International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review

IJASER

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-August 2022, page no. 22-31

To cite this article: ANDRIANARIZAKA Marc Tiana, TSISAROTINA Maminiaina René Alexandre and RASOAMPARANY Jean Marie (2022). EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION, A FACTOR OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF THE COMPANY, International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review (IJASER) 3 (4): 22-31

EMPLOYEE SATISFACTION, A FACTOR OF FINANCIAL PERFORMANCE OF THE COMPANY

ANDRIANARIZAKA Marc Tiana[1], TSISAROTINA Maminiaina René Alexandre[2] and RASOAMPARANY Jean Marie[3]

[1]Doctor in cognitive sciences and applications
University of Antananarivo, Madagascar

[2]Doctor in management science
Lecturer in university
University of Antsiranana, Madagascar.

[3]Doctor entitled to direct research, Lecturer in university
University of Antsiranana, Madagascar.

DOI: http://dx.doi.org/10.52267/IJASER.2022.3403

ABSTRACT

The intensity of competition accentuated by globalization forces companies to look for all possible strategies to perform. In this context, human resources management is becoming more and more strategic and employee satisfaction is an objective. Thus, the question arises as to how employee satisfaction could impact the financial performance of the company?

Based on the hypothesis that employee satisfaction affects the company's financial performance, this work aims to analyze the dependency between these two variables by means of an opinion survey of 100 employees.

KEYWORDS: Employees, Satisfaction, Company, Performance, Turnover.

INTRODUCTION

Currently, it is clear that the management system has evolved a lot thanks to globalization, technology and innovations. The balance of an entity is now based on the way in which management is exercised.

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

Many companies have to reorganize their function in order to perform well. Integrating the human resources dimension into the company's strategy is becoming a necessity.

HRM has become more practical and focuses more and more on what a person can bring or on his contribution to the work in an organization. Employee satisfaction is becoming a vital source. The styles that leaders adopt to lead their employees seem to be key to motivating them through their job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction refers to a feeling of self-realization and well-being in and through work. It cannot be separated from personal perception. Satisfaction is a positive or pleasant emotional state resulting from a person's evaluation of his or her work or work experiences. It is here to speak of an affective and emotional response of the person to his job.

Satisfaction results from the adequacy of the person's perceptions of the different aspects of his or her work. Indeed, the sense of reality is relative to each person. In the professional world, it is common to believe that a happy and satisfied person is more successful in his or her work.

In this sense, the question arises as to how employee satisfaction could impact the financial performance of the company.

Based on the hypothesis that employee satisfaction affects the financial performance of the company, this research aims, from a survey in the form of an opinion poll with a sample of 100 employees[1], identify the dimensions of job satisfaction that affect the financial performance of the company. In-depth statistical analyses of the results and correlation tests will serve as a basis for testing the dependency between the variables.

I- CONCEPTUAL BASIS

The concept of job satisfaction is the subject of debate in the scientific community. Some announce the end of the work-value ideology (Gorz, 1988; Méda, 1995). For others, it remains the main element in favor of integration and social cohesion. Indeed, the authors who support this way of thinking maintain that identity and self-fulfillment depend on recognition in connection with work (Dominique L'huilier, 2016).

Locke's (**1969**) divergence theory is the theoretical foundation on which the large body of work on job satisfaction has been built. It results from three causal models that study the psychological mechanisms that generate satisfaction or dissatisfaction for the individual (**Boisserolles de Saint Julien, 2005**).

[1] Characteristic in appendix

International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review

IJASER

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

Roussel (1996), based on the work of Locke, defines job satisfaction as the level of convergence between what the person wants and what he or she gets from the different aspects of his or her work. Although this definition seems to be the subject of a consensus today (**Paillé, 2008**), it does not settle all the questions on the subject, and in particular the debate between job satisfaction considered as an attitude and job satisfaction considered as an affective state, a degree of positive emotions of an individual with regard to his or her role at work, as is more readily envisaged in certain Anglo-Saxon works (**Besseyre des Horts and Nguyen, 2010**). But for some (**Mignonac and al, 2004**), emotions and their study remain a field of research distinct from that of attitudes and, consequently, job satisfaction. For these authors, the definition of the concept focuses much more on the evaluation of satisfaction.

Job satisfaction refers to the framing of fulfillment, well-being, and performance in relation to work collectives and professional life. Being satisfied means reaching the final stage of needs. This theory is completed by Herzberg's theories (1950) according to which it is not the resolution of the dissatisfaction factors that motivates, but the achievement of the satisfaction factors.

II-RESULTS

According to the objective of this research, the following results will mainly focus on the relationship between employee satisfaction and company performance reflected in its turnover.

