

The impact various determinants interlinked with the job satisfaction and employees' performance at Pakistan International Airlines (PIA), Pakistan

Naushad Siddiqui¹Mohammad Abdullah²

Received: 07/06/2019

Accepted: 06/09/2019

Online Published: 28/10/2019

Abstract

The impact of the interlinked determinants (nature of work, opportunities for promotion, relationship with the co-workers, relationship with the supervisors, and existing pay) with the job satisfaction and employees' performance was examined at the PIA through cross-sectional research strategy. Total 42 employees participated in the survey included through combining purposive and convenience sampling technique. Findings revealed that there is strong positive upward linear correlation between job satisfaction and employees' performance ($r=0.905$) and statistically significant ($p=0.001$). In addition to that, the opportunities for learning, relationship with co-workers, and existing pay has statistically significant role while relationship with supervisor and nature of work have non-significant role in relation to employees' performance and job satisfaction. Lastly, the existing pay is most dominant among all factors that mediate employees' performance and job satisfaction.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction; Employees' Performance; Existing Pay; Relationship with co-workers; Opportunities for promotion; Aviation Industry

JEL Classification: D23, J28, J39, M10

1. Introduction

Background and Context

There are several types of challenges faced by managements related to work, worker and workplace (Haque & Oino, 2019). Job satisfaction and employees' performance is not a new phenomenon (Khan et al., 2017). It is a widely studied area, which indicates its importance. According to Luthan (2008), organisations ensure that employees are satisfied as productive employees are those who have higher satisfaction at workplace. From the Maslow's Hierarchy of Need to Locke's goal-setting theory, the job satisfaction and employees' performances are studied to larger extent (King, 2003; Asmus et al., 2015; Khan et al., 2017; Zahid, Sheikh, and Zehra, 2017). The previous empirical studies showed that organisations ensure workforce has higher job satisfaction because it enhances the chances of the business to survive and thrive in the competitive environment while reduces employee turnover ratio (Rast and Tourani, 2012; Zameer et al. 2014; Kumari, 2016; Khuong & Uyen, 2016).

¹ University of West London, United Kingdom, naushadsid98ns@gmail.com

² University of West London, United Kingdom, qaiss00@hotmail.com

From Pakistan's aviation sector there is no exploratory study to measure the correlation between job satisfaction and employees' performance. Furthermore, the Pakistan's first airline; Pakistan International Airlines (PIA) has been in the news for different reasons as the performance and service quality of the airline has reduced (Ali, Dey, and Filieri, 2015, Siddiqui, 2018). Perhaps, the employees' job satisfaction could be a contributing factor but at present there are no evidences to support it. Despite heavy backing from the Government of Pakistan, PIA is unable to improve on quality and performance part thus there is a need to investigate employees' performance and job satisfaction that is affecting the overall performance of the organisation.

Pakistan International Airlines

Pakistan International Airlines (PIA) is Pakistan's first international airline service provider found in 1955 (Ahmed and Nawaz, 2015). It is a national air services offering travelling and shipment facilities but largely known for travelling (Ibid). Since it is governmental corporation thus it comes under public organisation (Ibid). Due to public corporation, the political influence is quite high (Hasan and Khan, 2013). Unfortunately, it has seen a downfall from being one a successful airline because of the higher political influences (Hasan and Khan, 2013). Karachi is the business city of Pakistan and the Headquarter is also there. In Asia, Middle East, North America, and Europe it flies passengers to over 30 destinations while within Pakistan 23 destinations are covered by it (Ahmed and Nawaz, 2015). Since, it is one of the prominent governmental corporation therefore provides employment to over 18000 employees (ibid). Rawal Pindi hub is the case for analysis because it is one of the places that is closely connected with Peshawar, Lahore, and Islamabad therefore the workforce is more diverse in this hub. Total 80 people work at PIA Rawal Pindi.

Significance and Scope

The study is extension to the previous empirical evidences. Therefore, the scope of research widens in terms of methodology. The selected case is from the developing country's aviation sector that despite having governmental support is going through lean patch. Hence, through this study the root cause behind lean patch would be explored. Therefore, this study is significant for the public organisation to understand the causes affecting the job satisfaction and performances. Moreover, the literature from the aviation industry strengthens by developing knowledge about job satisfaction and employees' performance.

2. Literature Review

Core Issues in the Aviation Industry

Khuong and Uyen (2016) explained that one of the key issues is the employee turnover faced by the human resources departments in the aviation sector because of the highly level competition. Moreover, the issue will be exceeding further in the upcoming years (ibid). Chen (2006) argued that the main reason for the higher employee turnover is inclined dissatisfaction among the workers that forces them to quit. Large number of the studies from the aviation industry identified that job involvement is ineffective, employee engagement has declined, and lower job satisfaction are the causes for higher employee turnover (Alniacik et al. 2011; Nawaz et al. 2012; Ahmed and Nawaz; 2015; Khuong and Uyen, 2016). However, the large part of literature from the aviation industry has confirmed employee turnover intentions predict overall

performance and satisfaction. Thus, the core issue in the aviation industry is the higher employee turnover.

