Social and Cultural Impacts on Employee Job Satisfaction and Commitment to Organisations

Augustine Imonikhe, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK*
Dane Lukic, Glasgow Caledonian University, UK

ABSTRACT
Job satisfaction continues to be an essential aspect of exploring performance, and its impact on productivity, organisational goals, and societies at large has been widely studied. This study aimed at investigating the impact of social, cultural, personal, and environmental factors of job satisfaction and reviewing the relationship between job satisfaction and performance in organisation while exploring the interrelationships of the aforementioned antecedent's groups. The study confirms the dual direction of connection that comprises a cycle of cause-and-effect relationship between job satisfaction and performance and explores the mediating factors. The study encourages managers to reflect on their tacit method of managing employees and exploring ways to apply explicit methods and provide work environment that is more conducive and unbiased. The study highlights the importance of considering job satisfaction and performance relationship holistically through addressing the social, cultural, personal, and environmental problems to improve employee performance.
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INTRODUCTION
Workplaces both in the public and the private sector, national and international depend on their workforce for maximum productivity which will in turn result in efficiency. Previously, organisations focused on cost reduction strategy and maximisation of sales However, the practice and research in the more recent decades showed that one of the key aspects of high productivity are employees and how they are managed. According to Hoverstadt and Bowling (2002), manager’s capability to handle a problem or workplace successfully is in direct proportion to the correctness and significance of the models they are applying to understand it. In most cases, managers depend on the tacit models that they have created themselves. to deal with employee management without explicit formulation. This is mainly true for management teams which have operated in the same sector or organisation for years. In circumstances like these, manager’s tacit models can correctly indicate certainty, giving the management team with a decent ground for handling with the kind of everyday issues that predictably
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troubled their organisation. However, adopting the tacit models undoubtedly have many possible disadvantages as they can hide big disparities in opinion among leaders and which can sometimes fail to provide a decent manage on new issues. Tacit model is not available as a text, it includes insubstantial elements rooted in personal values, experiences and beliefs (Pan & Scarbrough, 1999).

Tacit models can also limit the capability and eagerness to deal and initiate with radical change as opposed to progressive change. The tacit models also emphasize on employees’ strengths without supporting their weaknesses. Although, tacit model symbolises abundant value to the organisation, by it is nature, it is far more challenging and at times difficult to overcome and diffuse (Koulopoulos & Frappolo, 1999; Nonaka, 1994). Davenport and Prusak (1998) display the difficulty connected with capturing the tacit model in their instance of an effort to transfer the expertise of the world best aerial picture specialist into a skilful system by a computer expert. The skilful system was unsuccessful.

As workplaces become bigger and more difficult, therefore the need to make use of explicit formal models that leaders can apply to share their knowledge and to communicate about the problem, tend to increase. Explicit knowledge implies factual statements about such matters technical information, tool characteristics and material properties (Koskinen et al, 2003). Companies working in rapid changing atmospheres also need to make use of the explicit formal models for the purpose of satisfying their employee and enhancing their productivity.

Job satisfaction is a personal’s attitude towards work, comprises of evaluative, affective and cognitive reactions to the job (Luthans, 2005). Job satisfaction is a complex phenomenon since it rises from the worker evaluation of numerous job dimensions created each day (Kinicki et al., 2002). Furthermore, job satisfaction is not solely based on the degree to which the job itself offers the employee with satisfaction connected to a particular job characteristic but also on the degree to which the job characteristic is relevant to employee (Locke, 1969). Job satisfaction is centred on the degree to which the work offers rewards that the employee considers relevant. Job satisfaction is a personal construct since it is a personal attitude centred on personal experience, which differentiate it from organisational environment experienced by an average individual or a combined attitude of organisation employees towards their jobs (Schneider, Erhart, & Macey 2011). The significant and attractiveness of job satisfaction idea stems from its assumed positive effect in individual productivity (Judge et al., 2001). Although, the general assumption that ‘a happy employee is a more productive employee’ has not received the anticipated amount of backing from empirical research (Staw, 1986), the major reasoning on study of job satisfaction continues to be the value to which it adds to productivity. Kappagoda (2012) signified that job satisfaction is among of the factors that impacts the development of the work performance. However, these experts have not really covered majority of the factors influencing job satisfaction and job performance in business organisations. Locke (1970) described job satisfaction as positive emotional state or pleasurable resultant from one’s work or work experience. The implied in Locke’s description is the significance of both feeling, or effect, and thinking or cognition. When individuals think, they will have feelings of what they think. On the other hand, when they have feelings, they think about what they feel. Effect and cognition are therefore inseparably connected in people’s mind and even in biology (Saari & Judge, 2004). A worker who is dissatisfied with his or her work carries negative attitude connected to the job while a worker with a higher job satisfaction carries positive attitudes connected to their job (Srivastav & Das, 2013). Job satisfaction originates from intrinsic factors that are connected to job itself or extrinsic factors which are connected to contributory value (Watson, 2012). Job satisfaction is under the effect of numerous factors such as: work team, work situations, the nature of the work, wages or salaries, progression opportunities and management (Aziri, 2011). The significant and attractiveness of job satisfaction idea stems from its assumed positive effect in on individual productivity (Judge et al., 2001).

