Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance at Bhutan Board Product Limited

Effulgence

Vol. 19, No. 2

July - December, 2021

Rukmini Devi Institute of Advanced Studies

E-mail : effulgence@rdias.ac.in, Website : www.rdias.ac.in

<http://effulgence.rdias.ac.in/user/default.aspx>

<https://dx.doi.org/10.33601/effulgence.rdias/v19/i2/2021/39-52>

Dr. Rajnish Ratna¹ ✉

Mr. Karma Yezer²

Mr. B. B. Rasaily³

Mr. Sangay Tenzin⁴

Mr. Lachuman Ghalley⁵

Mrs. Tshering Lhamo⁶

Abstract

The productivity of an organization as a whole, depends on employee job satisfaction, the success of any organization depends on the effectiveness of manpower that gets pleasure from their jobs and feel rewarded for their efforts. The aim of this research is to examine the employee job satisfaction and its effect on employees' performance. Descriptive and hypotheses testing design are used in this study. The convenient sampling technique is used and data is collected from 148 employees using a well-designed self-administered questionnaire. SPSS is used for data analysis. The results showed a significant and positive impact of employee job satisfaction on employee performance. It is reported that the overall employee job satisfaction and employee performance are found above average, though above supervisors are performing slightly better than others; while female employees are slightly more satisfied than male employees. It is recommended to the organization to give more importance on all facets of employee job satisfaction to have better employee performance.

Keywords: Employee Job Satisfaction, Employee Performance, Benefits, Communication, Contingent Reward, Nature of Work, Operating Procedures, Promotion, Supervision, Customer Focus, Job Knowledge, Motivation of Staff, Quantity of Work, Quality of Work, Team Work, Work Attitude.

-
1. Associate Professor, Gedu College of Business Studies, Royal University of Bhutan, rajnish.gcbs@rub.edu.bt
 2. Lecturer, Gedu College of Business Studies, Royal University of Bhutan, karmayezer.gcbs@rub.edu.bt
 3. HR Officer, Gedu College of Business Studies, Royal University of Bhutan, bbrasaily.gcbs@rub.edu.bt
 4. Teacher, Norbuling Higher Secondary School, Sarpang, sangayt123@education.gov.bt
 5. Teacher, Sarpang Middle Secondary School, Sarpang, lgally13@gmail.com
 6. Lecturer (HR), Gedu College of Business Studies, Royal University of Bhutan, tsheringlhamo.gcbs@rub.edu.bt

INTRODUCTION

Human resource is the most valuable asset of organizational success (Muhammad & Wajidi, 2013). Human resources are the heart of organizational organ that keeps the organization alive. The human resources should be utilized to optimum levels to achieve individual and organizational goals. In the works of Kumar et al. (2013), it is highlighted that happy worker are productive workers and productive workers are likely to be happy. The productivity of an organization is determined by employee's performance. Owusu (2014) mentioned that dissatisfied employees have high turnover, low commitment and high absenteeism rate. Ratna (2009) conducted a research on job satisfaction of employees in IT sector and suggested that increased level of job satisfaction can minimize attrition rate to certain extent. In the same line, Clark (2001) conducted research on data from the British Household Panel Survey (BHPS) showed that satisfaction with total pay, job security, and the ability to work, the actual work itself and hours of work leads to a reduced reduction in employee turnover. Besides that, it has a number of benefits like enhanced organizational citizenship behaviours (Organ and Ryan, 1995). Furthermore, Murray (1999), points out that it accelerates employees' retention level and reduces unnecessary hiring cost to company or organization. Job satisfaction survey would offer deeper understanding on how to maintain, attract and develop skilled employees.

Bhutan is a small country that lies between two giant nations that have rich natural resources and environment. Due to its richness Bhutan is the main source of carbon store that benefits people. Wood is natural, renewable building product that can be grown sustainably in productive forest. Bhutan Board Product Limited (BBPL) is the first biggest wood manufacturing industries in the country with meaningful extraction of timber and produce board particles. Ever since the establishment of the company, the company has not carried out employee

job satisfaction survey which is an important aspect in human capital development. The life of the company lies in the hands of the employees. Therefore, the findings of this study can be used by the client organization in amending specific regulation and procedures were ever found missing and credit for the success areas. Though the turnover rate in BBPL is not very high timely employee satisfaction must be monitored to combat future lapses and repercussion. Therefore, it is assumed that it would be of great value for BBPL to conduct employee satisfaction survey to understand and address future needs before it becomes serious.

