Task performance	Low	1	.09
	High	107	99.1
Total		108	100

Respondents reported a high level of contextual performance, a high level of task performance and a high level of overall job performance. Thus, senior staff administrators have a high level of job performance (contextual and task) in UCC.

Research hypothesis one: There is a significant relationship between the psychosocial work environment and the job performance of senior staff administrators in UCC.

The first research hypothesis sought to find out the relationship between the psychosocial work environment and the job performance of senior staff administrators. This study also looked at the correlation between role clarity, degree of freedom, job demand and performance feedback and job satisfaction on contextual performance and task performance.

A Significant correlation was found between psychosocial work environment and job performance $r(106) = .59, p < .01$. The analysis showed a high positive correlation between the psychosocial work environment and the job performance of senior staff administrators. This means that a better psychosocial work environment leads to better work performance.

Table 6: Correlation between role clarity, degree of freedom, job demand, performance feedback, job satisfaction on contextual performance and task performance

Variable	1	2	3	4	5	6	
Role clarity	1						
Degree of freedom	.37**	1					
Job demand	.29**	.44**	1				
Performance feedback	.24**	-.06	.29**	1			
Job satisfaction	.34**	.06	.33**	.46**	1		
Contextual performance	.38**	.38**	.38**	.33**	.30**	1	
Task Performance	.44**	.16	.35**	.37**	.36**	.49**	1

**Correlation is significant at .01 (2 – tailed)

Significant moderate correlations were found between role clarity and contextual performance, there was also a significant moderate correlation between role clarity and task performance. There was a significant moderate correlation was found between degree of freedom and contextual performance. Analysis showed that senior staff administrators reported a moderate correlation between job demand and contextual performance and reported a moderate correlation between job demand and task performance. Senior staff administrators reported a moderate relationship between performance feedback and contextual performance with similar reports on performance feedback and task performance. There was a moderate relationship between job satisfaction and contextual performance and similar was reported for job satisfaction and task performance. However, there was no significant correlation between the degree of freedom and task performance $r(106) = .16, p > .11$.

Research hypothesis two: There is a significant gender difference in the psychosocial work environment of UCC senior staff administrators.

The results from the independent sample t-test showed that the homogeneity of variance assumption was not violated ($p = .180$). The results further showed that there's a statistically significant difference between the mean scores of males ($M = 104.38, SD = 11.45$) and females ($M = 111.82, SD = 11.68; t(106) = -3.34, p < .01$) on the psychosocial work environment.

Moreover, this study further explored the gender differences in role clarity, degree of freedom, job demand, performance feedback and job satisfaction in Table 7 and 8.

Table 7: Group Statistics for Gender on role clarity, degree of freedom, job demand, performance feedback and job satisfaction

	Gender	N	Mean	SD
Role clarity	Male	58	25.10	3.14
	Female	50	25.96	3.68
Degree of freedom	Male	58	9.53	3.96
	Female	50	14.56	3.82
Job demand	Male	58	36.52	4.71
	Female	50	39.16	4.33
Performance feedback	Male	58	9.53	1.45
	Female	50	9.00	1.50
Job satisfaction	Male	58	23.69	4.05
	Female	50	23.14	3.56

Table 8: Results of independent sample t – test for gender on role clarity, degree of freedom, job demand, performance feedback and job satisfaction

	Sig (Lev.)	T	Df	Sig (2- tailed)	Mean diff.	Std. Err. Dff.
Role Clarity	.13	-1.31	106	.19	-.87	.66
Degree of freedom	.991	-6.68	106	.00	-5.03	.75
Job Demand	.457	-3.02	106	.00	-2.64	.88
Performance feedback	.982	1.88	106	.06	.53	.28
Job satisfaction	.742	.74	106	.46	.55	.74

There was no statistically significant gender difference between the mean scores of males and females:

On role clarity, males ($M=25.10$, $SD=3.14$), and females ($M=25.96$, $SD=3.68$) Male and female senior staff administrators have clear roles.

on performance feedback, males ($M=9.53$, $SD=1.50$), females ($M=9.00$, $SD=1.50$); $t(106)=-1.88$, $p=.06$). Both male and female senior staff administrators get the necessary feedback about their job.

On job satisfaction, males ($M=23.69$, $SD=4.05$), females ($M=23.14$, $SD=3.56$). Both Male and female senior staff administrators are satisfied with their job in the

University of Cape Coast according to this study.