Job performance on the other hand, is described as the behaviour that achieves results (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). Overall organisational performance depends on the effective and efficient performance of its employee in the organisation. Therefore, almost all organisations place a considerable dependence on their employee’s performance to attain high result in the organisation.
Employee effort is a significant factor that determines their performance in the organisation. When employees are satisfied about the job that they do, they will be motivated and put a greater effort to accomplish a better result, and which will now increase the total performance of the organisation. In other words, a satisfied employee with commitment and effort are important for the success of the organisation. Knowing the job performance for everyone is important as the organisational decisions are centred on each employee performance leading to an organisational success (Sonnetag, Volmer & Spachala, 2008).

Although, the general assumption that ‘a happy employee is a more productive employee’ has not received the anticipated amount of backing from empirical research (Staw, 1986), the major reasoning on study of job satisfaction continous to be the value to which it adds to productivity. Theoretically, various mechanisms have been accounted for to try to clarify why happy employees carry out their work better (Bakker & Demerouti, 2008). For instance, positive feelings improve employee’s through action performances, Therefore, increasing individual resources (Fredrickson, 2013). furthermore, engaged employees are healthier, which means they can put more effort and energy into their assigned work. Kappagoda (2012) signified that job satisfaction is among of the factors that impacts the development of the work performance. Although job satisfaction and even its impact on performance have been studies for decades, companies still struggle to address and raise job satisfaction in a consistent fashion and factors surrounding the key relationship vary from study to study. The emerging literature increasingly points to shift of attention from personal factors to socio-cultural factors which are critical for employee to maintain performance and commitment to the organisation. Thus this paper adds to existing studies by further examining personal, environmental, social and cultural factors and their interplay in the job satisfaction and job performance correlation.

LITERATURE REVIEW AND THE THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK AND HYPOTHESES

In order to set the scene for the proposed study, this section reviews the key concepts of job satisfaction and job performance and their relationship. Furthermore, the adjoining factors are reviewed, exploring in particular socio cultural and environmental factors.

Job Satisfaction

Job satisfaction is the result of employee’s evaluation level to which the work surrounding fulfils their needs (Dawis & Nestron,1984). Job satisfaction refers to the feelings and attitudes employees have towards their job. Favourable and positive attitudes towards the job specify satisfaction and while unfavourable and negative attitudes towards the job specify dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2006). Luthans (1985) repeats a comprehensive description specified by Locke. A positive emotional state or pleasurable leading from the evaluation of employee’s work or work experience. Job satisfaction is an outcome of individual’s view of how well their work offers the things which are significant. Job satisfaction is also described as rebuild of affect generated by employee’s view of achievement of his necessities in connection to his job and the environment (Saiyadan, 1993). Organ and Hammer (1991) highlighted that job satisfaction signifies a compound gathering of emotion, cognition, and predisposition. Smith et al. (1969) proposed that job satisfaction is mental state or emotional replies facets of the condition. Job satisfaction can also be described as the degree to which employees are satisfied with the benefits, they get from their job in terms of intrinsic motivation (Statt, 2004).