Job Satisfaction

Rast and Tourani (2012) developed on the earlier definition of Hoppock (1935) regarding job satisfaction that a satisfaction or a pleasant feeling on the employee arises at work due to mix and match of physiological and psychological needs with existing environment. Hence, the right combination would increase job satisfaction. Similarly, the mismatch is a reason for job dissatisfaction and might leads to develop employee turnover intentions. Authors like Kreitner and Kinicki (2004) explained it from behavioural perspective by stating that affective and emotional way of responding to the workplace setting because of the facets of the job reflects job satisfaction. This means that if any individual is affected by the job in a non-contentious manner hence the employee showing no exhaustion or boredom while performing same repetitive tasks indicate job satisfaction. The work of Ahmed and Nawaz (2012) showed that low level of job involvement is one of the reasons for lower job satisfaction, eventually resulting into employee turnover. Additionally, Robbins (2002) found that social relationship and the psychological attributes are reason for job satisfaction because it is directly linked with the employees;' performance and productivity.

Content and Process Theories of Job Satisfaction

The two main bodies that divide the schools of thoughts about job satisfaction are (a) content theories, and (b) process theories. The basic distinction between the two schools is that content theories emphasize on what motivates other and largely associated with the goals and needs on the individual basis whereas process theories consider the motivational process and largely focuses on the exploration of motivational occurrence (Luthan, 2008). Rast and Tourani (2012) argued that under the content theories, self-actualization and sense of career growth inclined due to regularly doing work indicate job satisfaction. From the content theory, most widely used theory is Maslow's Hierarchy of needs. However, there are other theories such as Herzberg's two factor theory that is effective largely in explaining the job satisfaction. The main aspect of the Maslow's (1954) theory is that with the fulfilment of each type of need, the human moves to another set of needs. Moreover, the self-actualization is a highest level of need (ibid). Considering this theory, it is evident that in order to satisfy psychological and security needs individuals work. The love and belongingness drive them to work further while self-esteem and self-actualization are top level needs that indicate that in case job satisfaction is higher than employees will stay else they will quit.

On the other hand, process theories focused on cognitive aspects by view the job holder's behaviour are driven by the set of needs (Rast and Tourani, 2012). Interestingly, Holmberg et al., (2015) argued that the process theory has taken the same attributes of job evident in the content theories and viewed it from the cognitive perspective. Therefore, cognitive process is prime theme of the later school of thought and showed that this cognitive process along with the various types of need play important role in the creation of job satisfaction (Rast and Tourani, 2012). Additionally, process theories argued that employee behaviour in a certain manner is affected and directed due to causes, sources, and motives (ibid). In addition to that, Gruneberg (1979) explained that process theories indicate that employees' values and expectations when matches with the workplace environment then job satisfaction develop (Zameer et al. 2014). Hence, in this study, the conceptual work is developed by considering the

aspects of both schools to construct the conceptual and theoretical framework in order to investigate correlation between variables at PIA Rawal Pindi hub.

Job satisfaction's determinants

Several authors have identified different attributes but this study considered the factors that are highly evident in the aviation sector because this study is specifically carried out with the attempt to explore the relationship in aviation sector. Following the pattern of Smith et al (1969), the five main attributes are considered to examine the correlation. These factors are (a) work's nature (b) opportunities for promotion, (c) relationship with co-workers, (d) relationship with the supervisor, and (e) existing pay.

Nature of work

Wide range of studies confirmed that employees' performance and level of satisfaction is affected to large extent by the nature of work (Luthans, 2006; Griffen and Moorhead, 2009; Rast and Tourani, 2012; Zameer et al. 2014). Hence, this reflects that the nature of work plays important role in shaping the job satisfaction and enhancing employees' good performance. In addition to that, Robbins et al. (2003) stated that nature of work is essential in providing the opportunities for the employees to learn further along with the personal growth and responsibility aspects develop among the employees due to the nature of work that lead to inclined job satisfaction among the employees at work. Thus, the motivational factors of Herzberg are closely interlinked with the nature of the work. Additionally, the wide range of researches showed that employees' improved performance and enhanced job satisfaction is significantly due to nature of the work (Sharma and Bhaskar, 1991; Rast and Tourani, 2012; Zameer et al. 2014). Interestingly, the work of Ahmed and Nawaz (2012) showed that job satisfaction and employees' performance at PIA increase due to motivational factors such as nature of work, recognition, appreciation, etc. Hence, nature of work is key determinant. Nevertheless, in recent times contradict that nature of work is significant determinant because his study findings found no significant role being played by the nature of work in strengthening the correlation between job satisfaction and employees' performances. Therefore, the hypothesis developed from the above argument is as following:

H_a: "Nature of work is not significant determinant in strengthening the relationship between job satisfaction and employee's performance"

Opportunities for promotion

Wide range of researchers have found that the opportunities for the promotion is significant in improving the job satisfaction and employees' performance (Ellickson and Logsdon, 2002; Peterson et al. 2003; Rast and Tourani, 2012). This indicates that when employee feel that there are opportunities within the organisations to get promoted through ranks and pay scale then they tend to perform their assigned task with more enthusiasm. It is a general psychology of the employees that they are more committed to the organisation when they see themselves progressing forward (Schultz and Schulz, 2010, Haque and Yamoah, 2014; Haque and Aston, 2016; Haque et al. 2018). On the other hand, Kostea (2010) found that the opportunities for the promotion does not improve the employees' satisfaction and employees' performance but adversely affect them because it creates additional workload. Nevertheless, Heery and Noon (2001) found that when employees view that there are chances for the upward movement in the

hierarchy it positively affects their psychology and they perform better reflecting higher level of satisfaction towards execution of assigned tasks.