However, there was a statistically significant gender difference between the mean scores of males and females:

On degree of freedom at work, males ($M=9.53$, $SD=3.96$), females ($M=14.56$, $SD=3.82$). Thus, female senior staff administrators reported a higher degree of freedom at work than their male counterparts in the University of Cape Coast

On job demand, males ($M=36.52$, $SD=4.71$), females ($M=39.16$, $SD=4.33$). Female senior staff administrators had high job demand than males in the UCC

Discussion of the Findings **Level of Psychosocial Work Environment**

Respondents expressed high role clarity and this is similar to Hassan (2013) that most employees reported high role clarity and which results in high job satisfaction. Pijnacker (2019) confirmed this claim that about 53% of employees receive high role clarity. Respondents reported high role clarity because they had clearly defined job descriptions and clear understanding of their tasks, responsibilities, and processes at work (Pijnacker, 2019). Posner and Butterfield (1978) opined that high-performing officers had a greater role clarity. The office of a senior staff administrator is a high-performing office since they work hand in hand with lectures.

Also, more respondents reported lower degree of freedom. Thus, they do not have much autonomy over their job. Thus, they are accountable to their superiors and their superiors ensure thorough scrutiny of every activity they may engage in. This conflicts with the findings from Dobin and Boychuk (2012) which explained that higher job autonomy exists among Nordic countries than in the USA, Canada and Australia. This is because employees' degree of freedom at work or job autonomy varies across nations (Einhorn & Logue, 1982). This study agrees with the findings of University of Birmingham (2017) which reported that high job autonomy exists among managers but non-managers. Administrative staff are not managers, they work under them and are accountable to their superiors at the workplace.

Moreover, respondents reported a high level of job demand. This means that there's high job demand among UCC senior staff administrators. Thus, administrative work requires continuous use of physical and psychological effort to execute their job duties. This is true because, administrative work requires individuals to work for about eight hours (Labour Act, 2003). This is in line with research by The Organisation for Economic Co-Operation and Development (OECD 2006), where Australian full-time workers reported to have a higher job demand and worked an average of 43.4 hours in a week. It is also in line with the study of Kokroko and Sanda (2018) that there exists high job demand among Ghanaian OPD nurses, supported by Horttordze (2018) when he revealed that there exists

a high workload in Ghanaian Hospitals. Though job descriptions of nurses and

Furthermore, respondents showed higher level of performance feedback. Thus, they get the needed appraisal, and coaching from their superiors to make an adjustment and improve in order to succeed on their job. A meta-analysis by Kluger and DeNisi (1996) suggests that performance feedback improves employees' job performance on average.

Again, participants showed high job satisfaction. In other words, senior staff administrators in the University of Cape Coast held positive attitude towards their job. This is not far-fetched from Saiyaden (1993) study that a person with a high degree of job satisfaction has a good attitude toward their job, whereas a person with a low level of job satisfaction has a negative attitude toward their employment.

Lastly, participants reported to have high psychosocial working environment. Thus, the overall psychosocial working environment of senior staff administrators of the university of cape coast was favourably high.

Level of Job Performance

There was a high job performance among senior staff administrators. Concerning contextual performance, there was also high contextual performance among employees. Same was reported for task performance. This is comparable to the findings of Inuwa (2016), who found a positive and substantial association between job satisfaction and university non-academic staff work performance.

Relationship between Psychosocial Work Environment and Job Performance

Results showed significant relationship exists between psychosocial work environment and job performance, implying that the psychosocial work environment of senior staff administrators affect their job performance. This is a similar finding of Adwi et al. (2018) which indicated that psychosocial work environment had a significant and positive effect on job satisfaction and employees' job performance. Again, when employees' duties are clear, their job performance is affected. This supports Mukherjee and Malhotra's (2005) claim that role clarity improves a variety of employee outcomes, including job satisfaction and performance.

Moreover, there was a significant relationship between employee's degree of freedom and job performance. thus, individual with somewhat freedom at work can come out with certain initiatives that can enhance their job performance. Hackman and Oldham (1975) provided empirical evidence that a high degree of job performance flexibility can provide employees with more time, energy, and autonomy to engage in particular behaviours, hence enhancing their willingness and incentive to develop and plan further.