2.1 Descriptive statistics

Table 1: Descriptive statistics of performance variables

Items	Medium	Ecart-type
How do you evaluate the company's turnover?	**3,45**	**1,356**
Is the remuneration a source of motivation in the company?	**1,20**	**,410**
In your opinion, is the well-being at work a source of satisfaction?	**3,20**	**1,105**
Do you have access to training within the company?	**3,25**	**1,517**
Does employee turnover have an impact on employee satisfaction?	**3,30**	**1,302**
Does the relationship between colleagues contribute to satisfaction?	**3,20**	**1,322**

International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review

IJASER

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

On a scale of 1 to 10, how would you rate your individual performance?	**5,15**	**2,434**

Source: Authors, 2022

In this table, we can see the means and standard deviations of the study variables. Comparing them, we can see that for the variable:

- Compensation as motivation: the mean is less than the standard deviation, the data are scattered. The mean for this variable is 1.20.

- Well-being at work: the mean is higher than the standard deviation, however, the data are not dispersed. The mean of the variable is 3.20.

- Training: the mean is greater than the standard deviation, the data are not dispersed. The mean is 3.25.

- Staff turnover: the mean is greater than the standard deviation, the data are not scattered. The mean for this variable is 3.30.

- Relationship between colleagues: the mean is higher than the standard deviation, the data are not dispersed. The mean of this variable is 3.20.

- Individual performance: the mean is greater than the standard deviation, the data are not scattered. The mean of this variable is 5.15.

2.2 Correlation test

The following results show the significance of the relationships between the variables studied

Table 2: Correlation table

	Corrélation							
		Turnover	Compensation	well-being	training	Staff turnover	Relationship between colleagues	Individual performance
Corrélation	Turnover	1,000	0,11	,218	,633	,158	,534	,489

IJASER
International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

of Pears on	Compensation	0,11	1,000	,023	-,085	-,217	-,175	,126
	well-being	,218	,023	1,000	,816	,907	,836	,791
	training	,633	-,085	,816	1,000	,706	,918	,859
	Staff turnover	,158	-,217	,907	,706	1,000	,820	,649
	Relationship between colleagues	,534	-,175	,836	,918	,820	1,000	,824
	Individual performance	,489	,126	,791	,859	,649	,824	1,000

Source: Authors, 2022

To examine the correlation between the variable to be explained and the explanatory variables, we observe the value of the Pearson correlation coefficient and the significance or Sig for each variable:

- For the remuneration as motivation: the Pearson coefficient which is 0.11 tends towards 0: there is a significant dependence between this variable and the turnover, it is weak. As for the Sig which is 0.004 is lower than 0.005. Therefore, Ho is false, there is a relationship between the remuneration and the turnover of the company.

- For the well-being at work: the Pearson coefficient which is 0.218 tends towards 0: there is a significant dependence between this variable and the turnover, but it is weak. As for the Sig which is 0.178 is greater than 0.005. This means that Ho is true. There is no relationship between well-being at work and turnover.

- For training: the Pearson coefficient is 0.633 which tends towards 0: there is a significant dependence between this variable and turnover. As for the Sig which is of 0.001 is less than 0.005. Hence, there is a relationship between training and turnover.

- For staff turnover: the Pearson coefficient is 0.158 which tends to 0: there is a significant dependence between this variable and turnover. As for the Sig which is 0.253 is greater than 0.005. So Ho is true, there is no dependence between staff turnover and turnover.

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

- For the relationship between colleagues: the Pearson coefficient is 0.534 which tends to 0. There is a significant dependence between this variable and the turnover. As for the Sig which is 0.008 is greater than 0.005. Ho is true: there is no relationship between the relationship of colleagues and the turnover

- For individual performance: the Pearson coefficient is 0.489 which tends to 0: there is a significant dependence between this variable and the turnover. As for the Sig which has a value of 0.001 is less than 0.005 which indicates that there is a relationship between individual performance and turnover.

Table 3: Summary of explanatory indicator performance models

				Summary of models						
Model	R	R-2	R-2 adjusted	Standard error of estimation	Change in statistics					Durbin - Watson
					Variation of R-2	Variation of F	ddl 1	ddl 2	Sig. Variation of F	
1	**,875**	**,766**	**,658**	**,793**	**,766**	**7,096**	**6**	**13**	**,002**	**1,797**

Source: Authors, 2022

The R-squared coefficient compares the estimated values of the dependent variable to its explanatory variables, it varies between 0 and 1. In the table above, there is an R-squared of 0.766: it is quite close to 1, so the explanatory variables contribute to 76.6% of the variability of turnover. As for the Sig which is 0.002 is lower than 0.005 which induces that the turnover and the explanatory variables are significant.

Table 4: ANOVA of company turnover

		ANOVA						
Model		Sum of squares	ddl	Mean of the squares	D		Sig.	
1	Regression	**26,775**	**6**	**4,462**		**7,096**		**,002[b]**
	Residual	**8,175**	**13**	**,629**				
	Total	**34,950**	**19**					

Source: Authors, 2022

ANOVA is used to check the significance of the relationship between the variables. The p-value here is less than 0.005: it is 0.002. This confirms once again that the relationship between turnover and the

International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review

IJASER

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

explanatory variables is significant.