The nature of job satisfaction in the organisational world is not just ascribed to one factor but numerous factors such as salary, promotion, supervision, work condition, work group and work itself (Nash, 1985). Job satisfaction is an accomplishment gained in going through different work reward and activities (Peretomode, 2006). Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction do not only rest on the type of the job, but it also as well depends on the belief of what the job could offer to its worker (AL-Hussami, 2008). Spector (1996) specified that job satisfaction can be regarded as an over-all feeling
towards the job or gathering of attitudes about different phases of the job. Workplaces with more satisfied employees are more productive than those with less satisfied employees (Robbins, 2003).

Chen (2015) described flexible work arrangement (FWA) as a variable that can influence job satisfaction. FWA has been described as the extent of flexibility in the workplace, the work timing and to what degree does individual works (Chen, 2015). Job satisfaction is an employee’s personal perception surrounding the way he or she senses his or her work and the organisation they work for. Also, job satisfaction is the pleasurable sensitive state that emanate from the accomplishment of work value (Courtney & Younkyoung, 2017). Working condition is also a significant factor for the satisfaction of job, an individual in a challenging working conditions are dissatisfied without a doubt. Therefore, to improve the satisfaction of the employees, it is important that management improve working condition (Bakotic & Babic, 2013). Job satisfaction allows organisation to evaluate the worker’s contentedness with the work that they are performing (Boamah et al. 2018). Job satisfaction should be investigated both globally and as well as domestically (Culibrk et al. 2018) and one of its key relationship is that with job performance.

**Job Performance**

Good knowledge of individual performance is important as critical management decisions are based on employee performance (Sonnetag, Volmer, & Spachala, 2008), resulting to an organisational accomplishment. Performance is described as the behaviour that achieves results (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). Job performance is described as something that employees normally do; the actions they take that add to organisational objectives (Campbell & Wiernik, 2015). In addition, performance behaviours are the overall set of tasks that the organisations presume employee to demonstrate (Griffin, 2005). Job performances demonstrate the performance of employees hired to work in organisation (Frieder, Wang & Oh, 2018). Performance is a multidimensional idea that contains at least two aspects: the behavioural and the result aspect (Armstrong & Taylor, 2014). The behavioural perspective explores the activities that employees do when they are at work while the result perspective looks into the outcomes of the employee’s behaviour (Sonnetag, Volmer, & Spachala, 2008).

Many researchers review two kinds of employee job performance, the first is the work performance (Kappagoda, 2012) or the in-role performance (Minnesota Libraries, 2015), and the second is the circumstantial performance or the organisational citizenship behaviour (OCBs). Performance of the employee symbolises the total acceptance of the employee about their behaviour and assistances to the success of the organisation. Benefit practices, performance review and progression practices are all factors of employee performance (Ahmad & Shahzad, 2011). Likewise, Anitha (2013) described performance as a display of monetary or other outcome of the worker that has a direct relationship with the performance of the organisation and its success, in addition, working environment, co-worker relationship, leadership, career progression and training, reward scheme, rules and employee involvement are major determinants of employee performance. Studying the main perspective of organisational structures and employee engagement in relation to improving employee performance (Alagarajal & Shuck, 2015) highlighted the importance of training and development.

**Job Satisfaction and Performance**

The history of studying the relationship between job satisfaction and performance is very long. The relationship between job satisfaction and job performance was considered in early 1930s, matching with the Hawthorne studies of human connections movement. The Hawthorne indicated that individual’s work performance is reliant on social matters and job satisfaction, and that financial incentives and adequate working environment are usually less significant in enhancing individual’s productivity than meeting individual’s requirement and desire to be part of a group and be involved in making decision at work. Hawthorne studies are usually recognised with prominence connection between worker attitudes and performance. Cummings (1970) indicated three main ideas regarding
this relationship: satisfaction generates performance, performance generates satisfaction, and rewards generate both satisfaction and performance. Mirvis and Lawer (1977) provided further results around the connection between job satisfaction and job performance. In trying to assess the performance of a bank cashiers in relations to currency shortages, their anticipated opinions are, satisfied cashiers were less expected to display shortages and less expected to resign from their work.