REVIEW LITERATURE

According to Hoppock (1935), the earliest definition mentions that job satisfaction is the mixture of once psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances that let a person to mention his/her gratification of a job. Similarly, Locke (1969, 1976) also highlighted job satisfaction as a positive emotional state that results from the one's own performance on the job experience. Similarly, Mankoe (2002) stated that job satisfaction is a couple of feelings which employees have about their work. The works of the mentioned scholars take into the consideration of person's need of emotional state, although job satisfaction is under the influence of many external attributes. The external attributes all contributes to the emotional well-being of a person. Spector (1997) in his work defines job satisfaction as an extent to which people like or dislike their jobs. The definition highlighted by scholars revolves around the emotional reaction of employees to the aspects of their job and actions they experience in the workplace. To some extent it connotes that, a satisfied worker or employees are the one who have a professional attitude towards their job and contentment and how satisfied they are in regard to the job. In brief, job satisfaction can be defined as how much employee like or dislike their job which implies that how much they are happy and contented in fulfilling their most needs and desires at the workplace. Job satisfaction is believed to be

complicated and viewed differently by different scholars and individuals; however, it is associated with motivation even though the significance of the connection is still not apparent (Aziri, 2011). Job satisfaction simply describes that the level of happiness and delight employees gets once their desires and needs at works are fulfilled. It can be in the form of tangible or intangible rewards and motivation to capture their emotional feelings at work.

According to Murphy and Kroecker (1988), Employee performance is defined as a role and responsibility of individual performance to achieve a particular objective specified in the standard job descriptions. On the other hand, Rotundo and Sackett (2002) mentioned that employee's capability to manage behaviors and actions that contribute to an organization's goals. In most of the literature employee performance is centered from the individual behavior. Murphy and Kroecker (1988) asserted that if performance is centered from the outcome, it would influence employees to find a shortcut to achieve results that would affect organization in the long run and lack certain performance behaviors. However, Befort and Hatstrup (2003) stated that the significance of job performance depends on the workload, the organizational goals and mission, and behavior of the organization.

Cook (2008) conducted a study on employee satisfaction and performance and mentioned that the employee gets satisfaction if the job provides expected psychological and physiological needs. Lim (2008) substantiated that job satisfaction plays critical role in both personal interest and organization success and therefore it became paramount importance to study for multiple reasons. Additionally, Bin (2016), also mentioned that employee satisfaction makes good business sense and increase productivity and career enhancement. To achieve organizational goal the behavior of the employee towards their own job is considered of paramount importance (Rotundo and Sackett, 2002).

Ratna and Kaur (2016) reported that job satisfaction is have more impact on performance as compared to other job factors like Health and Safety, Work Life Balance etc.

When employees are satisfied greater the chances of productivity of an employee and the organization as a whole. According to Abbas and Yaqoob (2009), performance of individual employees is influenced by the job satisfaction and higher performer must be looked better from the organization for them to succeed more. In most of the organization the output and productivity of an organization is assessed against the performance of the employees and for the higher performer employee demands a higher level of job satisfaction (Sousa-Posa and Sousa-Posa, 2000). According to Ahmad and Shahzad (2011), performance of employee expresses the attainment of the organizational goals and mission. Jhajharia, Ratna and Mathias (2013) concluded that employee satisfaction is important for increase in productivity and smooth running. Anitha (2014) disclosed that the attributes such as relationship with bosses, co-workers, compensation procedure, and engagement of an employee are determining factors for performance. Conversely, Alagarajal & Shuck (2015), point out that the performance of an employee can be measured by regular training and improvement. Ratna and Tummala (2012) reported that incentive plan is having more impact on work motivation as compared to fix components of compensation.

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

1. Research Objectives

- i. To find the level of employee satisfaction and employee performance with different components of job satisfaction at Bhutan Board Product limited (BBPL), Darla.
- ii. To explore job satisfaction and employee performance with respect to demographic variables of employee at BBPL.
- iii. To find the impact of job satisfaction on employee performance at BBPL.

