



Finance Management

Elixir Fin. Mgmt. 47 (2012) 8726-8730

Elixir
ISSN: 2229-712X

Factors affecting the job performance: In case of Pakistani banking sector

Abid Hussain¹, Shahzad Sardar¹, Muhammad Usman² and Ashar Ali³

¹Department of Business Administration, Government College University, Faisalabad, Pakistan.

²Banking Services Manager, Allied Bank Ltd., Pakistan.

³Department of Business Administration, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad, Pakistan.

ARTICLE INFO

Article history:

Received: 21 January 2012;

Received in revised form:

18 May 2012;

Accepted: 5 June 2012;

Keywords

Job Involvement,
Job Performance,
Gender,
Male Performance,
Female Performance.

ABSTRACT

One of the key issues in management today is the lack of Job Involvement in employees. This lack ultimately leads to lack of Performance in employees. The study was conducted to see the impact of Job Involvement on the Job Performance and the difference between the females and males with respect to Job Performance. The data was collected using questionnaires. The respondents were mainly from the Banking sector of Pakistan. The results show that there is a positive correlation ($r=0.705$, $p<0.01$) between Job Involvement and Job Performance. Moreover, the results for group statistics show there is no significant difference between performance of males and females ($\mu_m=48.6744$, $\mu_f=47.2432$) at confidence Levels of almost 35%. The reasons for such results are then discussed.

© 2012 Elixir All rights reserved.

Introduction

Employees are the most valuable asset in any organization. A successful and highly productive business can be achieved by engaging them in improving their performance. All employees are not equal in their working and they have different modes of working like some have highest capability regardless of the incentive but other may have occasional jump-start. If they are handled effectively, the result can be greater productivity and increased employee morale.

Mostly the motivation of the employees is ignored in small companies. The reason is being employers' constant pressure to increase productivity, profitability and revenue growth and it often overshadows the importance of how an unengaged workforce can negatively affect performance.

There are a number of factors which may be affecting the employees' performance. Each employee may have different effect from different things at workplace. Their attitude and behaviour can play a vital role in their performance. The level, to which the employee gets involved in his job, also plays a vital role in determining his performance. The project will identify the root of employee behaviour and how it relates to low productivity so that you can establish strategies for improving employee performance.

Climate is another factor having effect on the performance of employees. This shows how they are satisfied or dissatisfied with the job and its working environment. It will also discuss how the people are treated and valued in their working place? How they are respected and how their issues properly considered, even any small or a large issue. A system is necessary for performing the required work at any level of the organization and the employees have to follow the set procedures and there may be a difficulty in accepting the standard procedures.

Feedback and its way of getting the same will also be very effective to get the employees for their performance. If the feedback is taken properly and required changes provide

according to the need of productivity. In this project it will be discussed to find the effectiveness of this factor in employee's performance in any organization.

Role of supervision or management is also a very important role in getting the success of profitability of the organization. This has a critical role as the decision making and implementation of the useful decision is the major part of the supervision and management. Motivation is another factor playing an important role in a profitable organization. The ways to get employees motivation with its different types can be vital for the betterment of the employees' usefulness. Every type of the motivation has unique effect on performance of employees. Skill is playing an important role in improving confidence of the employee and will also have a critical role in improving the level of performance in any field of the job and ultimately will get an importance place in performance of the employee. The skill can be achieved with learning and experience. The ways of getting skills and improving skill required on job for the performance of the employees and ultimately for the profitability of the organization. Class room training, computer based / e-learning and on job training is also a considerable way of getting positive performance improvements if they are getting in a very professional way. It will also give a view of finding the importance of the said training and its effect on the performance of the employees in playing profitable role in any organization.

Rationality:

One study (Chughtai) could be found that examined the impact of job involvement on the self-report measures of job performance and organizational citizenship behaviour. The results of this study revealed that job involvement was positively correlated with both job performance ($r = 0.30$, $p<0.01$) and OCB ($r = 0.43$, $p<0.01$). In addition to this it was found that organizational commitment partially mediated the job involvement performance relationship. Furthermore the findings of this research uncovered that job involvement exerted a stronger impact on OCB than on job performance.

Finally the practical implications of this research for organizations were discussed.

Another study (L. A. Yahaya) that shows the impact of gender on job performance revealed that gender has no significant influence on job performance.

While these research findings are suggestive, they are based on rather large sample sizes or on female & male workers in more than one career fields. Additional research is clearly needed to determine if similar results are obtained with a more homogeneous sample. In addition, research is needed to determine if gender differences in the importance of job performance once the individuals enter into workforce. The study has been conducted in the banking sector. The respondents were from the middle level management, not the lower or the top management.

