



GSJ: Volume 9, Issue 7, July 2021, Online: ISSN 2320-9186  
[www.globalscientificjournal.com](http://www.globalscientificjournal.com)

**JOB SATISFACTION AND PERSONALITY CHARACTERISTICS AS  
CORRELATES OF LECTURERS PERFORMANCE IN IBADAN, NIGERIA**

**BY**

**Jimoh, Audu Michael<sup>1</sup>, Ukpabi, Ihezue Donatus<sup>2</sup> & Salaudeen, Kehinde Kenneth<sup>3</sup>**

**Department of Counselling and Human Development Studies**

**University of Ibadan<sup>1&3</sup>**

**Department of Adult Education**

**University of Ibadan<sup>2</sup>**

**ABSTRACT**

This study investigates job satisfaction and personality characteristics as correlates of lecturers' performance in University of Ibadan. The study adopted a descriptive research design. Two hundred participants were chosen from selected faculties through stratified random sampling technique. Job satisfaction scale, personality scale and job performance scale were used to collect data for the study. Three research hypotheses were tested at  $P < 0.01$  level of significance. The data were analysed using Pearson Product Moment Correlation (PPMC), Multiple Regression Analysis and *T-test* for independent samples

statistical methods. The independent variables (job satisfaction and personality characteristics) jointly accounted for 9.4% of the total variance job performance of lecturers ( $R^2 = 0.094$ ). The results further showed that the independent variables accounted for the criterion variable when taken together ( $p < 0.05$ ). The findings imply that job satisfaction ( $\beta = .312$ ;  $t = 4.369$ ;  $p < 0.05$ ) correlates majorly with job performance than personality characteristics. On the basis of this finding, it is herein recommended that supervisors, administrators, policy makers, researchers and employers should identify job satisfaction as a potent factor that can aid job performance among lecturers in the educational institutions.

**Key Words:** Job Satisfaction; Personality Characteristics; Lecturers' Performance

## **Introduction**

Performance is the accomplishment of a given task measured against preset known standards of accuracy, completeness, cost and speed. In a contract, performance is deemed to be the fulfillment of an obligation, in a manner that releases the performer from all liabilities under the contract. The extent to which a lecturer is able to accomplish given tasks is the lecturer's performance. Once a task is given, performance is inevitable and cannot be overlooked because it depicts the action that will produce the desired result or outcome as expected by the task-giver. Every existing organisation expects optimal performance from their employees in order to ensure effectiveness and efficiency for maximum output and realisation of organisational goals respectively. An educational institution such as the university has the goal of producing graduates with academic excellence and ability to meet societal demand as far as the world of work is concerned. Therefore, if mediocre are produced, the adverse effect will be highly pronounced on the larger society. So, if lecturers cannot perform at their peaks or optimal level, the set goals of the organisation may not be achieved. Lecturers who perform at their peaks or optimal

level can said to be satisfied on their jobs and have good personalities which help to sustain their interest in the job they do. In other words, the success of any organisation depends largely on the workers' job satisfaction and this can be noticed when there is no complain about the management, salaries and wages or little problems that are associated with carrying out their duty.

Performance is defined as the degree of task accomplishment that constitutes the workers' job (Lloyd and Leslie, 2004). Performance of the lecturers is referred to as task-specific behaviours which are exhibited by the academic staff in their workplace (Okolcha, 2021). In order to meet up with the vision and mission of the academic institution, the working environment of the lecturers must be conducive and give them a sense of fulfillment towards performing their task optimally (Raziq and Maulabaksh, 2015). It is expected that a good working environment that encourages teaching and research, with good and fair pay would ultimately encourage job satisfaction (Okolcha, 2021). The achievement of a good working environment can be brought to fruition with institutional employee that is driven by policy. Institutional policy is central to the effectiveness of lecturers and the success of the institution (Okolcha, 2021).