2. Proposed alternate hypothesis

- H₁:** The level of employee satisfaction with a job is above average
- H₂:** The level of employee performance is above average
- H_{3A}:** There is significant difference between job satisfaction and gender of employees.
- H_{3B}:** There is significant difference between employee performance and gender of employees.
- H_{4A}:** There is significant difference between job satisfaction and age group of employees.
- H_{4B}:** There is significant difference between employee performance and age group of employees.
- H_{5A}:** There is significant difference between job satisfaction and level of employees.
- H_{5B}:** There is significant difference between employee performance and level of employees.
- H_{6A}:** There is significant difference between job satisfaction and education level of employees.
- H_{6B}:** There is significant difference between employee performance and education level of employees.
- H₇:** There is significant impact of employee satisfaction on employee performance.

3. Instruments

For job satisfaction, Job Satisfaction Survey developed by Spector (1997) is adopted for this study. It comprised of 36 items based on nine job factors. The job facets include pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, contingent rewards, operating procedures, co-workers, nature of work and communication. Well-designed questionnaire is used for employee performance that is comprised of 24 that is covered under - Customer focus, Fairness (Attendance & responsibility), Job Knowledge (product and services), Motivation of staff, Quantity of work, Quality of work, Team work, and Work attitude.

4. Sampling Techniques – Convenient sampling
5. Sample Size – 148
6. Research population and site - in the plant and forest division under BBPL
7. Data Collection Technique – Structured interview.

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

1. **Sample description** – This is described to introduce the composition of respondents.

Table 1. Sample Description of respondents

Demographic factors	Types	Frequency	Percent	Cumulative Percent
Gender	Male	111	75.0	75.0
	Female	37	25.0	100.0
	Total	462	100.0	
Qualification	Below 10	97	65.5	97.6
	Undergraduate	47	31.8	100.0
	Graduate	4	2.7	
	Total	462	100.0	
Age	18-25	12	8.1	8.1
	25-35	43	29.1	37.2
	35-45	40	27	64.2
	45 and above	53	35.8	100.0
	Total	148	100.0	

Designation	Above supervisor	7	4.7	4.7
	Supervisor	6	4.1	8.8
	Below supervisor	135	91.2	100.0
	Total	148	100.0	
Work Experience	Above 1 Year	7	4.7	4.7
	1-5 years	26	17.6	22.3
	5-10 years	25	16.9	39.2
	Above 10 Years	90	60.8	100.0
	Total	148	100	

The respondent constitutes of 75% male and 25% female employees. It shows that major chunk of the employees is below supervisor level. As per the age group, more numbers of employees are of 45 years and above which comprises of 53 employees out of 148 samples giving 35.8%. Qualification wise, it shows that maximum numbers of employees of BBPL are having below class 10 level qualifications. It shows that 97 employees out of 148 samples are having qualification below class 10 level showing 65.5%. The maximum numbers of employees are below the class 10 level because the company is

deploying a huge number of manual workers than the office workers besides machineries. Majority of the employees of BBPL has work experience of more than 10 years. Out of 148 samples taken more than 90 employees are having work experience of above 10 years, which comes to 62.2% indicating that the company has a good number of experienced employees (Table 1).

2. Reliability Analysis - it conducted to test the reliability of instruments and result is presented in table 2.

Table 2. Reliability Results

Variable	No. of Items	Cronbach's Alpha
1. Employee Satisfaction	36	0.912
Benefits	4	0.808
Communication	4	0.801
Contingent reward	4	0.859
Co-workers	4	0.849
Nature of work	4	0.861
Operating procedures	4	0.818
Pay	4	0.815
Promotion	4	0.791
Supervision	4	0.783
2. Employee Performance	24	0.802
Customer focus	3	0.718
Fairness (Attendance and responsibility)	3	0.764

Job Knowledge (Product and service)	3	0.709
Motivation of staff	3	0.756
Quantity of work	3	0.708
Quality of work	3	0.764
Team work	3	0.709
Work attitude	3	0.756
Overall	60	0.914

It is interpreted those instruments used in this study are reliable as is value of $\alpha > 0.7$ for both variables, respective dimensions and Overall (Table 2).

3. Descriptive Analysis

This conducted to study the present level of study variables.

3.1. One sample t-test

One sample t-test is conducted to study the present level of employee job satisfaction and employee performance with test value of '3'.