Objective Of The Study

The purpose of this present study was to investigate gender differences on job performance. In light of prior research findings, we predicted women would give higher importance ratings to job performance.

A second purpose of this research was to examine the effect of job involvement on the job performance and to determine if gender played a role in this effect.

We have not found any related searches in the banking sector of Pakistan. So this study aims at investigating the impacts of Gender and Involvement in the Banking Sector of Pakistan, specifically those working in Islamabad.

Present Study:

The central aim of this research is to examine the relationship between job involvement and job performance. This research will not only examine the direct effect of job involvement on in-role job performance but will also study the difference between the males and females on the basis of their performance.

Problem Statement:

How the job performance is affected by job involvement and is there any difference in performance of Males and Females?

Theoretical Framework:

1) For the research purpose, we have selected Job Involvement and Gender as independent variables and Job Performance as dependent variable.

2) A) There is a relationship between Job involvement and Job Performance.

B) There is difference between Males and Females on the basis of Performance.

3) A) As per proved by previous researches, if the Job Involvement increases, then Job Performance also increases.

B) Females perform better than males at job place.

4) Logic: As such individuals who display high involvement in their jobs consider their work to be a very important part of their lives and whether or not they feel good about themselves is closely related to how they perform on their jobs. In other words for highly involved individuals performing well on the job is important for their self esteem (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965).

Females perform better than males at their academic institutions and at workplace (Bailey and Brown, 1999).

5) Schematic Diagram



Hypothesis Development:

H₁: There is a positive relationship between Job Involvement and Job Performance.

H₂: Females perform better than males at job.

Methodology:

Research Design:

• Purpose of the Study:

The purpose of study is to test the hypotheses. This would allow to conclude the relationship between Job Involvement and Job Performance and also to clarify the difference between performance of Males and Females.

• Type of Investigation:

The study type is both Correlation and Differential in the cases of Job Involvement and Gender respectively.

• Researcher's Interference Level:

The researcher's interference is minimum and the study is conducted in natural environment.

• Study Setting:

This is a field study conducted in the natural environment, so the study setting is non-contrived.

• Unit of Analysis:

The study is conducted on the employees at workplace, so the units of analysis are the Individuals that are the employees.

• Time Horizon:

The time horizon is cross-sectional, as the data is collected only once from the respondents.

Population and Sample:

• The population under study is the employees working in Islamabad, who are directly involved in customer services. For the purpose of research, the sample taken consisted of employees of organizations like Askari bank Limited, HBL, ZTBL etc.

• Sample Size:

A sample size of 80 was selected for the purpose of study. The number was calculated as follows:

• 30 for each group in the differential variable (30 males, 30 Females)

• 10 for Job Performance

• 10 for Job Involvement

• Sample Design:

The sample was selected using non-probability sampling. The design used is quota sampling, in which we decided the number of males and females to respond to our questionnaires. The sample was to consist of minimum 30 males and 30 females. The sample taken was of 43 males and 37 females.

Measurement:

Measurement for the variables has been done through questionnaires. The demographic details were taken and the two variables namely; Job Involvement and Job Performance were measured using 9 and 14 statements questionnaires scales respectively. The Scale for Job Involvement used was prepared by J.K. White and R.R. Ruh (1973). The Scale of Job Performance used was taken from Lamar Institute of Technology (www.lit.edu), which used this scale to measure the job performance of its employees.

The two variables are quantitative in nature and were measured through Interval Scale with the rating 1 to 5. For Involvement, Likert Scale was used for rating; the items were Strongly Disagree, Disagree, Neither Agree nor Disagree, Agree and Strongly Agree. For Performance, Itemized Rating Scale was used for rating; the items were Major Improvement Needed, Some Improvement Needed, Meets Expectations, Often Exceeds

Expectations and Consistently Exceeds Expectations. Gender was measure on the Nominal Scale, using dichotomous rating.

The Cronbach's Alpha for this scale is 0.888, which means that the scale is highly reliable for measuring Job Involvement.

A total of 80 questionnaires were filled. The table above shows the statistics of the Job Involvement questionnaires, filled in by the respondents.

The Cronbach's Alpha for this scale is 0.948, which means that the scale is highly reliable for measuring Job Performance.

A total of 80 questionnaires were filled. The table above shows the statistics of the Job Performance questionnaires, filled in by the respondents.

The table above shows the frequency of male and female respondents considered for the study.

