

School Administrator's and Teacher's Perceptions of Job Satisfaction and Job Performance in Some Secondary Schools in Freetown, Sierra Leone

Abdulai Maxim Conjoh, Elizabeth A.M Taylor-Morgan, Ibrahim Sesay,
Kai-Bundor Mbayo and Santigie Sesay
Department of Education, Milton Margai College of Education and Technology,
Goderich, Ontario, Canada

Abstract: The aim of this study was to investigate school administrators and teachers perception of job satisfaction and job performance in some secondary schools in Freetown, Sierra Leone. A total of 112 participants (32 administrators and 80 teachers) participated in the study. The two job satisfaction/job performance questionnaires (for school administrators and teachers, respectively) were developed pretested and administered for this study. The data collected was analysed quantitatively using Pearson's product moment correlation. The findings from this study suggest that for school administrators; length of service, appreciation, personal growth, fringe benefits and salary were good predictors of performance on the job while gender/sex and position were negative predictors of performance on the job. For the teachers while fringe benefits were strong predictors of performance on the job, length of service, appreciation, personal growth and work environment were weaker predictors of performance of the job. This study highlights factors that must be taking into consideration in improving organisational performance.

Key words: School administrator, perception, teachers, job satisfactions, job performance, Freetown

INTRODUCTION

After 11 years war in Sierra Leone, the education sector was devastated. School buildings were destroyed, teachers lost their lives and many more were displaced. After the war which ended in 2002, the government had been trying to improve on the education system. That dream cannot be realized without the efforts of the school administrators and teachers. For them to play such a key role in the school, it is crucial that they feel happy about their jobs and so work hard. In the light of this there is the need to find out their perceptions about job satisfaction and job performance.

Perception can be described as the process by which people translate sensory impressions into coherent and unified view (www.businessdictionary.com/definition). This implies that perceptions vary from person to person, since different people want different things which affect their attitudes, making their behaviors different or sometimes similar. Satisfiers then may be similar and sometimes different which brings us to the question of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction has been the subject of many studies as it relates to performance. Conventional wisdom

suggests that happiness in the work place can influence job satisfaction and performance. Job satisfaction also called employee satisfaction is a major variable in organizational behaviour. Historical perspective to the concept of job satisfaction was focused on its affective nature. It was described as "feelings or affective responses to facets of the (work place) situation (Smith *et al.*, 1969). This view is still supported by contemporary researchers. According to Scholl (2003), it is an employee's attitudinal response to his or her organization. At the turn of the century researchers acknowledged that job satisfaction also has a cognitive as well as an affective attribute. According to Brown and Peterson (1993) also lend support to the affective argument by suggesting that employees feelings on the job can be used to measure job satisfaction. Proponents of the cognitive attribute suggest that job satisfaction requires judgment and beliefs about the job (Scholl, 2003; Organ and Near, 1985).

Several factors can create job satisfaction (Spector, 1997) lists fourteen common factors some of which include: appreciation, fringe benefits, personal growth, recognition, etc. On the other hand Spicer, listed ten factors that create job satisfaction. According to him,

interesting jobs, security and being appreciated were top of employee list. This was a paradigm shift from findings of his earlier research on the same topic in 2008 in which interesting work, good wages, promotion and growth ranked the highest.

The true potential of an organization can only be realized when the productivity level of all individuals and teams are fully aligned, committed and energized to successfully accomplish the goals of the organization (information@insightlink.com). It must be noted that before you can improve employee satisfaction and employee performance, you need to know what to improve (Humanresources.about.com).

Job performance is the outcome of job satisfaction; it is an influence situation. Campbell describes it as an individual variable or something a single person does. This differentiates it from more encompassing constructs such as organizational performance which are higher-level variables.

Research conducted among health workers tried to analyze the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. Findings showed that performance is related to job satisfaction. It was shown that “a number of factors influence employee performance such as satisfaction from the profession, work environment, compensation policies, etc”.