Table 3. One-Sample Statistics

Variable	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Job Satisfaction	3.128	0.342	0.028
Employee Performance	4.068	0.463	0.038

Highest mean is reported for performance followed by job satisfaction (Table 3).

Table 4. One-Sample Test

Variable	Test Value = 3					
	t	Df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference	
					Lower	Upper
Job Satisfaction	4.557	147	0	0.128	0.072	0.183
Employee Performance	28.077	147	0	1.068	0.993	1.143

The overall mean for employee job satisfaction and employee performance is above average, according to the one-sample statistics (table 3) that is shown as 3.12 and 4.06. Further to substantiate, the one-sample test initiated (table 4) and the value of P is less than 0.05 which shows that the employee job satisfaction and employee performance is above average. Therefore, hypothesis H_1 and hypothesis H_2 are accepted.

4. Test of difference -

This test is conducted to study the perceptual difference towards Job Satisfaction (EJS) and Employee

Performance (EP) with respect to demographic factors of respondents.

4.1. Gender – independent sample t-test is conducted to study the difference in study variable with respect to gender.

Figure 1: Group Statistics (Based on gender)

According to the group statistics (Figure 1) it revealed that the job satisfaction level of female employees is slightly more satisfied as compared to male employees. However, on the other hand, the mean of employee performance is higher for male employees and low for female employees.

Table 5. Independent Sample Test

Variable		Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means				
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference
Job satisfaction	EVA	7.134	.008	-.804	146	.423	-.0523	.065
	EVNA			-1.080	119.245	.282	-.0523	.048
Employee Performance	EVA	3.074	.082	2.115	146	.036	.1837	.086
	EVNA			2.554	91.409	.012	.1837	.071
Note: EVA- Equal variances assumed & EVNA -Equal variances not assumed								

The value of p in independent sample test (table 5) is more than 0.05 (.282) that means job satisfaction is not having significant difference with respect to gender of the employees. Thereby, proposed alternate hypothesis H_{3A} is rejected. Similarly, the test result for the employee performance based on the independent sample test (table 5) showed that the value of p is less than 0.05 (.036) which means there is a significant difference in male and female employees. Based on results, the proposed alternate hypothesis H_{3B} is accepted.

4.2. Age group – One-way Anova is conducted to study the difference in study variables with respect to age of respondents.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics with Age Group

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Job Satisfaction	18-25	12	3.166	.374	.108
	25-35	43	3.105	.324	.049
	35-45	40	3.029	.403	.063
	45 and above	53	3.212	.279	.038
	Total	148	3.128	.342	.028
Employee Performance	18-25	12	4.206	.389	.112
	25-35	43	3.915	.441	.067
	35-45	40	3.967	.587	.092
	45 and above	53	4.238	.311	.042
	Total	148	4.068	.463	.038

Highest mean is reported for the age group of 45 and above for both variables – job satisfaction and employee performance (Table 6).

Table 7 ANOVA Result of Age Group

Variable		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	0.806	3	0.269	2.358	0.074
	Within Groups	16.408	144	0.114		
	Total	17.214	147			
Employee Performance	Between Groups	3.181	3	1.06	5.389	0.002
	Within Groups	28.336	144	0.197		
	Total	31.517	147			

Table 8. Homogeneous Sub-Set Result of job satisfaction for Age Group

Employee Job Satisfaction			
	Age years	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05
			1
Tukey B ^{a,b}	35-45	40	3.0292
	25-35	43	3.1059
	18-25	12	3.1667
	45 and above	53	3.2123

The satisfaction level with respect to age group found slightly better for the age group of 45 and above indicated in Table 10 (mean 3.2123). Moreover, their performance was also found better compared to other age group (mean 4.2385). While the glimpse on significance level the ANOVA result (Table 10) showed that employee job satisfaction has P value which is more than 0.05 so there is less possibility of significant difference towards the variables with respect to age. However, on the other the value of P is less than 0.05 for employee

performance so, there is a significant difference towards the variables with respect to age group. Further from the Homogeneous Sub Set (Table 8 & 9), it revealed that there is no significant difference in respect to employee job satisfaction. Thereby, the proposed alternate hypothesis H_{4A} is rejected. But there is significant difference in respect to employee performance between age group of 25-35 and above 45 only. Therefore, proposed alternate hypothesis H_{4B} is partially accepted.