The following table shows the descriptive statistics of the two subjective variables used in the study, i-e Job Involvement and Job Performance.

It contains the minimum and maximum total of scales, the means and the standard deviations.

The results show that there is a positive correlation between Job Involvement and Job Performance. The value of $r = 0.705$ shows a high correlation. This means where the employees have a higher Job Involvement, their Job Performance goes up. The level of significance is 0.01, showing that the results are highly valid and reliable. There exists a highly significant positive correlation between Job Involvement and Job Performance, thus proving the hypothesis true.

From the above tables, we infer that the hypothesis that the females perform better than males is untrue. There is a slight difference in the performance of males and females, with high significance levels. So, we conclude that there is no significant difference between males and females on the basis of Job Performance.

Discussion:

The results show that the correlation between Job Involvement and Job Performance is positive with a magnitude of 0.705. The confidence level is 99%, which shows that the chances of error in the results are only 1%.

The group statistics for males and females show that there is not a significant difference between the performance of males and females. The results show a high level of significance, thus a low confidence level. The hypothesis does not hold true in this case. The reason for this might be the selection of area and the industry. Moreover, the respondents are the middle-level management employees.

Suggestions & Limitations:

The study focuses only on the banking sector of Pakistan. The respondents were generally the high post individuals. Further researches are required in the other sectors of the economy. Moreover, the lower level management should also be included in the further researches. The scale used for the measurement of Job Performance is Texas based. The means of measurement should be adopted as suiting the local job systems. Furthermore, the hypothesis relating to females and males performance did not prove true. It needs to be taken into consideration. The reason might be the selection of sector or the position of employee in management. The reason may also be the locality being considered.

The study also lacks the other factors that affect Job Performance, like Motivation, Organizational Commitment, Job Satisfaction, Pay Scale, Employee Empowerment, leadership traits, Climate, Work Environment, and Self-Esteem etc. Further researches can be made relating to these and other variables.

Reference

- Somers, M.J. & Birnbaum, D. (1998). Work-related commitment and job performance: it's also the nature of the performance that counts. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 19, 621-34.
- Spector, P.E. (1987). Method variance as an artifact in self-reported affect and perceptions at work: Myth or significant problem. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, 438-443.
- Yousef, D.A. (1998). Satisfaction with job security as a predictor of organizational commitment and job performance in a multicultural environment. *International Journal of Manpower*, 19, 184-194.
- Zikmund, W.G. (2003). *Business research methods*. Ohio: Thomson South-Western.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Lee, J.L., Podsakoff, N.P. (2003). Common method biases in behavioural research: A critical review of the literature and recommended remedies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88, 879-903.
- Podsakoff, P.M., Mackenzie, S.B., Moorman, R.H., & Fetter, R. (1990). Transformational leader behaviours and their effects on followers trust in leader, satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behaviours. *Leadership Quarterly*, 1, 107 – 142.
- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D.T. (1977). Organizational research on job involvement. *Psychological Bulletin*, 84, 265-288.
- Rabinowitz, S., & Hall, D.T. (1981). Changing correlates of job involvement in three career stages. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 18, 138-144.
- Rotenberry, P.F., & Moberg, P.J. (2007). Assessing the impact of job involvement on performance. *Management Research News*, 30, 203-215.
- Saal, F.E. (1978). Job involvement: A multivariate approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 63, 53-61.
- Motowidlo, 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.
- Motowidlo, S.J. & Van Scotter, J.R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475-480.
- Murphy, K. R. & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding Performance Appraisal*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.
- Noe, R.A., Hollenbeck, J.R., Gerhart, B. & Wright, P.M., (1994). *Human Resource Management: Gaining a Competitive Advantage*. Burr Ridge, Illinois: Irwin.
- Oeser, O.A., & Harary, F. (1964). A mathematical model for structural role theory, II. *Human Relations*, 17, 3-17.
- Organ, D.W. (1988). A restatement of the satisfaction-performance Hypothesis. *Journal of Management*, 14(4), 547-557.
- www.lit.edu/pdf/facstaff/PerformanceEvaluation.pdf
- Campbell, J.D., Trapnell, P.D., Heine, S.J., Katz, I.M., Lavallee, L.F., & Lehman, D.R. (1996). Self-concept clarity: Measurement, personality correlates, and cultural boundaries. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 70(1), 141-156.
- Campbell, J.P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In M.D. Dunnette and L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, (Vol. 1, 2nd ed., pp 687-732), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press
- Campbell, J.P., McCloy, R.A., Oppler, S.H., & Sager, C.E. (1993). A theory of performance. In N. Schmidt, W.C. Borman, & Assoc. (Eds.), *Personnel Selection in Organizations*, pp 35-70, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Cardy, R. L. & Dobbins, G. H. (1994). *Performance Appraisal: Alternative Perspectives*. Cincinnati, OH: South-Western Publishing Co.