III- DISCUSSION

The validation of our hypothesis suggesting that employee satisfaction impacts the financial performance of the company is done by analyzing the coefficient of the indicators of the variation of the turnover in the model which will then output the model equation.

Table 5: Coefficient of the indicators of turnover variation in the model

				Coefficients							
Model		Unstandardized coefficients		coefficients standardized	t	Sig.	Colinearity statistics		Information of fraction missing.	Variance of relative increase	Relative effectiveness
		A	Erreur standard	Bêta			Tolerance	VIF			
1	(Constant)	**4,400**	**,876**		**5,024**	**,000**					
	Compensation	**1,319**	**,594**	**-,399**	**-2,220**	**,045**	**,556**	**1,797**			
	well-being at work	**-,449**	**,628**	**-,366**	**-,715**	**,487**	**,069**	**14,532**			
	training	**,775**	**,389**	**,867**	**1,995**	**,067**	**,095**	**10, 508**			
	Staff turnover	**-,572**	**,485**	**-,549**	**-1,179**	**,260**	**,083**	**12,053**			
	Relationship between colleagues	**,195**	**,469**	**,190**	**,415**	**,685**	**,086**	**11, 620**			

IJASER

International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

	Individual performanc e	**,158**	**,170**	**,283**	**,931**	**,369**	**,194**	**5,158**			

Source: Authors, 2022

At the end of this table, the effect of each variable will be verified in the turnover model that will reflect the performance of the organization and then the model equation will be established.

- For compensation as motivation: B is positive: This variable has a fairly high effect on the financial performance of the company.

- For well-being at work: B is negative: this variable has a low effect on the financial performance of the company

- For training: B is close to 0: the effect of training is weak on the financial performance of the firm

- For staff turnover: B is negative: the effect of this variable is weak on the financial performance of the firm

- For the relationship between colleagues: B is close to 0: the effect of the relationship between colleagues is weak on the financial performance of the firm

- For individual performance: B is close to 0: the effect of this variable is weak on the financial performance of the firm

The equation of the model is then as follows:

Y performance= 4,4 + 1,319 compensation as motivation - 0,449 well-being + 0,775 training - 0,572 staff turnover + 1,195 relationship between colleagues + 0,158 individual performance

The hypothesis is thus partially verified because according to the results, motivation through compensation, training, co-worker relationship, and individual performance has a positive impact on the financial performance of the company. It should be noted that the well-being at work and the relationship between staff negatively affects the performance of the company.

CONCLUSION

In order to analyze the relationship between employee satisfaction and the financial performance of the

International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review

IJASER

ISSN: 2582-6271

Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

company, this study was based on the analysis of the results of an opinion survey of a sample of 100 employees. The different statistical analysis techniques, starting from descriptive analysis and correlation analysis, allow us to affirm that employee satisfaction has a significant impact on the financial performance of the company.

BIBLIOGRAPHY

- **Besseyre des Horts et Nguyen**, « *Satisfaction, implication, engagement, enracinement et intention de départ des jeunes cadres: une relation ambiguë* », XXIème congrès AGRH, Saint Malo, 17-19 novembre 2010.
- **Boisserolles de Saint Julien**, « *les survivants : vers une gestion différenciée des ressources humaines* », L'Harmattan 2005.
- **Locke**, "*What is Job Satisfaction? OB and Human Performance*", Vol. 4, pp. 309-336, 1969.
- **Mignonac et al**, « *Que mesure-t-on réellement lorsque l'on invoque le concept de satisfaction au travail* », Revue de Gestion des Ressources Humaines, 53, Juillet-Septembre, p. 80-92, 2010.
- **Paillé**, « *Les comportements de citoyenneté organisationnelle : une étude empirique sur les relations avec l'engagement affectif, la satisfaction au travail et l'implication au travail* », Le travail humain, Vol. 71, p. 22-42, 2008
- **Roussel**, « *Rémunération, motivation et satisfaction au travail* », Economica, Paris 1996.
- **Dominique L'huilier**, « *Travail* », Vocabulaire de psychologie, 2016

APPENDIX

Table 6: Sample Characteristics

Variables	Modality	Frquency (%)
GENRE	Men	50
	Female	50
AGE	25 to 35 years old	15
	36 to 40 years old	35
	40 years and olde	50
DEPARTMENT	Human Resources	20
	Administrative and financial	25
	Technical	25
	Marketing and communication	30

IJASER
International Journal of Applied Science and Engineering Review
ISSN: 2582-6271
Vol. 3, Issue.4, July-Aug 2022, page no. 22-31

FORMER POSITION	Less than 5 years 5 to 10 years 10 years and more	30 50 20
FORMER COMPANY	Less than 5 years 5 to 10 years 10 years and more	20 55 5