Some earlier studies questioned the relationship between these two key variables of satisfaction and performance. Katzell, Barret and Porker (1952) claimed that work satisfaction connected to neither revenue nor the excellence of manufacture. According to Brayfield and Crockett (1955), there was not huge connection between employee performance and job satisfaction, classifying it ‘little or no connection’. The Brayfield and Crockett analysis was restricted and only an exceedingly small number of published studies were accessible for review as at that time. Precisely, only nine studies that described a connection between job satisfaction and job performance of the employee were analysed. Despite all doubts, Brayfield and Crockett’s piece of work was possibly the most regularly quoted in this area of study around 1985. Since the Brayfield and Crocket analysis in 1955, many other effective narrative analyses has been produced (Vroom, 1964, Herzberg et al., 1957, Locke, 1970, Schwab & Cummings, 1970). These analyses varied hugely in their understanding and to some extent, the positivety they showed concerning the satisfaction and performance connection and with Herzberg et al, being the most positive. Locke, 1970, Schwab and Cummings (1970) issued a serious awareness for theory-driven studies of the job satisfaction and performance connection. In reply to these studies, researchers started to deliberate more of the significance of the connection, giving specific attention to factors that may mediate or moderate the connection.

Majority of studies have indicated that a positive connection does exist between job performance and job satisfaction. Therefore, businesses considering the connections between employee and their level of satisfaction as a serious problem which is connected to employee organisational performance (Indermun & Bayat, 2013). The significance of job satisfaction and job performance of the employee is not just limited to only one organisation but to all organisations looking to enhance their productivities (Kappagoda, 2012). Job satisfaction is connected to motivation, production, job performance and life satisfaction, meaning that job satisfaction also relates to personal lives of the workers (Abuhasheshe et al., 2019).

The fundamental concept of reciprocal method is that if the satisfaction is extraneous in nature, then it results performance, and the performance results satisfaction, in case of an intrinsic value in satisfaction through a social exchange model (Skibba, 2002). A study that was conducted on 7939 business entities in 2006 in about 38 countries revealed that profitability, customer satisfaction, revenue of employee and a reduced work adversity were gained because of higher satisfied and involved employee (Norwack, 2006).

Earlier studies focussed on individual factors affecting job satisfaction. Some study exploring the demographic attributes such as gender, age, educational level of the people and years of experience found limited connection to job satisfaction (Hyz, 2010). In a study demonstrated by Anuar Bin Hussin in Trade Winds Group of companies in Klang Valley, it revealed the connection between job satisfaction elements which were work itself, promotion, work colleagues except for salary in regards to how employee are performing (Anuar Hussin, 2011). In addition, the survey mentioned a major variance between individual’s role and job performance. The job satisfaction dimensions such as promotion, salary, supervision, work colleagues and the work itself can solidly contribute 17.8 percent increase to job performance in the workplace. Satisfied workers are priceless to their organisations as they perform better and contribute to the total objectives and achievement of the organisation whereas a dissatisfied worker could be a burden to any organisation (Shmailan, 2016). Still, it has remained difficult to explain the complex nature of job satisfaction through objective and explicit factors and an increasing number of studies explore other more tacit and less tangible factors to look at job satisfaction more holistically.
Theoretical Framework and Hypotheses

We present a theoretical framework (Figure 1) that envisages job satisfaction more widely based on seminal work of previous studies. This study builds on the work Gupta et al. (2012) which found that job satisfaction is impacted by four variables: the personal factors, the social factors, the cultural factors and the organisational and environmental factors. This composition of factors is further supported by authors such as Armstrong et al. (2014) and Watson (2012). This study further explores the nature of these groups of factors in order to find out then conclude on what organisational management must do to resolve cultural, social, personal and environmental barriers that hindered employee’s performance and satisfaction.

The framework indicates the common factors influencing job satisfaction and performance of employees in organisations. These factors are categorised into four segments such as cultural factors, social factors, personal and environmental factors. Also, the model indicates double direction of the relationship and composes a cycle of cause and effect relationship. The line between the two variables shows that the two variables have indirect impact on each other. Therefore, job satisfaction leads to job performance and job performance leads to job satisfaction through mediating factors. Among of all the above factors, social and cultural factors seen to be more modern challenges to employees, employers and societies at large.