Regardless of the assertion that workers still get on with their jobs even though they get no satisfaction yet organizations will always want to achieve maximum employee satisfaction which results in happy and high performing workers. According to other researchers, happy workers work harder and get more done. They feel confident about their decisions and their role with the company and when they complete a task they are sure that they have produced their best work for the company (www.aiu.edu).

Against this backdrop the study seek to determine the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance as perceived by school administrators and teachers with regards the satisfiers of: appreciation, personal growth, work environment, fringe benefits and salary.

Jacobson stated that over the past 5 years recognition/appreciation has become increasingly more common as a topic and is clearly now regarded by European practitioners as a critical component of any engagement strategy and a proven method for building a positive and happy work culture.

According to McReynolds (2012) studies show that appreciation is linked to work performance. There is a clear correlation between feeling appreciated and a desire

to perform well and remain actively engaged with an employer. There’s always a desire to be appreciated. Low employer morale can adversely affect your ability to attract and retain the best employees and have a detrimental effect on productivity (Business filings incorporated and its affiliates in 2015).

In a research at the Wharton school at the University of Pennsylvania to see the effects of appreciation in two fund raising groups, reported by Harvard Medical School, Tanner (2015) said that of the two university fund raising groups, the second group that the director told he was grateful for their efforts, made 50% more fund raising calls than the first group who the director told nothing. With employee appreciation, you’re not only boosting performance and engagement but the employee’s wellbeing and health.

Research has also shown that appreciation and a sense of belonging are the primary job motivators for key employees to reach their full potential (www.thebirchgroup.com/teambuilding). Appreciation is seen as key to high performing employees. Gallup conducted a large scale research into employee happiness and performance for over a decade with Reynold’s being a contributor. Firstly, result showed that staff discontent was very common and secondly that millions were extremely negative or actively disengaged at work, i.e., they go through the motions of work-employees turn up physically but don’t bring their hearts and mind along as well (www.fortes.com/sites/simareynolds, April, 2014). Leaders want the best performance out of workers and almost all workers are crying out for something that leaders could easily give-appreciation.

Bialopotocki (2006) conducted a research among teachers in relation to job satisfaction and recognition. Results revealed positive relationship to job satisfaction and non-monetary recognition from each source. The recognition that Principals provided to teachers had the strongest positive relationship to job satisfaction and was the best predictor of job satisfaction.

Nokia’s Nicole Robertson emphasized the importance of recognition as a tool for driving engagement and creating a stronger culture-recognition is about appreciation. Show of appreciation towards one another increases work place morale motivation and job quality. It renews loyalty and increases commitment (www.agonleadership.com/appreciation).

Thus, appreciation and a sense of belonging are the true primary job motivators for key employees to reach their full potential (www.thebirchgroup.com/teambuilding: Leadership Development Team Building).

Personal growth is a key to job satisfaction and it is an opportunity for advancement. Positions within the organization that allows workers to move forward does not mean only promotion but also opportunities to learn new skills and qualification (keys to job satisfaction career-success-for-newbies.com). The Ruchi Jain stated that the concept of work environment is an actual comprehensive one including the physical and social aspects that make up the working conditions. Work environment have both positive and negative effects on the psychological and welfare of employees.

According to Ingram workplace environments influence employee satisfaction which in turn directly affects employee turnover rates. Knowing how to use a positive work environment to increase employee satisfaction and reduce turnover is a key to developing a high performance workforce. Personal respect for employees, growth opportunities, management styles, company culture, create the environment that satisfies employee and impact on job performance.

Research showed that the traits: self-esteem, generalized self-efficacy, locus of control and emotional stability had relationship to satisfaction and performance. The productivity of employees is determined by an inordinate level on the environment in which they work. If the environment is congenial, fatigue, monotony and boredom are minimized; thus work performance can be maximized.

Structuring the work environment, therefore is key in influencing workplace behaviour and performance which encourages productive behaviours and discourages those that are unproductive (Industrial and organizational psychology in 2014).