Similarly, the relationship between the job satisfaction and employees' improved performance is positively interlinked with the career advancement opportunities and fair treatment at work (Kreitner and Kinicki, 2004). The study of Nawaz et al., (2012) found that the organisational commitment and performance of employees are positively associated with the advancement opportunities. On the other hand, the study of Drafke and Kosen (2003) argued that the job satisfaction does not improve due to opportunities for the promotion because people still quit jobs as they want to experience something different in another organisation. Hence, it indicates that voluntary turnover is also happening and employees' performance or satisfaction is not significantly determined by the present of opportunities of promotion. Thus, the hypothesis is as following:

H_b: "Opportunities for promotion is not significant determinant in improving job satisfaction and employee's performance"

Relationship with co-workers

As per Dar (2010), often researchers while investigating the trust and organisational efficiency ignore the relationship with the co-workers at the expense of relationship with the managers. It is equally important to give thought to the aspect because employees do not work in isolation and have interaction with the co-workers on regular basis. The work of Ariani and Sumantri (2015) confirmed that the relationship with the co-workers is a psychological attribute that increases employees' engagement at workplace. Interestingly, the Luthan (2008) confirmed that employee engagement reflects the higher employee performance and job satisfaction. Thus, the work of Ariani and Sumantri (2015) indicate that relationship with the co-workers is a significant mediator.

Wide range of researches commenced in different times confirmed that the employees' job satisfaction and overall performance enhance due to the friendly environment and supportive co-workers (Viswesvaran et al. 1998; Kreitner and Kinicki, 2004; Luthans, 2006; Rast and Tourani, 2012). The work of Berta (2005) showed that supportive colleagues play important role in the development of job satisfaction at work among individuals. In addition to that, Riordan and Griffeth (1995) also found that employees' performance and job satisfaction is significantly positively correlated due to the supportive teams. Moreover, the study of Rast and Tourani (2012) confirmed that job satisfaction increases and employee engagement and involvement at work strengthen along with the reduction in the employee turnover because of the good relationship at workplace with co-workers. However, the findings of Zameer et al (2014) argued that relationship at work with co-workers are not always positive indicators because of the intense competition there develops the feelings of jealousy resulting into negatively affecting the employees' performance. Moreover, Duffy, Ganster, and Pagon (2006) argued that negative emotions and personality clashes lead to reduce job satisfaction because

the criticism faced by few because of the others performing better. The formulated hypothesis is as following:

H_c: "Relationship with the Co-Workers is not statistically significant in determining the correlation between job satisfaction and employee's performance"

Relationship with supervisor

Ariani and Sumantri (2015) found that there is statistically significant role of the relationship with the supervisor in determining the employee engagement and positive psychological impact at work. In other words, the employees' positive attitude and engagement is determined by the relationship between the employees and their respective supervisors. Again, Luthan (2008) stated that job satisfaction and employees' performance are measured through the employee engagement at work. Therefore, Ariani and Sumantri (2015) findings confirm that a significant mediating role is played by the relationship with supervisor in strengthening the correlation between employees' performance and job satisfaction. In addition to that, the earlier work of Staudt (1997) revealed that employees having a good relationship with the manager/supervisor have higher level of performance because of high level of satisfaction whereas those having poor relationship with their respective manager/supervisor have lower level of satisfaction and therefore have low performance. This clearly indicates that a good bondage between the employee and supervisor tends to improve the employees' performance as well as job satisfaction.

Wide range of researches indicated that healthy professional relationship between the employees and their supervisors has significant positive role in determining the job satisfaction and employees' performance (Peterson et al., 2003; Koustelios, 2001; Smucker et al., 2003). Packard and Kauppi (1999) found that the style of supervision is equally important because the performance of the employees vary under it. Moreover, the authors argued that employees' performance and job satisfaction is highly positive under the democratic and participative style while less constructive under the autocratic style of supervision. Hence, this shows that the relationship depends upon the style of supervision. Nevertheless, the study of Rast and Tourani (2012) argued that it is not entirely necessary for the employees to perform poorly if there is no support from the supervisors. Additionally, the authors found that employees performed well despite having good relationship with their supervisors. In addition to that, despite the absence of any social and emotional support from their supervisors the employees do perform well (ibid). Nevertheless, the job satisfaction is not established in this aspect by the researchers. Hence, the hypothesis is as following:

H_d: "Relationship with the supervisor is not significant determinant in establishing the correlation between job satisfaction and employees' performance"

Existing pay

Lastly, the existing pay is considered as a determinant in this study because it is evident to some extent to have a role in the employees' performance and job satisfaction within the aviation sector. Luthans (2008) explained that the salaries (existing pay) have a pivotal role in determining the level of satisfaction and/or dissatisfaction of the employees. It facilitates the employees by motivating them to attain the tasks and satisfy their needs (Luthans, 2008). Hence, this means that the existing pay to some extent is a driving force behind the employees' performance and level of satisfaction. This means that those employees who perceived that they

are paid according to their deserving level they do efforts to do well at workplace, which leads to increase the organisational performance to large extent.