Job satisfaction is defined as the general attitude of the employees towards their job within the organization (Robbins and Coulter, 2012). In the light of this, a person with high job satisfaction would display positive attitude toward their job, while those with low job satisfaction would showcase negative attitude towards their job. Therefore, satisfied employees would have low tendency to be absent from job, show high commitment to the organization and consequently a higher organizational performance. Studies have shown that relationship with co-workers, morality, sense of community, work stress and university atmosphere influence job satisfaction of employees (Kyzyltepe, 2008). Provision of supervision, interpersonal relationships, authority, organizational commitment, income, policies, facilities, work and workload significantly

contributed to the job satisfaction of academic staff (Mohamad, 2013; Amazt and Idris, 2011).

Furthermore, Singh and Loncar (2010) opine that employees who are dissatisfied with pay have increased tendency on the performance of the employees. The implication is that equitable pay and adequate provision of all needed facilities would help the academic staff to fulfill all their basic essential needs which ultimately optimizes their performance level (Okolcha, 2021). Unfavorable and difficult conditions in the workplace highly influence the performance of employees (Bakotic and Babic, 2013). Several studies have investigated the relationship between job satisfaction and performance of employees. According to Samad (2011) employees who are satisfied and committed were found to be high in productivity and high in performance. This implies that satisfaction of lecturers has direct impact on their level of performance. The study was of the view that institutions of learning should strengthen the commitment and satisfaction of their workers in order to improve the performance of the workers. Zi-long (2010 cited in Kwizera, Mwirumubi and Kizito, 2021) investigated the relationship among job satisfaction, pay level satisfaction, hierarchy of needs and organizational performance and it was found that job satisfaction significantly and positively influence organizational performance. However, Mawoli and Babandako (2011) found in their study that poor academic staff performance is affected by negative conditions of work leading to absenteeism, less classroom effectiveness, lower job satisfaction, lower level of effort and low motivation. The researchers therefore aver that good working conditions are good ways of encouraging and boosting the commitment level of the lecturers, which ultimately enhances their performance.

Personality is a dynamic organization of all the psychophysical systems which determine the uniqueness in adapting to the environment (Robbins, 2015). Personality characteristics encompass the whole dynamic concept that gives description to the growth and development of the whole psychological system of the person (Indiyati, Yulianti and

Ramdhany, 2016). The personality characteristics of the lecturers are keys towards determining their level of performance. This is because in order for lecturers to have increasing level of performance, there is a need for them to be highly creative, with high intellectual skills, personality, thinking style, motivation, knowledge (Amabile, 2012). It has been established also that lecturers who are creative in the classroom must not only demonstrate creativity in intelligence, work experience or schooling but there must be possession of requisite personality characteristics and capacity (Florida et al., 2008). Studies have found significant relationship between personality characteristics and job performance. According to Ozer and Benet-Martinez (2006) the big five personality has been related with different forms of behaviors such as job performance, prosperity, leadership and achievement. Darsana (2013) investigated personality characteristics and job performance of employees and found that a significant and positive relationship exists between personality factors and job performance.

This study hinged on Campbell's theory of job performance which states that outcome is the result of a lecturer's job performance (Wei and Yazdanifard, 2014). According to John Campbell, performance does not have to be actions that can be observed directly, but it is the mental productions of an individual which provides answers to some crucial questions. Therefore, performance must be under the control of an individual, either behaviour or mental (Wei and Yazdanifard, 2014). Performance must be therefore relevant to the goal of the organization and which is driven by several factors such as motivation, job satisfaction, commitment, personality characteristics, interest, training and so on (Wei and Yazdanifard, 2014). Therefore, this study investigates job satisfaction and personality characteristics as determinants of performance of University lecturers.

### **Statement of the problem**

The reduction in the level of performance among the lecturers has been due to the poor level of job satisfaction (Kwizera, Mwirumubi and Kizito, 2021). The inconsistent rate at which they teach the students and the poor output of their research is a reflection of the

poor performance of these lecturers. Lecturers that are satisfied with their job would ultimately perform better in the classroom and in their research works. However, lecturers with poor job satisfaction would perform poorly with the students and in conducting researches. The personality characteristics of the lecturers have been found to significantly influence their performance (Indiyati et al., 2016). This implies that poor performance of lecturers may have been caused by their personality characteristics. In essence, lecturers with good, hardworking, collaborative and friendly personality would ultimately have good working relations with students and other lecturers which in turn optimize their level of performance. However those lecturers with faulty and unfriendly personality would affect negatively their level of performance.