Table 9 Homogeneous Sub-Set result of employee performance for age group

Employee Performance				
	Age years	N	Subset for alpha = 0.05	
			1	2
Tukey B ^{a,b}	25-35	43	3.9153	
	35-45	40	3.967	3.967
	18-25	12	4.2067	4.2067
	45 and above	53		4.2385

4.3. Designation - One-way Anova is conducted to study the difference in study variables with respect to designation of respondents.

Table 10 Designation

Variable		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Job Satisfaction	Above supervisor	7	3.214	.1875	.0708
	Supervisor	6	3.333	.3531	.1441
	Below supervisor	135	3.114	.3460	.0297
	Total	148	3.128	.3422	.0281
Employee Performance	Above supervisor	7	4.405	.2279	.0861
	Supervisor	6	4.033	.1866	.0761
	Below supervisor	135	4.052	.4746	.0408
	Total	148	4.068	.4630	.0380

The table 10. showed that employee whose are in supervisor and above supervisor category are performing slightly better than below supervisor similarly, performance of above supervisor is better than other categories.

Table 11. ANOVA result for designation

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	0.329	2	0.165	1.414	0.247
	Within Groups	16.884	145	0.116		
	Total	17.214	147			
Employee Performance	Between Groups	0.837	2	0.418	1.978	0.142
	Within Groups	30.68	145	0.212		
	Total	31.517	147			

However, in the ANOVA result (Table 11.) the value of P is more than 0.05 so there is least possibility of significant change in job satisfaction and performance with respect to level of employees. Therefore, the alternate hypotheses H_{5A} and H_{5B} are rejected.

4.4. Educational Qualification - One-way Anova is conducted to study the difference in study variables with respect to educational qualification of respondents.

Table 12. Educational Qualification

		N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error
Job satisfaction	Below 10	87	3.168	.2954	.0300
	Undergraduate	47	3.032	.4189	.0611
	Graduate	14	3.270	.1702	.0851
	Total	148	3.128	.3422	.0281
Employee Performance	Below 10	97	4.065	.3264	.0331
	Undergraduate	47	4.047	.6691	.0976
	Graduate	4	4.390	.2909	.1454
	Total	148	4.068	.4630	.0380

The mean comparison based on educational qualification (Table 12.) highlighted that the employees who has qualification of graduate are slightly more satisfied towards their job and performing slightly better in job.

Table 13. ANOVA result for educational qualification

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Job Satisfaction	Between Groups	0.671	2	0.335	2.939	0.056
	Within Groups	16.543	145	0.114		
	Total	17.214	147			
Employee Performance	Between Groups	0.435	2	0.217	1.014	0.365
	Within Groups	31.082	145	0.214		
	Total	31.517	147			

However, viewing on overall results based on the ANOVA (Table 13.) shows that the p value is greater than 0.05 which statistically implies that there is no significant difference in employee job satisfaction and performance with respect to education qualification of the employees. It also indicates that irrespective of qualification the satisfaction level and performing is not harmed. Thereby, the proposed alternate hypotheses H_{6A} and H_{6B} are rejected.

5. Regression Analysis

Table 14. Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.492 ^a	0.242	0.192	0.41619

The model summary shows that 19.2% of variation independent variable is explained by the independent variable. The remaining is attributed to other factors.

Table 15. ANOVA Results

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	7.614	9	0.846	4.884	.000 ^b
	Residual	23.903	138	0.173		
	Total	31.517	147			

In ANOVA result the value of P is less than 0.05 so, the factors of employee job satisfaction are predictors of employee performance.

Table 16. Coefficient Results

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.601	0.331		7.868	0.000
	JS	0.469	0.105	0.347	4.468	0.000

In the coefficient result the value of p is significant which means there is significant impact of employee job satisfaction on employee performance. From the value of standardized coefficient it is revealed that one unit change in independent variable will change 0.347 units on the dependent variable. Therefore, proposed H_7 is accepted.

CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

The BBPL constitutes of 75% male and 25% female employees. The maximum chunks of the employees in BBPL are male and 91.2% of the employees are below supervisory level. The majority of the employees are found to be 25 years and above and 65.5% of the employees have the education qualification of class 10 and below or illiterate. The majority of the employees have work experience of more than 10 years in the current organization

and same for the total work experience. The nature of work, co-workers, and supervision are the top three job facets that boost employee job satisfaction according to the inferred data. While operating procedures, promotion, and benefits are the least job facets for the employee job satisfaction. However, the overall job satisfaction is found to be above average. The overall performance of the employees working under the company falls above average, which is an indication that the performance of the employees is found to be very good.

From results, it is reported that employee job satisfaction and employee performance to be above average which is good for the company. As per the result generated female employees are found slightly more satisfied than male employees. However, the performances of male employees are better than female employees in respect to gender. There is not much difference in employee job satisfaction with respect to all age groups. However, age groups of 18-25 and 45 and above are found to be slightly performing better. As per the collected survey questionnaire the researchers have found several designations, however, owing to the convenience of the researcher they are categorized into three major groups such as above supervisor, supervisor, and below supervisor. According to the data analysis, it is revealed that above supervisors are performing slightly better than others. On the other hand, the satisfaction level derived from the job is also found to be same, meaning performing well. Irrespective of qualification all the employees are satisfied as well and performing well. There is a positive and significant correlation between the employee job satisfaction and employee performance. Therefore, employee job satisfaction has an effect on the employee performance.

There is a positive a significant correlation between employee job satisfaction and employee performance. Therefore, employee job satisfaction has an effect on the employee performance. The outcome of mentioned hypothesis is in line with the past studies conducted by Vermeeran, Kuipers and

Steijn (2011). Aziri (2011) suggested that job satisfaction have a direct relationship to employee performance which indicates that a satisfied employee has a higher performance level.

After the rigorous analysis, the findings of this study act as a basis for the management of BBPL, Darla to intervene in the areas that needs improvement and they can also maintain the same level or try to increase the satisfaction level in areas which are exceptionally good.

Recommendations

Based on the findings of the study the following recommendations were drawn from the current study. The information generated would help client organization in keeping the same spirit for the success and positive outcomes followed with some interventions where ever it is lagging with respect to job facets and performance.

1. Promotion is a major form of boosting employee motivation and morale. This results in high productivity and prevent from losing high achiever and important employees from the organization. Similarly, an employee benefit is also a motivating factor to boost employee in carrying out their responsibility with full dedication. However, among the nine job facets of employee job satisfaction the satisfaction level derived from the benefits and promotion is minimal. Therefore, researchers recommend to review on the employee benefits and promotion plan if company mandate does not object. The employees were happy and contented with the type of work that they are performing and the people they work with. Apart from that the company has excellent safety measures that protect employees from exposing to hazardous working environment.
2. As per result of the computed mean for the job facets it was found that operating procedure is below average which means employees are not satisfied. For that the company can work on

developing skills of employee via training opportunities, mentoring, online courses or external training which ultimately improves operating procedure and level of satisfaction enhanced.

3. The overall satisfaction levels of employee's were found to be above average, which is a good sign for the company to treasure the success.
4. The overall performance of the company with respect to identified dimensions found to be above average, which means the performance of individual employees is very good. However, due importance and attention must be given in the area of motivating staff and job knowledge.
5. The data analysis found that there is positive and significant correlation between the employee job satisfaction and employee performance. Researchers would like to recommend a client organization to give more importance on employee job satisfaction that has direct impact on the employee performance.

Limitation and future scope of the study

The study is confined to Darla (BBPL) alone, which has two departments, namely plant and forestry division with 234 employees. Most of the workers under plant were found illiterate and the enumerators had to translate in the local language to get the information. Some information might have been concealed due to the presence of enumerators.

Owing to the above limitations, the results obtained have valuable contributions towards the client organization to intervene in the areas of least satisfaction and make improvement where ever necessary. However, future researchers can focus on including all the employees working under the Bhutan Board Product Limited (BBPL).