The study findings of Taylor and West (1992) found that the salary amount received by the employees has a statistically significant role in the determining the level of satisfaction towards their respective jobs or assigned tasks. Furthermore, Rast and Tourani (2012) evident that usually in the public sector, the reason for lower job satisfaction and undermine employees' performance is due to lower salary packages. Furthermore, Robbins et al. (2003) found that improved performances of the employees are because of the fair system at workplace that determines fair salary to the employees as per their performance. The job satisfaction of the employees is higher who experience fair system and view their salary as fair (ibid). On the other hand, Brainard (2005) found that increase job satisfaction is not due to fringe benefits and salary packages but other factors as recognition and appreciation is essential to increase performance and job satisfaction. Additionally, the same survey showed that pay scale is not significant in increasing employees' performance or job satisfaction. In addition to that, the work of Nawaz et al. (2012) revealed that pay scale is not vital in improving the performance of employees at PIA. Hence, there are mix results from the literature and therefore the hypothesis is as following:

H_e: "Existing pay is not significant factor in positively affecting the correlation between job satisfaction and employee's performance"

3. Research Methodology

A belief or a way of doing research is regarded as research philosophy (Cooper and Shindler, 2006). The positivist philosophy is followed because emphasis has been on the quantitative aspects. Lavarkas (2008) explained that quantitative researches use deductive approach by numerically expression the relationship. Hence, this study follows deductive approach by considering statistical findings. According to Kelley (2003), survey is one of the commonly practiced strategies in the research field because it is designed to expand the existing knowledge. This study does the same thus survey is the considered research strategy using quantitative methods in order to have numeric expression for variables of interest. In addition to that, research design is cross-sectional because the research is completed in less than a year time.

According to Lavarkas (2008), this is the most important area and contains several things. Different aspects are explained in this section. Probability and non-probability are types of sampling technique for selecting respondents for data collection (Lavarkas, 2008). In this research non-probability was used because it is cost-effective and ideal for the researches that is targeting a small audience within the organisation. Within non-probability sampling, purposive and convenience sampling was preferred because participants were given the option of participation based on their own convenience and we also ensured that largely gender is given equal fair representation, following Haque et al. (2018) and Kot et al.'s (2019) approach.

As part of the data collection, formal approval was obtained from the HR department of PIA operating at Rawal Pindi (See copy in Appendix C). Additionally, the online survey questionnaire through GOOGLECOG was formed following Urbański et al. (2019) strategy. It contained five ratings (1=strongly disagree while 5=strongly agree) and questions were matrix based. It was circulated through HR department on the official email IDs of employees.

According to Lavarkas (2008) the minimum sample size for studying single case is at least 30% of total respondents. In this study, total 42 employees participated out of 80, which means 52.5% participated in the survey. As part of data analysis, SPSS 25.0 was used for measuring the correlation. The multiple regression and correlation was checked to provide statistical significance.

Lavarkas (2008) argued that in order to be results of research being adequate and relevant it is essential to ensure the reliability and validity. For the reliability, Cronbach's alpha was used. The value of 0.826 confirmed that the items are aligned excellently on the scale. Moreover, the explanatory factor analysis revealed that the model is a good fit as the 3 items explained 61% of the total variance explained by cumulative percentile. Lastly, the ethical conduct was attained by informing the participants about the research purpose, option of leaving anytime and confirming that their details will be kept confidence. The shared information was only used for the academic research and no details were shared with anyone.

4. Results and Findings

4.1. Reliability Test

Table 1: Case Processing Summary

		N	%
Cases	Valid	42	100.0
	Excluded ^a	0	.0
	Total	42	100.0

a. Listwise deletion based on all variables in the procedure.

Table 2: Reliability Statistics

Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.826	.820	12

The results from the reliability test for the items on scale and research instrument are reliable for the research. In the social researches, 0.7 is a minimum acceptable value. Since 0.826 is higher thus reliability is good.

4.2. Explanatory Factor Analysis

Table 3: KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.826
Bartlett's Test of Approx. Chi-Square		182.856
Sphericity	Df	66
	Sig.	.000

Table 4: Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	4.104	34.203	34.203	4.104	34.203	34.203
2	2.064	17.198	51.400	2.064	17.198	51.400
3	1.184	9.863	61.264	1.184	9.863	61.264
4	.991	8.261	69.525			
5	.745	6.206	75.730			
6	.660	5.503	81.233			
7	.597	4.975	86.208			
8	.538	4.484	90.692			
9	.436	3.633	94.325			
10	.357	2.976	97.301			
11	.174	1.453	98.754			
12	.149	1.246	100.000			

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

The explanatory factor analysis using dimension reduction technique revealed that KMO score is 0.826, which means that it is good. Moreover, the principle component analysis through total variance revealed that three items on the scale has above 60% explanatory power. This confirms that the test results are valid.

4.3. Descriptive Statistics

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics

Gender				
Male	Female			
52.4	47.6			
Qualification				
Diploma	Graduation	Masters		
4.8	54.8	40.4		
Age				
18-25 years	26-33 years	34-41 years	42-50 years	Above 50 years
11.9	64.3	7.1	4.8	11.9
Total Experience				
Less than year	2-3 years	4-5 years	6-7 years	8 or Above
11.9	19.0	45.2	7.1	16.8

Figure 1: Demographic variables in this study.

The demographic variables revealed that majority of the participants are male (52.4%), having graduation qualification level (54.8%), in the age bracket between (26-33 years) (64.3%) with 4-5 years experience in the aviation sector (45.22%).