Furthermore, a statistically significant relationship existed between job demand and job performance for employees. This differs from other empirical studies, which show that when job demand rises, employees' psychological resources are depleted. If employees' needed resources are not available, this results in unfavourable job outcomes (Demerouti et al., 2001; De Spiegelaere et al., 2012). This study showed that if a person has the necessary resources to deal with the demands of a work, his or her performance would not be affected. There is a statistically significant positive relationship between job performance and performance feedback. Employees can enhance their work performance if they receive enough feedback. This backs up Kluger and DeNisi's (1996) meta-analysis, which found that performance feedback enhances employees' job performance on average.

Additionally, there was a statistically significant positive relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. As a result, employee job satisfaction has an impact on their performance. Employees who are happy at work are more likely to perform well and be more productive. The idea that job satisfaction and productivity are important interactions in which each influences the other is supported by ground breaking research (Smith & Cranny, 1968; Carroll et al., 1964).

Gender difference in Psychosocial Work Environment

On research hypothesis two, we sought to find out the gender difference in the psychosocial work environment among UCC senior staff administrators, results showed that females don't differ from males in terms of role clarity. This is incongruence with the study of Yadev and Kumar (2017) which explains that women had higher role clarity as compared to men. Our findings differ from Yadev and Kumar because, administrative roles for males and females does not differ in UCC.

Furthermore, our study revealed that there was no significant gender difference between males and females on performance feedback. This is different from the findings from Correll and Simard (2016) indicated that women are systematically less likely to receive specific feedback tied to outcomes. Here, in UCC males and females senior staff administrators receive feedback from their superiors about their work. This helps them to improve upon their jobs every day.

Moreover, there was no significant gender difference on job satisfaction among males and females senior staff administrators. This is in support of the findings of Banerjee and Perrucci (2010) who revealed that gender and race segregation does not impact job satisfaction but having supportive co-workers does.

Further analysis revealed that, there was a significant gender differences among males and females on degree of freedom at work. It was revealed in this study that women differ from males in terms of their degree of freedom. On the average, according to the

findings of this study, females have higher degree of freedom at work than males. This is different from the findings of that say that women experience lower job autonomy or degree of freedom at work than males (Ecker 2015, Fagan & Burchell 2002). This is because their research was not done using senior staff administrators and could account for the difference.

Additionally, the analysis revealed that there's a significant difference between males and females on job demand. This study further revealed that females have higher job demand demands than males. This is line with the study of Holst et al. (2012) that Danish female symphony musicians reported higher work demands.

Lastly, analysis on psychosocial work environment showed that there is a significant gender difference between males and females. This study showed that females had a better psychosocial work environment than males. This is different from the findings of Westerburg and Aremelius (2000) which of the view that women had less satisfying psychosocial work environment. The reason for these conflicting findings could be the sample used. This study used senior staff administrators and Westerburg and Aremelius (2000) used municipal middle managers.

Conclusion

A high psychosocial work environment exists among senior staff administrators at the University of Cape Coast. This study further indicated high role clarity, performance feedback, job demand and job satisfaction among senior staff administrators at the University of Cape Coast. Female senior staff administrators differed from males in the degree of freedom and job demand. There was also a significant relationship between the psychosocial work environment of senior staff administrators and their job performance. It was discovered that each of the psychosocial work environment's components, such as role clarity, degree of freedom, job pressure, performance feedback, and others, had a statistically significant relationship on the job performance (contextual and task).

Recommendations

Management of the university should endeavour to create a humane psychosocial work environment devoid of high stress that can help employees to be productive. Moreover, management must assign tasks within the competence and skills of employees so they can be more productive. Given that most employees want to contribute to the organisation's overall success, their degree of job autonomy should be increased to allow them to come up with creative ideas that improve their job performance, give them time and energy to engage in productive behaviours, and improve their willingness and motivation to develop and plan further. Male employees need to improve their job

performance and productivity to help UCC Senior Staff Administrators function better. Furthermore, resources required to meet workers' job demands at all times should be provided regularly to avoid physical and psychological exhaustion. Providing the necessary resources will assist employees in coping with their work demands and viewing them in more exciting and challenging ways, reducing or preventing negative work outcomes.