Dyer, L. & Theriault, R. (1976). The determinants of pay satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61: 596-604.

Gerhart, B., Minkhoff, H.B., & Olsen, R.N. (1995). *Employee compensation, theory, practice, and evidence*. Center for Advanced Human Resource Studies, Cornell University, Ithaca, NY: working paper 95-04.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R. & Balkin, D.B. (1992). *Compensation, organizational strategy, and firm performance*. Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western Publishing Co.

Gomez-Mejia, L.R., Balkin, D.B., & Cardy, R.L. (1998). *Managing human resources*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice-Hall, Inc.

Graham-Moore, B.E. & Ross, T.L. (1990). *Productivity gainsharing: How employee incentive plans can improve business performance*. Englewood Cliffs, NJ: Prentice-Hall.

Heneman, H.G., & Schwab, D.P. (1985) Pay satisfaction: Its multidimensional nature and measurement. *Journal of Psychology*, 20, 129-141.

Ilgel, D.R., & Hollenbeck, J.R. (1992). The structure of work: Job design and roles. In M.D. Dunnette and L.M. Hough (Eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, (Vol. 2, 2nd ed., pp 165-207), Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press.

Jackson, S.E., & Schuler, R.S. (1995). Understanding human resource management in the context of organizations and their environments. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 46, 237-204.

Mead R. What is Stress? Roger Mead Associates, Stress Management, Coaching and Training for Individuals and Groups 2000.

Murphy, S. L. Sauter, *Occupational Stress Issues & Development in Research*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.

Harrison, D.A., and Martocchio, J.J. (1998). Time for absenteeism: A 20-year review of origins, offshoots and outcomes. *Journal of Management*, 24, 305-350.

Lawler, E.E. (1994). From job-based to competency-based organizations. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 15, 3-15.

Lawler, E.E. (1992). *The Ultimate Advantage*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Lawler, E.E. (1986). *High Involvement Management: Participative Strategies for Improving Organizational Performance*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass. Role-Based Performance Scale WP 97-05 Page 28

Lawler, E.E., Mohrman, S.A., & Ledford, G.E. (1992). *Employee Involvement and Total Quality Management: Practices and Results in Fortune 1000 Companies*, San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass.

Motowidlo, 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.

Motowidlo, S.J. & Van Scotter, J.R. (1994). Evidence that task performance should be distinguished from contextual performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 79(4), 475-480.

JK White RR Ruh (1973). Effects of Personal Values on the relationship between participation and Job Attitudes. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 18, 4, p.509

Murphy, K. R. & Cleveland, J. N. (1995). *Understanding Performance Appraisal*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publications.

Lodahl, T., and Kejner, M. (1965). The definition and measurement of job involvement. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 49, 24-33.

Reliability Statistics of Job Involvement

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.888	.892	9

Statistics Job Involvement

N	Valid	80
	Missing	0
Mean		34.2000
Std. Error of Mean		.82454
Median		34.5000
Std. Deviation		7.37495
Variance		54.390
Range		30.00

Reliability Statistics of Job Performance

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.948	.947	14

Statistics Job Performance

N	Valid	80
	Missing	0
Mean		48.0125
Std. Error of Mean		1.55169
Median		48.5000
Mode		70.00
Std. Deviation		13.87876
Variance		192.620
Range		53.00

Gender

		Frequency	Percent	Valid Percent	Cumulative Percent
Valid	Male	43	53.8	53.8	53.8
	Female	37	46.3	46.3	100.0
	Total	80	100.0	100.0	

Descriptive Statistics

	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
JobInvolvement	80	15.00	45.00	34.2000	7.37495
JobPerformance	80	17.00	70.00	48.0125	13.87876
Valid N (list wise)	80				

Results and Interpretations: Correlations

		JobInvolvement	JobPerformance
JobInvolvement	Pearson Correlation	1	.705(**)
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000
	N	80	80
JobPerformance	Pearson Correlation	.705(**)	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	
	N	80	80

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

Group Statistics

	gendertotal	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
JobPerformance	1	43	48.6744	13.04337	1.98910
	2	37	47.2432	14.93580	2.45543