Artz (2010) explained the purpose of a survey on fringe benefits and job satisfaction which was to empirically identify the theoretically ambiguity relationship between fringe benefits and worker job satisfaction. Results showed that “fringe benefits are significant and positive determinants of job satisfaction”. The practical implications were that higher levels of worker job satisfaction, potentially resulting from fringe benefit provisions have been linked to important productivity measures such as lower quit rates and absenteeism.

In career builders latest survey on what organizations can do to keep talented employee on board, Hollou’s results showed that the majority (70%) of the employees reported that “increasing salary is the best way to boost employee retention”. Findings of a study conducted by Malik *et al.* (2012) among teachers revealed that pay has influence upon job satisfaction of educationists at the university. Findings showed that pay has a significant impact on job satisfaction of educationist.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

Participants: The design for this study was quantitative. The views of participants (principals, vice principals and teachers) on job satisfaction was correlated with their views on job performance. In the school system, the progress of the school largely depends on the administrators (principals and vice-principals) and teachers as such these sets of workers were selected.

The research was conducted at the peak of the Ebola outbreak in Sierra Leone. This meant that there was restriction on movement and physical contact with the people. For this reason, a convenience sampling was done. About 16 schools (those the researchers could access and believed were safer and easier to contact) were selected for the research. The principals and vice principals of the selected 16 schools formed part of the participants for the study. The distribution of the participants are presented in Table 1.

From the table, it can be seen that one hundred and twelve participants took part in this study, a total of 95 males and 17 females. Among the participants were 32 school administrators (16 principals and their vice principals) accounting for 28% of the total participants. About 80 teachers (70 males and 10 females) which accounted for 71% of the total participants participated in the study. The eighty teachers were randomly selected from each of the 16 schools targeted for this study, 5 from each school.

Procedures and measures: As stated earlier, a simple random sampling method was used to select the 80 teachers, 16 principals and 16 vice-principals (administrators) from 16 secondary schools in Freetown for the study. The instruments used (questionnaires) consisted of 2 Sections A and B. Section A sought information on demographic/personal data of teachers, principals and vice-principals while Section B consisted of 21 questions for principals and vice-principals and 24 questions for teachers. The items sought information on the respondent’s perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance. A Likert scale of highly dissatisfied, dissatisfied, satisfied and highly satisfied was used.

The questionnaires produced six measures for the two categories of school administrators and teachers including appreciation, personal growth, work environment, fringe benefits and salary. Each of these represents elements that define job satisfaction. Meaning that individuals look for job satisfaction from the above satisfiers. In the questionnaires, all the items in each of the satisfiers measure job satisfaction except the last question. The last question in each of the satisfier category provided the measure for job performance. The instruments were pretested and found to have Cronbach

alphas for the satisfiers range from 0.51-0.75 while that between the job satisfaction and job performance stood at 0.62.

In this study, the variables for each of the satisfiers (appreciation, personal growth, work environment, fringe benefits and salary) were correlated with the variable for job performance for each of the two categories of school administrators and teachers and the results presented per category.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The aim of this study was to investigate school administrator's and teachers perceptions of job satisfaction and job performance in schools in freetown. In this study, elements of job satisfaction were identified as position, length of service, appreciation, personal growth, work environment, fringe benefits and salary. The researchers sought to establish the relationship between these elements and job performance. Using SPSS, the pearson's product moment correlation was determined between job satisfiers and job performance and the result is presented in Table 1. From the analysis in Table 2, it is evident that position in the work place (specifically being a principal or a vice principal) has an

inverse relationship to performance denoted by a 0.036 coefficient. This implies that being a school administrator does not necessarily translate into better performance on the job in the school setting.

However, satisfiers like salary (0.722; $p = 0.01$) work environment (0.692; $p = 0.01$; personal growth, 0.577; $p = 0.01$; fringe benefits, 0.519; $p = 0.01$) were stronger predictors of performance of school administrators. On the other hand, length of service (0.415; $p = 0.05$) and appreciation (0.380; $p = 0.05$) though were good predictors of performance on the job, they were not as strong as the previously mentioned satisfiers. It is also important to note that from this study and for school administrators, the factors (satisfiers) that greatly influence performance on the job are salary, work environment, personal growth and fringe benefits in this order (Table 3).