### **Purpose of the study**

This study was conducted in order to:

1. Determine the relationship among the independent variables (job satisfaction and personality characteristics) and the dependent variable (Lecturers' performance).
2. Examine the joint contribution of job satisfaction and personality characteristics on Lecturers' performance,
3. Know the relative effect of job satisfaction and personality characteristics on Lecturers' performance.

### **Test of Hypotheses**

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship among the independent variables (job satisfaction and personality characteristics) and the dependent variable (Lecturers' performance).

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant joint contribution of job satisfaction and personality characteristics on Lecturers' performance,

**Hypothesis 3:** There is no significant relative effect of job satisfaction and personality characteristics on Lecturers' performance.

## **METHODOLOGY**

### **Research design**

The research design for this study is ex-post fact design. This design is employed because participants for this study will not be subjected to any manipulation of the independent variables. The variables already have their influences on the dependent variable. For the purpose of the research work, a descriptive survey research design method, where a subset is taken to represent the whole, is adopted. A section of people were employed for this study and data was generated through questionnaire.

### **Population**

The population chosen for this study was lecturers in the University of Ibadan, Nigeria. The target participant for this study was two hundred (200) participants.

### **Sampling Technique**

Multistage sampling technique was used to select participants for the study. This is a combination of cluster and simple random sampling techniques. The researcher took the step of identifying number of faculties in the University. Then, the researcher adopted a simple random sampling through assigning numbers to select the target faculties. The researcher randomly selects participants from the following faculties in the University, which include Faculties of Arts, Agriculture, Education, Science, the Social sciences respectively. The total sample in this study was two hundred (200) lecturers.

### **Instruments**

Section A of the questionnaire for this study focused on the demographic attributes of respondents such as gender, age, and years of work experience, educational qualification

and academic rank. They include job satisfaction, personality characteristics and job performance scales respectively. Job satisfaction scale had 15 items, personality characteristics scale also had 15 items while job performance scale had 20 items. They were rated in four likert response format ranging from 1= strongly disagree, 2= disagree, 3= agree, 4= strongly agree.

### **Procedure for Data Collection**

Administration of the instruments was done by the researcher. The questionnaires were administered randomly to participants in their offices which did not give room to discussing any matter concerning the choice of options on the questionnaire between themselves. On the whole, data collection lasted four weeks. Out of two hundred and fifteen questionnaires distributed, only one hundred and ninety were returned and were used for the research purpose.

### **Method of data analysis**

The multiple regression statistical analysis and correlation matrix were used to analyze the data generated for this study. Correlation matrix is a statistical procedure that is used to establish the relationship between variables. It is used in this study to know the relationship between the variables of the study. Multiple regression was also used to determine the effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable.

### **Results**

**Hypothesis 1:** There is no significant relationship between the independent variables (job satisfaction and personality characteristics) and the dependent variable (Lecturers' performance).

**Table 1: Summary of Correlations among study variables**

<b>Variables</b>	<b>1</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>3</b>
<b>Mean</b>	52.2567	43.5316	40.7926



<b>Standard Deviation</b>	6.98373	4.98533	4.53678
<b>Job Satisfaction</b>	1		
<b>Personality Characteristics</b>	.144*	1	
<b>Lecturers' Job Performance</b>	.340**	.000	1

\*\*Correlation is significant at 0.01 level (2-tailed)

Table 1 reveals the inter-correlation matrix of the significant relationship among the independent variables on the prediction of lecturers' job performance. The result shows a positive significant relationship between job satisfaction and personality characteristics ( $r=.144$ ,  $P<.05$ ), there was significant relationship between job satisfaction and lecturers' job performance ( $r=.340$ ,  $P<.01$ ). This indicates that the personality characteristics and job satisfaction of the lecturers enhance their job performance.

**Hypothesis 2:** There is no significant joint contribution of job satisfaction and personality characteristics on Lecturers' performance.