The cultural factor is a crucial factor that impact job satisfaction and performance because it defines the inner collective nature of the organisation in which the workers do their work and accomplish the need results (Schein 2004; Ashkanasy et al. 2001). Cultural distance or differences can also affect business activity at numerous levels. At the supervisory level, international transformations amongst host nation subsidiaries and headquarters reveal employees to numerous cultures, where diverse social beliefs and organisational cultures might be leading to threatening distresses to follow (Lee et al., 2019). These distresses can result to in cross-cultural doubt and mental suffering that influence personal choices and dedication to the organisation (Ghemawat, 2017), generating identity worry between leaders (Kraimer et al., 2012). Through experience and exposure of numerous cultures, leaders and other experts become carriers of cultures, manipulating decisions, politics, favourites,
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their interactions with other and about decisions they make in their environments (Hoff & Stiglitz, 2016; Li & Van den Steen, 2019).

Organisational culture can have a negative or positive impact on employee satisfaction and performance. Positive culture improved commitment of the employees (Yildirim et al., 2016). Likewise, marketing culture can impact the performance of the employees (Mohammad, 2014). Stephen and Stephen, (2016) explained that the differences in culture influence the attitude of employees that diverse cultures have different practices. A good organisational culture inspires individuals to perform their tasks with passion and drive. The more inspiring the organisational culture is, the greater the level of job commitment and job satisfaction. Organisational strong culture can fascinate talented employees and lower turnover rate (Kim et al., 2017). The above discussion leads to the first hypothesis.

**H1:** Different types of organisational cultures are connected with different level of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance.

**H1:** a) Organisational culture is a significant determinant of overall job satisfaction, b) in which higher levels of job satisfaction and performance relate to the higher level of organisational supporting culture to employees.

The social factors on the other hand is extremely important because job satisfaction relates to organisational attitudes such as connection with work colleague, supervision, or top management, working in group, decision making participation, informal relations, autonomy, and empowerment. An employee not participating in any of these factors is likely to be dissatisfied. According to Social Information Processing Theory (SIPT), as social creatures, people pay close attention to the behaviours and opinions of the group. Human beings have drive to rely on others for information which enables them create a full image of themselves (Festinger, 1954). Social information processing theory contends that with the connections to the sociological concept of ‘constructivism,’ individuals create an image of reality by communicating with other individuals around them. According to this model, individuals may (unconsciously or consciously) examine the way their team-mate feel before determining how they themselves feel. If work colleagues feel optimistic about the job that they do and the environment they are working in, they are more likely to be satisfied (Jex, 2002). The above discussion leads to the second hypothesis.

**H2:** Different types of social factors are connected with different levels of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance.

**H2:** a) Social factors are significant determinant of overall job satisfaction, b) in which higher levels of job satisfaction and performance relate to the higher level of organisational supporting social wellbeing to employees.

Personal factors of job satisfaction include age, gender, education, years of experience, occupation, role or personal status. These factors are believed to have a significant influence on individual’s job satisfaction. Previous studies have shown that job satisfaction could be designed by genetic components and life accomplishment (Schulz & Schultz, 2006). According to McCann (2002), several personal factors of job satisfaction such as age and gender affect the satisfaction of employees. For instance, the production of employees who are between the age of 59 and above are stated to be lower than those who are between the age of 58 and below pointing at relevance of age (Cheal, 2002). Gender variances in job satisfaction have engrossed consideration of numerous researchers; in the year 1990, Greenhaus, Parasuraman and Wormley, establish no substantial variances in gender but they justified this outcomes describing that the male employees might have more rewarding positions than the female employees. They indicated that female employee could be more satisfied when they have
less challenging jobs due to their lesser expectation (Spector, 2012). It is also assumed that status or occupational level of job could hugely impact individual’s satisfaction, - the higher positions are most likely to present higher autonomy, challenge, responsibility and higher opportunity for satisfying individual’s needs (Schulz & Schultz, 2006). The above discussion leads to the third hypothesis.

**H3:** Different types of personal factors are connected with different levels of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance.