References

- Abbas, Q., & Yaqoob, S. (2009). Effect of leadership development on employee performance in Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social review*, 47(2), 269-292.
- Adwi, C., Kalimin, L. O., Yusuf, B. & Patwayati, G. (2018). The influence of psychosocial work environment on job satisfaction and its implication on turnover intention in Bahteramas hospital of Southeast Sulawesi Province. *Journal of Business Management*, 20(7), 7-12.
- Albertsen, K., Nielsen, M. L., & Borg, V. (2001). The Danish psychosocial work environment and symptoms of stress: The main, mediating and moderating role of sense of coherence. *Work & stress*, 15(3), 241-253.
- Alfredsson, L., Karasek, R., & Theorell, T. (1982). Myocardial infarction risk and psychosocial work environment: an analysis of the male Swedish working force. *Social Science & Medicine*, 16(4), 463-467.
- Agervold, M., & Mikkelsen, E. G. (2006). Relationship between bullying, psychosocial work environment and individual stress reactions. *Work & Stress*, 18(4), 336-351.
- American Times Use Survey. (2018). *Bureau of labour statistics* [News release]. Retrieved from <https://www.bls.gov/tus>
- Babbie, E. R. (1990). *The practice of social research*. Belmont CA: Wadsworth Publishing Company.
- Bouguila, S. (2019). Employee freedom: till what extent? *International Journal of Research-Granthaalayah*, 7(3), 282-301.
- Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modelling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organisational psychology. *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, 1(2), 687-732
- Carroll, S, Keflas, R. and Watson, C. (1964) *Job Satisfaction and Productivity*, Irwin: Illinois.
- Ceschi, A., Costantini, A., Phillips, S. D., & Sartori, R. (2017). The career decision-making competence: a new construct for the career realm. *European Journal of Training and Development*, 41(1), 8-27
- Chandrasekar, K. (2011). Workplace environment and its impact on organisational

- performance in public sector organisations. *International Journal of Enterprise Computing and Business Systems*, 1(1), 1-19.
- Check, J., & Schutt, R. K. (2012). Teacher research and action research. *Research Methods in Education*, 23(4), 255-271.
- Correll, S., & Simard, C. (2016). Vague feedback is holding women back. *Harvard Business Review*, 94(1), 2-5.
- Davidescu, A. A., Apostu, S. A., Paul, A., & Casuneanu, I. (2020). Work flexibility, job satisfaction, and job performance among Romanian employees—Implications for sustainable human resource management. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 60-86.
- Deadrick, D. L., & Gardner, D. G. (2008). Maximal and typical measures of job performance: An analysis of performance variability over time. *Human Resource Management Review*, 18(3), 133-145.
- Demerouti, E., Bakker, A. B., Nachreiner, F., & Schaufeli, W. B. (2001). The job demands-resources model of burnout. *Journal of Applied psychology*, 86(3), 499-650.
- DeNisi, A. S., & Kluger, A. N. (2000). Feedback effectiveness: Can 360-degree appraisals be improved?. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 14(1), 129-139.
- De Rijk, A. E., Blanc, P. M. L., Schaufeli, W. B., & De Jonge, J. (1998). Active coping and need for control as moderators of the job demand–control model: Effects on burnout. *Journal of Occupational and Organisational Psychology*, 71(1), 1-18.
- De Spiegelaere, S., Van Gyes, G., & Hootegem, G. V. (2012). Job design and innovative work behaviour: One size does not fit all types of employees. *Journal of Entrepreneurship, Management and Innovation (JEMI)*, 8(4), 5-20.
- Donnelly Jr, J. H., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1975). Role Clarity and the Salesman: An empirical study reveals that perceived role clarity may be an important factor in maximizing a salesman's job performance. *Journal of Marketing*, 39(1), 71-74.
- Fagan, C., & Burchell, B. (2002). Gender, jobs and working conditions in the European Union. *Official Publications of European Companies*, 1(1), 1-29.
- Goodman, S. A., & Svyantek, D. J. (1999). Person–organisation fit and contextual performance: Do shared values matter. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 55(2), 254-275.
- Greene, J., Mero, N., & Werner, S. (2018). The negative effects of job embeddedness on performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 33(1), 58-73.
- Gustainienė, L., & Endriulaitienė, A. (2009). Job satisfaction and subjective health among sales managers. *Baltic Journal of Management*. 4(1) 56-67
10.1108/17465260910930449.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1975). Development of the Job Diagnostic Survey. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(2), 159–170.
- Hameed, A. & Amjad, S. (2009). Impact of office design on employees' productivity: A