**Table 2: Joint effect of the independent variables on Lecturers' Job Performance**

<b>R = .307</b>						
<b>R Square = .094</b>						
<b>Adjusted R Square = .085</b>						
Model	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	P	Remarks
1						
Regression	828.461	2	414.230	9.54	.000 <sup>a</sup>	Sig.
Residual	7943.824	188	43.409			
Total	8772.285	190				

variables (job satisfaction and personality characteristics). The table also showed a co-

efficient of multiple correlations (R) of 0.307 and a multiple adjusted R square of 0.094. This means that 9% of the variance in the lecturers' job performance is accounted for by job satisfaction and personality characteristics, when taken together. The significance of

Table 2 indicates that the composite contribution was tested at  $p < 0.05$  using the F- ratio  $(2,188) = 9.54$ . It was further found that  $R = .307$ ,  $R^2 = .094$ , Adjusted  $R^2 = .085$ . This indicates that job satisfaction and personality characteristics made a contribution of 9.4% to lecturers' job performance. This implies that the joint contribution of the independent variables was significant and that other variables not included in this study may have accounted for the remaining variance.

**Research Question 3:** There is no significant relative contribution of the independent variables (Job satisfaction and personality characteristics) on the dependent variable (Lecturers' Job performance).

**Table 3: Summary of Relative contribution of the independent variables on dependent variable**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	34.415	5.995		5.741	.000
Job satisfaction	.484	.111	.312	4.369	.000
Personal characteristics	-.080	.108	-.053	-.742	.459

The result from this table revealed the relative contribution of each of the independent variables to the dependent variable in the following order: Job satisfaction ( $\beta = .312$ ,  $t =$

x

4.369,  $p < .05$ ), personality characteristics ( $\beta = -.053$ ,  $t = -.742$ ,  $p > .05$ ). This implies that job satisfaction made significant relative contribution to Lecturers' job performance, while personality characteristics did not make significant relative contribution to Lecturers' job performance.

## **Discussion**

The analysis of the relationship from the correlation matrix table indicates a positive significant relationship among the independent variables on the prediction of lecturers' job performance. Job performance positively correlates with job satisfaction but did not correlate with personality characteristics. This finding ascertains Okolcha (2021) previous research on the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. In line with the current findings, Kwizera, Mwirumubi and Kizito, (2021) found evidence of the relationship between job satisfaction and job performance among maintenance workers in a parastatal in South Africa. Meta-analyses suggest that emotional stability prompts greater job proficiency across occupations (Clarke and Robertson, 2005), whereas neurotism should be associated with lower job efficiency. A neurotic personality experiences anxiety, depression, anger, insecurity and worry (Indiyati et al., 2016), which tend to create negative opinions. Niehoff (2006) notes also that, based on the different types of personality, it negatively correlate with job performance.

Result from the tested research shows that the Lecturers' Job performance correlated positively with job satisfaction and personality characteristics. Darsana (2013) concluded that well-constructed measures of normal personality are valid predictors of job performance. Job satisfaction and personality characteristics are so important in that their absence often lead to lethargy and reduced job performance (Ozer and Benet-Martinez, 2006; Samad, 2011). Lack of job satisfaction is a predictor of quitting a job (Mawoli and Babandako, 2011).

The result from the study revealed that Job satisfaction made the highest contribution to Lecturers' job performance while personality made zero significance. Therefore, it shows that job satisfaction is a potent factor when predicting job performance (Bakotic and Babic, 2013).

### **Conclusion**

Satisfied lecturers tend to be more loyal to their job. Generally, when people are satisfied with their job, they will have a positive attitude and feelings about their jobs. In their minds, other job would not be better than the current one. Therefore, it is unlikely that they will change their jobs. In fact, in order to maintain their current satisfied job, they will perform well and work effectively. Therefore, in order to increase the level of workers' efficiency and effectiveness, workers' level of job satisfaction should be increased. A positive effect of job performance of lecturers on job satisfaction is that turnover and absenteeism will be reduced.

### **Recommendations**

The level of lecturers' job satisfaction should be increased in order to ensure optimal level of performance with special reference to the critical areas of their job which are teaching, research and community service.