**H3:** a) Personal factors are significant determinant of overall job satisfaction, b) in which higher levels of job satisfaction and performance relate to the higher level of organisational supporting personal value to employees.

Environmental factors such as wages or salary, promotion and economic synergy and resilience also have a huge impact in job satisfaction and performance. A good working environment enables in lowering absenteeism and improve employee performance that leads to improved productivity in organisation (Boles et al., 2004). According to report of the Social and Economic Council in 2007, global and economic growth is gradually falling to create more satisfying jobs that may reduce poverty. Regardless of high and constant economic growth in several emerging countries, unemployment is seriously increasing, large number of people working are receiving low wages. More consideration should be given in identifying and dealings with working environmental issues because when employee develop a negative perception about the environment that they work in, it can sometimes result in chronic stress (Noble, 2009). A positive work environment enhances the attitude of the employee towards work and organization. If the organization is caring towards their workforce by offering all the required resources, then it results in increasing their productivity (Massoudi & Hamdi, 2017). The above discussion leads to the fourth hypothesis

**H4:** Different types of environmental factors are connected with different levels of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance.

**H4:** a) Environmental factors are significant determinant of overall job satisfaction, b) in which higher levels of job satisfaction and performance relate to the higher level of organisational supporting environmental value to employees.

The current study will explore the feasibility of the proposed theoretical model and the high order hypotheses around the groups of factors, building a stepping stone for future studies exploring the relationship between job satisfaction and performance more holistically.

**METHODS**

**Study Instruments and Measures**

The study involves a set of procedures, including a pre-investigation for the questionnaire design, questionnaire distribution, and finally statistical analysis. The questionnaire was based on the HR management literatures, including the empirical work referenced. The design focuses on the proposed model (Figure 1) by which the measures and variables were refined following interviews with several HRM managers. Formally, we used five sets of measures, 1) demographic related, 2) experience related, 3) social cultural … 4) organizational and social environment. The analyses also involved a set of measures that allowed subject to express their satisfaction and commitment and evaluation of their performance at workplace (the above used as dependent variables).

Instruments for data collection are scale measures for all variables, using a five-point Likert scale with the following scoring, 1 = totally disagree and 5 = totally agree. The data sets are treated as ratio data in the databases. Using scales of turnover intentions, the dependent variable, (Jex, 2002). The
data measures of the other sets varied depending on the nature of the data. For example, demographics are identified by nominal values, experience by scale values, and countries by strings, such as 1 for the UK, 2 for EU counties, and so on. We use a taxonomy to cluster data in the databases.

**Data Collection**

We repeatedly distributed questionnaires to a target population of employees who currently working in the UK organizations, either large or medium, or small, either private companies or institutions, or large multinational companies. The response rate was 30%, 127 questionnaires were retained for the analysis. The proportion of male respondents was higher than that of female and their marital status rate is was reasonably well balanced. Education status shows that a large proportion have either a bachelors’ or a masters’ degree, which indicates that in general they have received a university level education.

**Data Screening**

The scales data (from the survey) reliability was tested using composite factor reliability scores and Cronbach Alpha, (Netemeyer, 2003). The Cronbach coefficient in average was 0.82. Average Variance Extracted (AVE) mostly achieved above 0.80, which suggested some construct–related variances, as Hair et al. (2011) recommend. Although an arbitrary rule-of-thumb commonly uses < 4 as a cut off tolerance (Fox, 2001) the criterion achieved for the Variance-Inflation Factor (VIF) > 0.20. For model fit, the screening of all data variables diagnosed multi collinearity by employing a correlation matrix. In diagnosing the presence of heteroscedasticity White’s $\gamma = 0$ null hypothesis was used (Pindyck & Rubinfeld, 1998). To diagnose error variance, data variables not meeting the validity requirements for the analysis were omitted.