Table 6: Correlations

		Job Satisfaction	Employees' performance	Opportunities for Promotion	Nature of Work	Relationship with Co-Workers	Relationship with Supervisor	Existing Pay
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	1	.904	.575	.665	.606	-.214	.458**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.001	.002	.263	.004	.173	.002
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Employees' Performance	Pearson Correlation	.904	1	.645**	.581*	.411**	.149	.478**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.001		.000	.854	.001	.347	.001
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Opportunities for Promotion	Pearson Correlation	.575	.645**	1	.634*	.244	-.004	.294
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.000		.000	.119	.980	.059
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Nature of Work	Pearson Correlation	.665	.581**	.634**	1	.250	.195	.326*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.263	.854	.000		.111	.216	.035
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Relationship with Co-Workers	Pearson Correlation	.606	.411**	.244	.250	1	-.058	.229
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.004	.007	.119	.111		.716	.144
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Relationship with Supervisor	Pearson Correlation	-.214	.149	-.004	.195	-.058	1	.447**

	Sig. (2-tailed)	.173	.347	.980	.216	.716		.003
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42
Existing Pay	Pearson Correlation	.458**	.478**	.294	.326*	.229	.447**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	.001	.059	.035	.144	.003	
	N	42	42	42	42	42	42	42

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

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The correlation coefficient revealed that moderate correlation is evident among the variables apart from relationship with the supervisor. Interestingly, all others have upward slope. The statistically significant correlation is evident for job satisfaction and employees' performance with all because it is below 0.05 except nature of work and relationship with supervisors. In addition to that, there is strong positive leaner upward relationship between employees' performance and job satisfaction ($r=905$) and the correlation is statistically significant ($=.001 < .005$).

Table 7: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.579 ^a	.549	.242	1.1201

a. Predictors: (Constant), Existing Pay, Relationship with Co-workers, Opportunities for Promotion, Relationship with Supervisor, Nature of Work

b. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

Table 8: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	22.738	5	4.548	3.625	.001 ^b
	Residual	45.167	36	1.255		
	Total	67.905	41			

a. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

b. Predictors: (Constant), Existing Pay, Relationship with Co-workers, Opportunities for Promotion, Relationship with Supervisor, Nature of Work

Table 9: Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	2.569	1.101		2.333	.025
Opportunities for Promotion	.170	.219	.142	3.777	.002
Nature of Work	-.198	.191	-.190	-1.034	.308
Relationship with Co-workers	.547	.225	.353	2.428	.020
Relationship with Supervisor	.162	.271	.095	.596	.555
Existing Pay	-.676	.199	-.561	3.392	.002

a. Dependent Variable: Job satisfaction

The Model summary for regression showed that the R-Square is 0.549, which indicates that the 54.9% variance in the job satisfaction is explained by the variation in the independent variables. In addition to that, the Anova table revealed that the F value is 3.625, which is the mean difference between the regression mean square and residual mean square. Additionally, the sig value is less than 0.05. Hence model has significant explanatory power to measure the regression.

The coefficient table revealed that the opportunities for promotion have statistically significant impact on the job satisfaction of the employees of PIA because the significance value is less than alpha ($p=.002 < .05$). Moreover, the t-value is greater than 1.96 thus it further confirms that the significance is higher. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected with the present statistical evidence. Since, the opportunities for promotion are established the findings are aligned with the work of Heery and Noon (2001), Ellickson and Logsdon, (2002), Kreitner and Kinicki (2004), Rast and Tourani, (2012) and Nawaz et al., (2012) while contradicts the work of Kosteas (2010) and Drafke and Kosen (2003) by confirming that job satisfaction is affected by opportunities for promotion.

Additionally, the relationship with the co-workers is also statistically significant determinant in affecting the employees' job satisfaction ($p=.002 < .05$). The t-value is also greater than 1.96, which confirms the statistical significance of mediating role played by relationship with co-workers in improving the employee satisfaction and performance. Thus, the null hypothesis is rejected. The findings support the work of Ariani and Sumantri (2015) and Luthan (2008), Berta (2005), and Riordan and Griffeth (1995) whereas oppose the Zameer et al (2014) and Duffy et al., (2006) claim that there is no significant mediating role of relationship with the co-workers in improving the job satisfaction. Furthermore, the existing pay also has a statistically significant role in determining the job satisfaction of the employees of PIA ($p=.002 < .05$). Additionally, the t-value is also greater than 1.96 so the significance of the existing pay cannot be ignored in determining the job satisfaction. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected. Therefore,

this study supports the work of Rast and Tourani (2012), Luthans (2008), and Robbins et al. (2003) while oppose work of Brainard (2005) and Nawaz et al. (2012) by confirming the significant role of existing pay in determining the job satisfaction.

On the other hand, there is no statistical significant evidence that nature of work is significant predictor to determine the employees' job satisfaction because the sig value is greater than alpha ($=.308 > .05$). The findings indicate that null hypothesis cannot be rejected. In other words, the nature of work is not the significant determinant affecting job satisfaction. Thus, present findings opposed the work of Sharma and Bhaskar (1991), Robbins et al., (2003), Rast and Tourani (2012), Ahmed and Nawaz (2015), and Zameer et al., (2014) by confirming no statistical significance evidence found to support the nature of work as important determinant in affecting job satisfaction. Moreover, there is no statistical evidence found that relationship with the supervisor is significant in affecting the job satisfaction ($=.555 > .005$). Therefore, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The study opposes the previous work of Packard and Kauppi (1999), Koustelios (2001), Peterson et al., (2003), Smucker et al., (2003), and Ariani and Sumantri (2015) whereas support the work of Rast and Tourani (2012).