Quality assurance personnel should make use of a rewarding system to recognize lecturers who perform their job well. Indeed, one would feel highly satisfied when he or she is rewarded for hard work or outstanding performance.

Lecturers should also try to increase their intrinsic motivation, which is self-applied. If they set goals for themselves, and the goals are achieved, they will be able to feel a sense of accomplishment. This may in turn lead to an increase in the level of satisfaction at their job and thus affect their level of job performance.

### **Suggestion for Further Studies**

Though attempts have been made to establish job satisfaction and personality characteristics positively correlates with job performance among lecturers in this study, efforts should be made by other researchers to carry out an intervention studies on the improvement of job performance among lecturers.

Furthermore, improvement can be brought to the view of this study by increasing the respondents of this study or studying other institutions or organizations as well as increasing the scope of this study.

### **REFERENCES**

- Amabile, T. (2012), “Componential Theory of Creativity”. Working Paper 12-096. Harvard Business School, Cambridge.
- Amazt IH, Idris AR (2011). Lecturers’ satisfaction towards university management and decision-making styles in some Malaysian Public Universities. *Precedia soc. Behav. Sci.* 15:3957-3970.
- Bakotic, D., & Babic, T. (2013). Relationship between Working Conditions and Job Satisfaction: The Case of Croatian Shipbuilding Company. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 4(2), 206–213.
- Darsana, Made. (2013), “The Influence of Personality and Organizational Culture on Performance Through Organizational Citizenship Behavior”, *The International Journal of Management*. Vol 2 Issue 4. ISSN 2277-5846.
- Florida, R., C. Mellander and K. Stolarick. (2008), “Inside the Black Box of Regional Development—Human Capital, the Creative Class and Tolerance”, *Journal of Economic Geography* 8 (5): 615–649.
- Indiyati, D., Yulianti, E., and Ramdhany, M.A. (2016). PERSONALITY AS A DETERMINANT OF THE PERFORMANCE OF LECTURERS. *IJABER*, 14(10): 6165-6180.

- Kwizera, E., Mwirumubi, R., and Kizito, J.B. (2021). Job satisfaction and its effect on academic staff performance in chartered private universities in Burundi. *Direct Research Journal of Social Science and Educational Studies*, 8: 14-21.
- Lloyd LB, Leslie WR (2004). *Human Resource Management (7thed.)*. McGraw-Hill Education, Singapore, Asia.
- Mawoli MA, Babandako AY (2011). An evaluation of staff motivation, dissatisfaction and job performance in an academic setting. *Australian Journal of Business and Management Research*,1(9),p.1.
- Mohammed F (2013). Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment: A Correlational Study in Bahrain. *International Journal of Business, Humanities and Technology*, 3(5), 43-53.
- Niehoff (2006). The influence of personality on performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*.
- Okolocha, C., B. (2021). Job Satisfaction and Employee Productivity: Evidence From Selected Universities in South-East, Nigeria. *International Journal of Business & Law Research* 9(1):127-138.
- Ozer, D., Benet-Martínez, V. (2006), "Personality and the Prediction of Consequential Outcomes", *Annual Review of Psychology*, 57401-421.
- Raziq, A., & Maulabakhsh, R. (2015). Impact of Working Environment on Job Satisfaction. In 2nd Global Conference on Business Economics, Management and Tourism, 30-31 October 2014, Prague, Czech Republic (pp. 717–725).
- Robbins PS, Coulter M (2013). *Management (11thed.)*. Pearson Horizon Editions.
- Robbins, S. P. (2015). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice Hall, Inc. New Jersey.
- Samad S (2011). The Effects of Job Satisfaction on Organizational Commitment and Job Performance Relationship: A Case of Managers in Malaysia's Manufacturing Companies. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(4):602–611.
- Singh, P., & Loncar, N. (2010). Pay Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intent. *Relations Industrielles*, 65(3), 470–490.

Wei, L.T., & Yazdanifard, R. (2014).The impact of Positive Reinforcement on Employees' Performance in Organizations. *American Journal of Industrial and Business Management*, 4(1): 10.4236/ajibm.2014.41002

© GSJ