From the point of view of the teachers, this research showed that the strongest predictor of performance on the job is fringe benefit ($r = 0.521$; $p = 0.01$) second to appreciation on the job ($r = 0.417$; $p = 0.01$). The other significant satisfiers to influence performance on the job were work environment and personal growth and length of service (0.388; 0.367; 0.322), respectively all significant at 0.01 level. However, while position has a negative correlation with performance, salary has a positive correlation with performance. Both of these relationships seem not significant. This study sort to investigate the relationship between school administrator's and teacher's perception of job satisfaction and job performance. To be able to the conditions around the day to day operations of the job. This study sort to investigate

Table 1: The participants in this study

Category	Gender		Total
	Males	Females	
Principals	13	3	16 (14%)
Vice principals	12	4	16 (14%)
Teachers	70	10	80 (7% \downarrow)
Totals	95	17	112 (100%)

Table 2: Relationship between satisfiers and job performance for school administrators

Relations	Sex	Position	Length of service	Appreciation	Personal growth	Work environment	Fringe benefit	Salary	Performance
Sex									
Pearson correlation	1.00	-0.116	0.003	-0.067	-0.107	-0.052	-0.121	-0.251	-0.117
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	0.542	0.988	0.726	0.574	0.783	0.526	0.180	0.539
N	30.00	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Position									
Pearson correlation	-0.116	1.000	0.146	-0.037	-0.135	-0.344	-0.011	-0.012	-0.036
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.542	-	0.440	0.848	0.477	0.063	0.955	0.951	0.848
N	30.000	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Length of service									
Pearson correlation	0.003	0.146	1	-0.210	0.080	-0.093	0.277	0.284	0.415 (*)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.988	0.440	-	0.264	0.675	0.625	0.139	0.129	0.022
N	30.000	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Appreciation									
Pearson correlation	-0.067	-0.037	-0.210	1	0.531 (**)	0.272	0.152	-0.014	0.380 (*)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.726	0.848	0.264	-	0.003	0.146	0.422	0.941	0.038
N	30.000	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Personal growth									
Pearson correlation	-0.107	-0.135	0.080	0.531 (**)	1	0.373 (*)	0.564 (**)	0.516 (**)	0.577 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.574	0.477	0.675	0.003	-	0.043	0.001	0.004	0.001
N	30.000	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Work environment									
Pearson correlation	-0.052	-0.344	-0.093	0.272	0.373 (*)	1	0.236	0.468 (**)	0.692 (**)

Table 2: Continue

Relations	Sex	Position	Length of service	Appreciation	Personal growth	Work environment	Fringe benefit	Salary	Performance
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.783	0.063	0.625	0.146	0.043	-	0.209	0.009	0.000
N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Fringe benefit									
Pearson correlation	-0.121	-0.011	0.277	0.152	0.564 (**)	0.236	1	0.482 (**)	0.519 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.526	0.955	0.139	0.422	0.001	0.209	-	0.007	0.003
N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Salary									
Pearson correlation	-0.251	-0.012	0.284	-0.014	0.516 (**)	0.468 (**)	0.482 (**)	1	0.722 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.180	0.951	0.129	0.941	0.004	0.009	0.007	-	0.000
N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30
Performance									
Pearson correlation	-0.117	-0.036	0.415 (*)	0.380 (*)	0.577 (**)	0.692 (**)	0.519 (**)	0.722 (**)	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.539	0.848	0.022	0.038	0.001	0.000	0.003	0.000	-
N	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30	30