- case study of banking organisations of Abbottabad, Pakistan. *Journal of Public Affairs, Administration and Management*, 3(1), 1-13.
- Hassan, S. (2013). The importance of role clarification in workgroups: Effects on perceived role clarity, work satisfaction, and turnover rates. *Public Administration Review*, 73, 716–725.
- Holst, G. J., Paarup, H. M., & Baelum, J. (2012). A cross-sectional study of psychosocial work environment and stress in the Danish symphony orchestras. *International Archives of Occupational and Environmental Health*, 85(6), 639-649.
- Hottordze, A.R. (2018). Examining the impact of clinical workload on health worker performance in Ghana. *Mphil Dissertation*. Cape Coast: University Press
- Huges, J. (2007). Office design is pivotal to employee productivity. *Journal of management*, 3(1) 23-54.
- Jackson, S. E., & Schuler, R. S. (1985). A meta-analysis and conceptual critique of research on role ambiguity and role conflict in work settings. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Decision Processes*, 36(1), 16–78.
- Kaiser, L. C. 2007. Gender-job Satisfaction Differences across Europe: An Indicator for Labour Market Modernization. *International Journal of Manpower* 28(3), 75–94. doi:10.1108/01437720710733483.
- Kluger, A. N., & DeNisi, A. (1996). The effects of feedback interventions on performance: A historical review, A meta-Analysis, and a preliminary feedback intervention theory. *Psychological Bulletin*, 119(2), 254-284.
- Kokoroko, E., & Sanda, M. A. (2019). Effect of workload on job stress of Ghanaian OPD nurses: The role of co-worker support. *Safety and Health at Work*, 10(3), 341-346.
- Kornhanuser, F. and Sharp, P. (1976). Job satisfaction and motivation of employees in industrial sector. *Journal of Social Psychology*, 145(5), 323-342.
- Krejcie, R. V., & Morgan, D. W. (1970). Determining sample size for research activities. *Educational and Psychological Measurement*, 30(3), 607-610.
- Kristensen, T. S., Hannerz, H., Høgh, A., & Borg, V. (2005). The Copenhagen Psychosocial Questionnaire-a tool for the assessment and improvement of the psychosocial work environment. *Scandinavian Journal of Work, Environment & Health*, 438-449.
- Labour Act (2003). *Ghana labour act 651. Official gazette*.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). Toward a theory of task motivation and incentives. *Organisational Behaviour and Human performance*, 3(2), 157-189.
- Lyons F. T. (1971). Role clarity, need for clarity, satisfaction, tension, and withdrawal. *Organisational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 6(1), 99-110.
- McGregor, D. (1960). Theory X and theory Y. *Organization theory*, 358(374), 5-20.
- Mirvis, C. & Lawer (1977). Job satisfaction and job performance in bank tellers, *Journal*

- of Social Psychology*, 133 (4), 564-587.
- Motowildo, S. J., Borman, W. C., & Schmit, M. J. (1997). A theory of individual differences in task and contextual performance. *Human performance*, 10(2), 71-83.
- Mukherjee, A., & Malhotra, N. (2005). Antecedents and consequences of role clarity in explaining employee-perceived service quality in call centres. *American Marketing Association*, 17(5), 15-17.
- Neelawala, N. G. O. N., & Karunarathne, R. A. I. C. (2020). Impact of psychosocial work environment on stress at work: Moderating role of personality. 7th HRM student research symposium. *Digital Repository*. <https://repository.Kln.ac.uk/handle/>
- Ohly, S., Sonnentag, S., & Pluntke, F. (2006). Routinization, work characteristics and their relationships with creative and proactive behaviors. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 27(3), 257-279.
- Opperman, C. S. (2002). Tropical business issues. Partner Price Water House Coopers, *International Business Review*, 18(4) 175-184.
- Onyemah, V. (2008). Role ambiguity, role conflict, and performance: Empirical evidence of an inverted-U relationship. *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 28(3), 299-314.
- Onuoha, U. D., Ogunjinmi, T., & Owodunni, M. (2016). Role clarity, self-concept and job satisfaction of library personnel in selected university libraries in Ogun State, Nigeria. *Journal of Applied Information Science and Technology*, 9(2), 9-16.
- Oyewole, G. O., & Popoola, S. O. (2013). Effect of psycho-social factors of job performance of library personnel to college of education in Nigeria library philosophy and practice. *Library Philosophy and Practice (e-Journal)*, 2 (5), 55-57. doi:<http://unlibunli.edu/LPP>
- Petitta, L., & Vecchione, M. (2011). Job burnout, absenteeism, and extra role behaviours. *Journal of Workplace Behavioural Health*, 26(2), 97-121.
- Porter, L. W. & Lawler, E. E. (1974). *Personal and industrial psychology: The effect of performance on job satisfaction (3rd ed.)*. Illinois: Edwin A. Fleishman Studies.
- Pijnacker, L. (2019). *HR analytics: role clarity impacts performance*. Retrieved from Effactory Web site: <https://www.effactory.com/knowledge/hr-analytics-role-clarity-impacts-performance>.
- Ryan, R. M., Bernstein, J. H., & Brown, K. W. (2010). Weekends, work, and well-being: Psychological need satisfactions and day of the week effects on mood, vitality, and physical symptoms. *Journal of Social and Clinical Psychology*, 29(1), 95-122.
- Sabir, M. S., Iqbal, J. J., Rehman, K. U., Shah, K. A., & Yameen, M. (2012). Impact of corporate ethical values on ethical leadership and employee performance.