Table 10: Model Summary^b

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.758 ^a	.575	.516	.7359

a. Predictors: (Constant), Existing Pay, Relationship with Co-workers, Opportunities for Promotion, Relationship with Supervisor, Nature of Work

b. Dependent Variable: Employees performance

Table 11: ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	26.407	5	5.281	9.751	.000 ^b
	Residual	19.498	36	.542		
	Total	45.905	41			

a. Dependent Variable: Employees performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), Existing Pay, Relationship with Co-workers, Opportunities for Promotion, Relationship with Supervisor, Nature of Work

Table 12: Coefficients^a

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	T	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	-.125	.723		-.172	.864
	Opportunities for Promotion	.394	.144	.401	2.746	.002
	Nature of Work	.165	.126	.193	1.310	.198
	Relationship with Co-workers	.269	.148	.211	4.816	.000
	Relationship with Supervisor	.023	.178	.017	.131	.897
	Existing Pay	.240	.131	.242	3.380	.004

a. Dependent Variable: Employees performance

The Model summary showed that R-Square scored 0.575, indicating that the predictors have 57.5% variance power and the regression in the employee performance is 57% explained by the regression in the predictors. Moreover, the ANOVA has a sig-value of $=.000$, which is significant and confirms that the F-score has a statistically significant power in explaining the relationship. Results revealed that opportunities for promotion is statistically significant in affecting the employees' performance ($=.002 < .005$). Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. T-score is greater than 1.96 so the role of this determinant cannot be ignored. Thus, the study opposes Drafke and Kosen (2003) and Kosteas (2010) work while confirm the findings of Rast and Tourani (2012), Kreitner and Kinicki (2004) and Heey and Noon (2001).

In addition to that, the relationship with the co-workers is also evident to be statistically significant in determining the performance of employees ($=.000 < .005$). The t-score is also greater than 1.96, indicating that there is strong statistical evidence that the factor is significant. Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected by confirming the earlier work of Riordan and Griffeth (1995), Berta (2005), Luthans (2008) and Ariani and Sumantri (2015) while contradict the study findings of Duffey et al., (2006) and Zameer et al., (2014). The existing pay is also evident to have statistically significant role in determining the employees performance at PIA ($=.004 < .005$). In addition to that, the t-value is greater than 1.96, which shows that the factor is significant in determining the performance of the employees. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected. Hence, the present findings differ from the work of Nawaz et al., (2012) and Brainard (2005) but support the work of Robbins et al., (2003), Luthans (2008), and Rast and Tourani (2012).

Since, the statistical findings revealed that nature of work has a value greater than the alpha ($=.198 > .005$) thus there is no significant role played by the nature of work in determining the employees' performance at PIA. In addition to that, the t-score is also lower ($1.31 < 1.96$). Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. Present work opposes the work of Zameer et al.,

(2014), Ahmed and Nawaz (2015), Rast and Touran (2012) and Robbins et al., (2003). Similarly, there is no statistical evidence regarding the relationship with the supervisors as a determinant factor in affecting the employees' performance because the results are non-significant ($=.897 > .005$). In addition to that, the t-score is lower than 1.96, which indicates that relationship with the supervisor does not affect the employees' performance at PIA. Hence, the null hypothesis cannot be rejected. The present findings support the work of Ariani and Sumantri (2015) and Smucker et al., (2003) while have striking difference with the work of Rast and Tourani (2012).

Hence, the statistical results confirmed that job satisfaction and employees' performance is statistically significantly affected by the opportunities for promotion, relationship with the co-workers, and existing pay while nature of work and relationship with the supervisor have no significant role in determining the job satisfaction and performance of PIA's employees.

5. Conclusion and Recommendations

The statistical evidences confirmed that there exists positive statistically significant correlation between employees' performance and job satisfaction ($=.905$). This reflects that there is strong correlation and the significance value of $=.001$ confirmed that there is statistically significant relationship. Moreover, correlation of the all except relationship with supervisor is evident to have positive moderate relationship. However, the relationship is significant for job satisfaction with the opportunities for promotion, relationship with the co-workers, and existing pay while non-significant with nature of work and relationship with supervisor. Similarly, the employees' performance is significantly linked with the opportunities for promotion, relationship with the co-workers, and existing pay whereas not significantly linked with nature of work and relationship with supervisor.

In addition to that, the regression analysis confirmed that existing pay is statistically significantly linked with the job satisfaction and performance. Hence, study support work of Ariani and Sumantri (2015) while differs with Rast and Tourani (2012) work. Opportunities for promotion are also evident to have statistically significant role in improving the job satisfaction and employee performance. Hence, the study supports work of Heey and Noon (2001) and Kreitner and Kinicki (2004) while opposes Kosteas (2010) work.

Relationship with the co-workers is also the key determinant in determining the employees' performance and level of job satisfaction. The statistical test confirmed the significance that it is one of the most important factors at workplace. Hence, this study supports the work of Berta (2005) and Ariani and Sumantri (2015) while opposes the work of Zameer et al., (2014). Remaining factors are evident to have non-significant statistical role at PIA.

Research Limitations:

There are some limitations attached with the present study. The sample size is very small considering the total employees working at PIA. Therefore, the results cannot be generalized to the entire PIA employees but restricted to only Rawal Pindi Hub. Secondly, there was no distinction made between the contractual and permanent employees. There is a likely chance that the findings would have differed if the distinction was made. Currently, it is more general

outlook rather than specific in terms of types of employees. There was no comparison made between the hubs of PIA functioning in different parts of the country. There is a likely chance that the results would have highlighted more in-depth understanding if comparative analysis would have been used. Lastly, the case strategy was cross-sectional so only limited time was available to explore limited cases.