Table 3: Relationship between satisfiers and job performance for teachers

Relations	Sex	Position	Length of service	Appreciation	Personal growth	Work environment	Fringe benefit	Salary	Performance
Sex									
Pearson correlation	1	0.168	-0.064	-0.147	-0.190	-0.165	-0.129	0.017	-0.073
Sig. (2-tailed)	-	0.135	0.571	0.193	0.092	0.143	0.255	0.884	0.520
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Position									
Pearson correlation	0.168	1	-0.560 (**)	-0.185	-0.287 (**)	0.018	-0.346 (**)	0.035	-0.194
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.135	-	0.000	0.100	0.010	0.877	0.002	0.755	0.084
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Length of service									
Pearson correlation	-0.064	-0.560 (**)	1	0.151	0.222 (*)	0.125	0.286 (*)	-0.275 (*)	0.322 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.571	0.000	-	0.183	0.048	0.269	0.010	0.014	0.004
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Appreciation									
Pearson correlation	-0.147	-0.185	0.151	1	0.259 (*)	0.308 (**)	0.361 (**)	-0.051	0.417 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.193	0.100	0.183	-	0.020	0.005	0.001	0.652	0.000
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Personal growth									
Pearson correlation	-0.190	-0.287 (**)	0.222 (*)	0.259 (*)	1	0.185	0.189	-0.072	0.367 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.092	0.010	0.048	0.020	-	0.100	0.093	0.523	0.001
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Work environment									
Pearson correlation	-0.165	0.018	0.125	0.308 (**)	0.185	1	0.386 (**)	0.147	0.388 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.143	0.877	0.269	0.005	0.100	-	0.000	0.193	0.000
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Fringe benefit									
Pearson correlation	-0.129	-0.346 (**)	0.286(*)	0.361 (**)	0.189	0.386 (**)	1	-0.064	0.521 (**)
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.255	0.002	0.010	0.001	0.093	0.000	-	0.575	0.000
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Salary									
Pearson correlation	0.017	0.035	-0.275 (*)	-0.051	-0.072	0.147	-0.064	1	0.161
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.884	0.755	0.014	0.652	0.523	0.193	0.575	-	0.154
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80
Performance									
Pearson correlation	-0.073	-0.194	0.322 (**)	0.417 (**)	0.367 (**)	0.388 (**)	0.521 (**)	0.161	1
Sig. (2-tailed)	0.520	0.084	0.004	0.000	0.001	0.000	0.000	0.154	-
N	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80	80

**Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed); *Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed)

whether there was any relationship between satisfiers such as position in the office, i.e., rank, salary, work environment, personal growth, fringe benefits, length of service and appreciation and performance on the job for both teachers and school administrators and the efficiency and effectiveness on the job. For school administrators, the result of the study revealed that

position in the work place (specifically being a principal or a vice principal) has an inverse relationship to performance denoted by a 0.036 coefficient. This implies that being a school administrator does not necessarily translate into better performance on the job in the school setting. School administrators in sierra leone, once appointed continue in their job until retirement. To

continue to stay on the job is not influenced by performance. From all indications, position on the job does not seem to influence performance for the aforementioned reasons.

However, this study revealed that salary is the highest predictor of performance on the job for school administrators ($r = 0.722$; $p = 0.01$). This colludes with Spicer who suggested that only interesting work supersedes 'good wage' as a satisfier for performance on the job. Interesting here could refer to a work one enjoys doing and in a conducive atmosphere. From this study and for school administrators, second to salary as a predictor of job performance is work environment (0.692 ; $p = 0.01$). The environment within which an individual works, particularly in terms of conduciveness, availability of work resources, safety on the job and job security could enhance performance on the job. In addition to these, personal growth (0.577 ; $p = 0.01$) fringe benefits (0.519 ; $p = 0.01$) were stronger predictors of performance of school administrators. This corroborates with findings elsewhere. On the other hand, length of service (0.415 ; $p = 0.05$) and appreciation (0.380 ; $p = 0.05$) though were good predictors of performance on the job, they were not as strong as the previously mentioned satisfiers. It is also important to note that from this study and for school administrators, the factors (satisfiers) that greatly influence performance on the job were salary, work environment, personal growth and fringe benefits in this order.