- International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(2), 163-171.
- Salaman, G., Storey, J., & Billsberry, J. (Eds.). (2005). *Strategic human resource management: Theory and practice*. London: Sage Publications.
- Samie, F., Riahi, L., & Tabibi, S. J. (2015). The relationship between role clarity and efficiency of employees in management & resource development department of ministry of health and medical education of IR Iran, 2014. *Biosciences Biotechnology Research Asia*, 12(3), 2803-2812.
- Schaufeli, W. B., Salanova, M., González-Romá, V., & Bakker, A. B. (2002). The measurement of engagement and burnout: A two sample confirmatory factor analytic approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 3(1), 71-92.
- Schmidt, K. H., & Diestel, S. (2013). Job demands and personal resources in their relations to indicators of job strain among nurses for older people. *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 69(10), 2185-2195.
- Singleton, L. J., & Singleton, R. (1988). *Instructor's Manual to Accompany Approaches to Social Research*. NY: Oxford University Press, USA.
- Sjögren, E., & Kristenson, M. (2006). Can gender differences in psychosocial factors be explained by socioeconomic status?. *Scandinavian Journal of Public Health*, 34(1), 59-68.
- Sloane, P. J., & Williams, H. (2000). Job satisfaction, comparison earnings, and gender. *Labour*, 14(3), 473-502.
- Smith, D. & Cranny, F. (1968). Job satisfaction, effort and commitment. *Journal of Business Management*, 123 (3) 151-164
- Söderberg, M., Härenstam, A., Rosengren, A., Schiöler, L., Olin, A. C., Lissner, L., Waern, M. & Torén, K. (2014). Psychosocial work environment, job mobility and gender differences in turnover behaviour: a prospective study among the Swedish general population. *BMC Public Health*, 14(1), 1-10.
- Sonnentag, S., & Frese, M. (2002). Performance concepts and performance theory. *Psychological Management of Individual Performance*, 23(1), 3-25.
- Taiwo, A. (2009). Waste management towards sustainable development in Nigeria: A case study of Lagos state. *International NGO Journal*, 4(4), 173-179.
- University of Birmingham. (2017). *Autonomy in the workplace has positive effects on well-being and job satisfaction, study finds*. ScienceDaily. Retrieved from <https://www.sciencedaily.com/releases/2017/>
- Van Doorn, R. R., & Hülshager, U. R. (2015). What makes employees resilient to job demands? The role of core self-evaluations in the relationship between job demands and strain reactions. *European Journal of Work and Organisational Psychology*, 24(1), 76-87.
- Western Electric Studies. (1966). Ohio States University, USA.
- Wheatley, D. (2017). Employee satisfaction and use of flexible working arrangements.

Work, Employment and Society, 31(4), 567-585.

- Westerberg, K., & Armelius, K. (2000). Municipal middle managers: Psychosocial work environment in a gender-based division of labour. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 16(2), 189-208.
- Yadav, M., & Kumar, A. (2017). An Indian outlook on role clarity, organisational citizenship behaviour, and gender relationship: multiple group confirmatory factor analysis (MGCFA) approach. *Jindal Journal of Business Research*, 6(1), 63-75.
- Yusoff, R. B. M., Ali, A. M., Khan, A., & Bakar, S. A. (2013). Psychometric evaluation of Utrecht Work Engagement Scale among academic staff in universities of Pakistan. *World Applied Sciences Journal* 28 (11),1555-1560,
- Zou M. (2015). Gender, work orientations and job satisfaction. *Work Employment and Society* 29(1), 3-22.
<http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/095001701455926>