REFERENCES

- Abbas, Q., & Yaqoob, S. (2009). Effect of leadership development on employee performance in Pakistan. *Pakistan Economic and Social Review*, 47 (2), p.269-292.
- Ahmad, S., & Shahzad, K. (2011). HRM and employee performance: A case of university teachers of Azad Jammu and Kashmir (AJK) in Pakistan. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(13), p.5249.
- Alagarajal, M., & Shuck, B. (2015). Exploring Organizational Alignment-Employee Engagement Linkages and Impact on Individual Performance a Conceptual Model. *Human Resource Development Review*, 14(1), 17-37.
- Anitha, J. (2014). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), p.308-324.
- Aziri, B. (2011). Job satisfaction: A literature review. *Management research and practice*, 3(4), p.77-86.
- Bin Shmailan, A.S., (2016). The relationship between job satisfaction, job performance and employee engagement: An explorative study. *Issues in Business Management and Economics*, 4(1), 1-8, DOI:10.15739/IBME.16.001.
- Clark, A (2001) What really matters in a job? Hedonic measurement using quit data. *Labour Economics* 8(2): 223-242.
- Cook, L. A. (2008), *Job Satisfaction and Performance: Is the Relationship Spurious?* (MSc. Thesis), Texas A&M University, Texas.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job satisfaction*, Harper and Brothers, New York.
- Jhajharia, P., Ratna, R. & Mathias, S. A. (2013). Study of employee satisfaction level at a public sector unit. *International Journal of Organizational Behaviour & Management Perspectives*, 2 (3), 445-463.
- Kumar, R., Ahmed, J., Shaikh, B. T., Hafeez, R., & Hafeez, A. (2013). Job satisfaction among public health professionals working in public sector: A cross sectional study from Pakistan. *Human Resources for Health*, 11(1), 2-5. doi:10.1186/1478- 4491-11-2.
- Lim, S. (2008), 'Job Satisfaction of Information Technology Workers in Academic Libraries', *Library and Information Science Research*, 30 (2)

- p. 115-121.
- Locke, E. A. (1969), What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4, p. 309-336.
- Locke, E. A. (1976), The nature causes and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette M. C. (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 1297- 1349). Chicago, IL: Rand McNally.
- Mankoe, J. O. (2002), *Educational administration and management in Ghana*. Winneba: University of Education.
- Muhammad R. A & Wajidi. F.A (2013). Factors influencing job satisfaction in public health sector of Pakistan. Double Blind Peer Reviewed International Research Journal Publisher: Global Journals Inc. (USA).
- Murphy, K.R., Kroecker, L. (1988). *Dimensions of Job Performance*. San Diego: Navy Personnel Development and Research Center in Murphy.
- Murray, R. A. (1999). *Job Satisfaction of Professional and Paraprofessional Library Staff at Chapel Hill, North Carolina*. University of North Carolina at Chapel Hill.
- Organ, D. W., & Ryan, K. (1995), A meta-analytic review of attitudinal and dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behavior. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), p. 775-802.
- Owusu, B. (2014). *An assessment of job satisfaction and its effect on employees' performance: a case of mining companies in the [BIBIANI - ANHWIASO - BEKWAI district] in the western region* (master's thesis). School of Business, KNUST.
- Ratna, R. & Kaur, T. (2016). The impact of Information Technology on Job Related Factors like Health and Safety, Job Satisfaction, Performance, Productivity and Work Life Balance. *Journal of Business & Financial Affairs*, 5 (1), 171. doi:10.4172/2167-0234.1000171.
- Ratna, R. (2009). *Job Satisfaction in IT sector*. *Business Vision*, 4 (1), 69-73.
- Ratna, R. and Tummala, R. (2012). *Employee Satisfaction with CRM Practices and Its Impact on Employee Motivation*. *The International Journal of Management Issues and Research* 1 (1), 48-56.
- Rotundo, M., & Sackett, P.R. (2002). The relative importance of task, citizenship, and counterproductive performance to global ratings of job performance: A policy capturing approach. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87 (1), p.66-80.
- Sousa-Poza, A., & Sousa-Poza, A.A. (2000). Well-being at work: Across-national analysis of the levels and determinants of job satisfaction. *Journal of Socio-Economics*, 29(6), p.517-538.
- Spector, P.E. (1997). *Job Satisfaction: Application, Assessment, Cause, and Consequences*. Thousand Oaks. Sage Publications.
- Vermeeren, B., Kuipers, B. & Steijn, B. (2011). Two Faces of the Satisfaction Mirror. A Study of Work Environment, Job Satisfaction and Customer Satisfaction in Dutch Municipalities. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 31(2), 171-189.