To address the issue of ‘common method variance’ as the result of systematic error variance (Ireland et al., 1987) given that survey measurement might engender ‘rater effects’ or ‘context effects’ (Podsakoff, MacKenzie, Lee, & Podsakoff, 2003). The survey design sought to reduce the biasing effects, which could relate to ‘rater effect’ or ‘rater bias’ (Podsakoff et al. 2003). The former is constrained by the survey design, which focused on current employees either international or local. Sample population had a wide range of experience and across countries. Some consideration given to the differences between demographics and experience among expatriates could also have enhanced data quality through comparative analyses. We sought to reduce the ‘systematic error variance’ (Ireland et al. 1987). The error can refer to differences drawn from perceptions without context. We limited the chance of data bias by stressing individual perceptions in linking to experience in different environments and conditions with which they engaged.

**Analytical Structures**

We develop a set of analyses by which to examine the interrelationship between cultural social, personal and environmental factor with employee perceived performance and their satisfaction and so forth. In particularly, we seek to explain whether cultural social and personal, Secondly, we examine by exploring whether it has a negative or a positive association with satisfaction, and if so, why. In addressing these questions, we seek to explain the importance of contextualised social personal factors. In many studies, satisfaction and commitment intention are treated as dependent variables. We also included control variables and mediating variables, which varied, depending on the immediate argument in the analysis.

**Hypothesis Testing Procedures and Techniques**

To test Hypothesis 1, (xx) satisfaction is investigated in relation to a set of control variable, including age, gender, experience education and so forth, while satisfaction and xx is the dependent variable. The comparison made in enable the analysis to observe individual differences xx is used as a control variable is the dependent variable. The analysis also considers individual differences in relation to
demographic characteristics and differences among them. The analysis used ordinary least squares (OLS) because they could take $n$ observations that consist of: \{yi, xi\}$i = 1$. Each observation included a scalar response $yi$ and a vector of $p$ predictors (or regressors) $xi$. This facilitated an examination of not only the data effect of a particular variable but also the value effect on different scales (e.g. 1, compared with 4) or whether the significance was likely derived from higher or lower scales of data values. Using OLS, we sought squared vertical distances between the observed responses in the database and the responses predicted by the linear approximation.

The tests of Hypothesis 2 and Hypothesis 3 used linear model and incorporated a number of different statistical models such as analysis of variance ANOVA through t-test and F-test, and ordinary linear regression. Especially, we examined $y = xB + u$, where $y$ was a matrix with series of multivariate measurements, $x$ was a matrix that might be a design matrix, $B$ is a matrix containing parameters that are to be estimated and $u$ was a matrix containing errors or noise. In the preparation towards model building, we also considered linear regression, using enter, stepwise, and removal procedures for generating model fit.

To recap, we used correlation analysis, hierarchical regression analysis and confirmatory analysis to predict expected values (probability and error residuals) attained through first-stage and second-stage analysis to inform the distributions, so that the values rested on the dependent variable which were based on multiple sets of data in $d$-dimensional structures (different matrices) of analysis. The complex relations lie in the exploration and examination of a database in $d$-dimensions. The analysis used statistical software SPSS26.0 for carrying out observations on coefficients and probability distributions.

RESULT

Four model tests are conducted and some initial evidence is obtained, and the results are reported in Table 1. We predicted that different types of personal factors are connected with different levels of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance, we find support from our Model 1 test. Model 1 reveals that employee commitment factors are positively associated with their age, education, and working experience. Although employee satisfaction at variant levels they intend to make positive commitment to the organization and show they are willing to take challenges, where higher satisfaction leads to higher strengthens to take challenge from their job roles and task uncertainty. We predicted that different types of environmental factors are connected with different levels of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance. Model 2 Model Fit statistics shows a stronger fit, where $F$-value = 51.54***, $p < .01$, Adj. $R^2= 58$, df =126.

We find support in model 2 test. It shows that employee commitment factors and satisfaction are positively associated, but satisfaction is negatively associated with workplace challenge and uncertainty. We predicted that Different types of social factors are connected with different levels of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance. We find support to our hypothesis from Model 3 test. Model 3 Model Fit statistics shows a stronger fit, where $F$-value = 51.54***, $p < .01$, Adj. $R^2= 58$, df =126.