Research Implications:

The research is significant in improving the job satisfaction and employees' performance. The management shall consider mixing the motivational and hygiene factors for the employees. Moreover, the fresh employees should be trained under the wing of the seniors to ensure that the human capital is sustained. Moreover, there is need for improving the relationship between the employees and supervisors. The communication gap shall be reduced through direct channels rather than following hierarchical structure. Additionally, there should be a balance development between psychological and social aspects. Immense focus on one would lead to depression, anger, jealousy, etc.

There are some suggestions that future researchers shall also consider for their researchers. It would be ideally better to have in-person visit so that there is observation too. Hence, the observational technique should be included. Moreover, the comparative analysis should also be considered to examine the variation among the factors in different hubs. In addition to that, the sample size should be increased for the purpose of higher generalizability. High number of respondents will give more statistical meaning to the findings and it could be generalized to the larger part of the population. Furthermore, the distinction should be made between contractual and permanent employees because there is a possibility that the two might have different outlook and their job satisfaction and performance is affected by different factors. Additionally, the studies should consider the exploration through gender perspective. At present this study is more case oriented but the addition of the gender might reflect upon some different reasons for specific attributes working differently for distinctive genders.

References:

- Ahmed, M., and Nawaz, N. (2015). Impact of Organizational Commitment on Employee Turnover: A Case Study of Pakistan International Airlines (PIA), *Industrial Engineering Letters*, 5(8), pp. 57-69.
- Ali, F., Dey, B.L., and Filieri, R. (2015). An assessment of service quality and resulting customer satisfaction in Pakistan International Airlines: Findings from foreigners and overseas Pakistani customers, *International Journal of Quality & Reliability Management*, 32(5), pp. 486-502.
- Alniacik, U., Cigerim, E., Akcin, K., and Bayram, O. (2011). *Independent and joint effects of perceived corporate reputation, affective commitment and job satisfaction on turnover intentions*, in Proc. 7th International Strategic Management Conference, 24, pp. 1177-1189.
- Ariani, D. W., and Sumantri, D. S. (2015). Relationship with Supervisor and Co-Workers, Psychological Condition and Employee Engagement in the Workplace, *Journal of*

- Business and Management*, 4(3), pp. 34-47.
- Asmus, S., Kari, F., Mohnen, A., and Reinhard, G. (2015). The Impact of Goal-setting on Worker Performance - Empirical Evidence from a Real-effort Production Experiment, *Procedia CIRP*, 26, pp. 127-132.
- Brainard, J. (2005). Postdoctoral researchers value structured training over pay, survey says. *Chronicle of Higher Education*, April, 51(32), pp. 21-28.
- Cooper, D. R. and Schindler, P. S. (2006). *Business Research Method*, 9th Edition. Boston: McGraw-Hill Irwin.
- Dar, O. L. (2010). Trust in Co-Workers and Employee Behaviours at Work, *International Review of Business Research Papers*, 16(1), pp. 194-204.
- Drafke, M. W., and Kossen, S. (2002). *The Human Side of Organizations* (8 th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall, Inc.
- Duffy, M. Gangster, D. and Pagon, M. (2006). The social context of undermining behavior at work, *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 101(1), pp. 105-126.
- Ellickson, M. C., and Logsdon, K. (2002). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *Public Personnel Management*, vol. 31(3), 343-358.
- Griffen, R.W., and Moorhead, G. (2009). *Organizational Behavior*. (9th ed.). Boston: South-Western College.
- Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: Macmillan.
- Haque, A.U., Aston, J., and Kozlovski, E. (2018). The impact of stressors on organisational commitment of managerial and non-managerial personnel in contrasting economies: Evidences from Canada and Pakistan, *International Journal of Business*, 23(2), pp. 152-168
- Haque, A.U., and Aston, J. (2016). A Relationship between Occupational Stress and Organizational Commitment of I.T Sector's Employees in Contrasting Economies. *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 14(1), pp. 95-105.
- Haque, A.U., and Oino, I. (2019). Managerial challenges for software houses related to work, worker and workplace: stress reduction and sustenance of human capital, *Polish Journal of Management Studies*, 19(1), 170-189. DOI: 10.17512/pjms.2019.19.1.13
- Haque, A.U., and Yamoah, F. (2014). Gender Employment Longevity: I.T staff response to Organisational Support Programme in Pakistan. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Science (IJ-ARBSS)*, 4(12), pp. 324-347.
- Hasan, S., and Khan, T. A. (2013). *PIA goes from being a success story to the brink of collapse*, The Tribune Express. Retrieved from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/611180/lost-glory-pia-goes-from-being-a-success-story-to-the-brink-of-collapse/>. [23-03-2018]
- Heery, E., and Noon, M. (2001). *A Dictionary of Human Resource Management*, Oxford University Press Inc.
- Holmberg, C., Sobis, I., and Carlström, E. (2015). Job Satisfaction Among Swedish Mental Health Nursing Staff: A Cross-Sectional Survey. *International Journal of Public Administration*. 39(6), pp. 429-436.
- Hoppock, R. (1935). *Job Satisfaction*. New York: Harper Brothers.
- Kelley, K., Clark, B., Brown, V., and Sitzia, J. (2003). Good practice in the conduct and reporting of survey research, *International Journal for Quality in Health Care*, 15(3), pp.