Whilst salary was the best predictor of performance for school administrators for teachers the strongest predictor of performance on the job is fringe benefit ($r = 0.521$, $p = 0.01$) second to appreciation on the job ($r = 0.417$, $p = 0.01$). Since salaries for teachers in Sierra Leone are generally low and in most cases before it comes its expended, it does not seem to be the top most satisfier for performance on the job. Instead, benefits other than salaries and appreciation for work done have peeped salaries as satisfiers for job performance.

This seem to be in line with Spector (1997), although for him in addition to fringe benefits and appreciation which he called recognition, personal growth is significant. Recognising the efforts individuals put into the day to day activities on the job can go a long way in making people give up their best and studies including this one, suggest the same. According to McRaynolds (2015) suggests that appreciation is linked to work performance. In fact Darcy (2015) stated that over the past 5 years, recognition or appreciation has become increasingly more common as a topic and is clearly now regarded by European practitioners as a critical component of an engagement strategy and proven method for building a positive and happy work culture.

Clearly, this study has found out that non-monetary recognition is what makes the wheels for performing well in schools turn and studies before this confirm that, Bialopotocki (2006). For teachers while position has a negative correlation with performance, salary has a positive correlation with performance. Both of these relationships seem not significant. In their study, Gedefaw revealed that no fringe benefits such as transport allowances, health insurance and medical care have a strong negative impact on job satisfaction of teachers.

CONCLUSION

This study suggests that there is a relationship between job satisfaction and job performance meaning that when an employee is satisfied on the job, he tends to perform better. While for principals of schools, salary, work environment, personal growth and fringe benefits in that order were better satisfiers for job performance for teachers it is fringe benefit and appreciation that are the greater satisfiers for performance on the job. Employers therefore need to take this into consideration in the managing the work place culture.

REFERENCES

- Artz, B., 2010. Fringe benefits and job satisfaction. *Int. J. Manpower*, 31: 626-644.
- Bialopotocki, R.N., 2006. Recognition and praise relate to teachers job satisfaction. Masters Thesis, University of Nebraska-Lincoln, Lincoln, Nebraska.
- Brown, S.P. and R.A. Peterson, 1993. Antecedents and consequences of salesperson job satisfaction: Meta-analysis and assessment of causal effects. *J. Market. Res.*, 30: 63-77.
- Darcy, J., 2015. Five core themes from HR tech. *Globoforce Limited, Dublin, Southborough*. <http://www.globoforce.com/gfblog/2015/themes-world-europe/>
- Malik, M.E., R.Q. Danish and Y. Munir, 2012. The impact of pay and promotion on job satisfaction: Evidence from higher education institutes of Pakistan. *Am. J. Econ.*, 10: 6-9.
- McReynolds, 2012. Lessons in employee motivation, appreciation and performance. *YouEarnedIt, Austin, Texas*. <http://youearnedit.com/blog/lessons-in-employee-motivation-appreciation-performance-from-geny/>.
- Organ, D.W. and J.P. Near, 1985. Cognition vs affect in measures of job satisfaction. *Intl. J. Psychol.*, 20: 241-253.

- Scholl, R.W., 2003. Determinants of job satisfaction. Schmidt Labor Research Center, South Kingstown, Rhode Island. <http://www.uri.edu/research/lrc/scholl/webnotes/Satisfaction.htm>.
- Smith, P.C., C.L. Hullin and L.M. Kendall, 1969. The Measurement of Satisfaction in work and Retirement. Rand McNally, Chicago, IL., USA., Pages: 210.
- Spector, P.E., 1997. Job Satisfaction, Application assessment, Causes and Consequences. SAGE Publications, UK., ISBN: 9780761989233, Pages: 96.
- Tanner, O.C., 2015. The psychological effects of workplace appreciation and gratitude. Emergenetics International Company, Colorado, USA. <https://www.emergenetics.com/blog/workplace-appreciation-gratitude/>.