Model 3 results suggest that social factors are positively related to satisfaction with the jobs and the organization, where commitment is insignificant for social factors. We predicted that different types of organisational cultures are connected with different level of overall job satisfaction as well as different levels of performance (H1), we find support to the hypothesis. Model 4 test of the cultural factors shows a negative association with gender factor, where men seem more sensitive than women to culture issues. However, employees from variant culture perspectives, intend to show their satisfaction and positive commitment to the organization. Where education, and working experience are also positively related to culture factors. Among the four models, Model 4 Model Fit statistics shows a stronger fit, where $F$-value = 51.54***, $p < .001$, Adj. $R^2 = 58$, df =126.
Factors influencing job satisfaction and performance are Social, Cultural, Environmental and personal factors (Armstrong et al., 2014). The cultural factor is a crucial factor that impact job satisfaction and performance because it defines the inner environment of the organisation in which the workers do their work and accomplish the need results (Schein 2004; Ashkanasy et al. 2001). Organisational culture can have a negative or positive impact on employee satisfaction and performance. Positive culture improved commitment of the employees (Yildirim et al., 2016). Likewise, marketing culture can impact the performance of the employees (Mohammad, 2014). Stephen and Stephen, (2016) explained that the differences in culture influence the attitude of employees that diverse cultures have different practices. A good organisational culture inspires individuals to perform their tasks with passion and drive. The more inspiring the organisational culture is, the greater the level of job commitment and job satisfaction. Organisational strong culture can fascinate talented employees and lower turnover rate (Kim et al., 2017).

The social factors on the other hand are extremely important because job satisfaction relates to organisational attitudes such as connection with work colleague, supervision, or top management,
working in group, decision making participation, informal relations, autonomy, and empowerment. An employee not participating in any of these factors is likely to be dissatisfied. According to Social Information Processing Theory (SIPT), as social creatures, people pay close attention to the behaviours and opinions of the group. Human beings have drive to rely on others for information which enables them create a full image of themselves (Festinger, 1954).

Job satisfaction is a significant individual attitude connected to work (Pfeffer, 1994). Employees with high level of satisfaction will actually say they are satisfied with their work (Mahmood & Ahmed, 2016). Job satisfaction also allows organisation to evaluate the worker’s contentedness with the work they are performing (Boamah et al., 2018). Working in an uncertain environment, employees normally find it difficult to approach new tasks because employees need to be adaptable and perceptive in a situation that is uncertain, need to have new skills and learn new things, they might no longer have the chance to utilise existing skills that they are perfect with (Dunst et al., 2018; Park & Jung, 2017). Organisational uncertainty has a significant impact on level on employee job satisfaction, behaviour, turn-over and stress (Jermsittiparsert, 2016). Therefore, Job uncertainty may have negative effect or job satisfaction and performance.

Both performance and job satisfaction have their own determinants and factors and some of these factors are personal, cultural, social and environmental factors (Gupta et al., 2012). This research was conducted to guide initial model tests between group of factors to carry out the true connection between job satisfaction and job performance in high quality. Several primary and secondary data has been covered to get through understanding of the research question and previous work from different experts within the same domain were also looked at. This research confirmed the previous findings of the correlations between job satisfaction and performance Armstrong et al. (2014) and Watson (2012). According to the nature of the connection, both variables have an indirect impact on each other through mediating factors. This research will enable future study examined a set of critical issues in the dynamic social organisational environment. This research has taken a step advance to contribute knowledge for HRM in the dynamic organisational environment, specifically, social personal identities and cultural issues in relation diverse workforce motivations in cooperation and performance.

CONCLUSION

Based on the findings of this initial study, it is suggested for managers to consider job satisfaction holistically and explore all groups of factors, ensuring a work environment that is more conducive and unbiased system that will enable its employee to perform their work effectively. Looking at the groups of factors explore in the model could affect job satisfaction and performance of employees. Although explored widely the nature of managing the interrelated groups of factor remains a challenging task and further empirical studies are needed. Organisations need to improve training and development scheme that will increase the level of work performance and benefit employee different requirements. Periodic in-depth reviews of performance and satisfaction should be implemented to check the level of these essential variables and set the corrective actions. The study proposed a basis for exploring the sub-factors impacting job satisfaction and performance with further exploration of the impact of social, cultural, personal and environmental aspects, which should be addressed through future research and practice implementation reviews.
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