- 261–266.
- Khan, R.S., Rao, B., Usman, K., and Afzal, S. (2017). The Mediating Role of Job Satisfaction between Transformational Leadership and Organizational Commitment within the SMEs of Karachi. *International Journal of Applied Business and Management Studies*, 2(1), pp. 46-55.
- Khuong, M.N., and Uyen, N.H.T. (2016). Factors Affecting Employee Job Engagement towards Aircraft Maintenance Organizations - A Mediation Analysis of Job Satisfaction, *Journal of Economics, Business and Management*, 4(4), pp. 339-346.
- King, K.M. (2003). *The Relationship between Participation in Goal Setting, Company Size and Performance, Commitment, Acceptance and Job Satisfaction in the United States and Macedonia*. Electronic Theses and Dissertations. Paper 758.
- Kosteas, V. D. (2010) Job Satisfaction and Promotions, *Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society*, 50(1), 174-194.
- Kot, S., Haque, A.U., and Kozlovski, E. (2019). Strategic SCM's Mediating Effect on the Sustainable Operations: Multinational Perspective, *Organizacija*, 52(3), pp. 219-235. DOI: 10.2478/orga-2019-0014
- Koustelios, A. D. (2001). Personal characteristics and job satisfaction of Greek teachers. *International Journal of Educational Management*, 15(7), pp. 354-358.
- Kreitner, R., and Kinicki, A. (2004). *Organizational behavior* (5th ed.). New York: McGraw-Hill Inc.
- Kumari, N. (2016). Study of Employee Satisfaction in Airline Industry, Social and *Basic Sciences Research Review*, 4(4), pp. 73-83.
- Lavarkas, P. (2008). *Cross-Sectional Survey Design*. In. Encyclopedia of Survey Research Methods, SAGE publications, London.
- Luthans, F. (2008). *Organizational Behavior*. (12th ed.). Irwin: McGraw-Hill.
- Maslow, A. (1954). *Motivation and personality*. New York, NY: Harper.
- Nawaz, N., Jahanian, A., and Tehreem, S. (2012). Determinants of Employee Retention in Pakistan International Airlines (PIA), *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(7), pp. 45-53.
- Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal of Social Economics*, 30(12), pp. 1210-1232.
- Packard, S. H., and Kauppi, D. R. (1999). Rehabilitation Agency Leadership Style. *Rehabilitation Counselling Bulletin*, 43(1), pp. 5-6.
- Peterson, D.K., Puia, G.M., and Suess, F.R. (2003). Yo Tengo La Camiseta (I Have the Shirt On): An Exploration of Job Satisfaction and Commitment Among Workers In Mexico. *Journal of Leadership & Organizational Studies*, 10(2), pp. 73-88.
- Rast, S., and Tourani, A. (2012). Evaluation of Employees' Job Satisfaction and Role of Gender Difference: An Empirical Study at Airline Industry in Iran. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), pp. 91-100.
- Riordan, C.M., and Griffeth, R.W. (1995). The opportunity for friendship in the workplace: An underexplored construct. *Journal of business and psychology*, 10(2), pp. 141-154.
- Robbins S.P. (2002). *Organizational behavior* (10th ed.). New Jersey: Prentice-Hall.
- Robbins, S.P., Odendaal, A., and Roodt, G. (2003). *Organizational Behavior*. Global and

- Southern African Perspectives, (9th ed.). Cape Town: Pearson Education.
- Schultz, D.P., and Schultz, S.E. (2010). *Psychology and Work Today: An Introduction to Industrial and Organizational Psychology* (10th ed.). New York City: Prentice Hall. pp. 38–39.
- Siddiqui, S. (2018), *PIA has flown into oblivion, but its new CEO wants to steer it back*, The Express Tribune. Retrieved from <https://tribune.com.pk/story/1603039/2-pia-flown-oblivion-new-ceo-wants-steer-back/> [23-03-2018].
- Sharma, B.R., and Bhaskar, S. (1991). Determinants of job satisfaction among engineers in a public sector undertaking. *ASCI Journal of Management*, 20(4), pp. 217-233.
- Smith, P.C., Kendall, L.M., and Hulin, C.L. (1969). *The Measurement of Satisfaction in Work and Retirement*. Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Smucker, M. K., Whisenant, W.A., and Pedersen, P.M. (2003). An investigation of job satisfaction and female sports journalists. *Sex roles*, 49(7), pp. 401-407.
- Staudt, M. (1997). Correlates of Job Satisfaction in School Social Work. *Social Work in Education*, 19(1), pp. 43-51.
- Taylor, G.S., and Vest, M.J. (1992). Pay comparisons and pay satisfaction among public sector employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 21, pp. 445-445.
- Urbański, M., Haque A.U., and Oino, I. (2019), The Moderating Role of Risk Management Between Project Planning and Project Success: Comparative Study, *Engineering Management in Production and Services*, 11(1), 23-35.
- Viswesvaran, C., Deshpande, S. P., and Joseph, J. (1998). Job satisfaction as a function of top management support for ethical behavior: A study of Indian managers. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 17(4), pp. 365-371.
- Zahid, M., Shaikh, T., and Zehra, S. Z. (2017). Impact of Organizational Culture on the Pakistani Hotels Workforce's Job Satisfaction: Qualitative Report. *International Journal of Applied Business and Management Studies*, 2(1), pp. 37-45.
- Zameer, H., Ali, S., Nisar, W., and Amir, M. (2014). The Impact of the Motivation on the Employee's Performance in Beverage Industry of Pakistan, *International Journal of Academic Research in Accounting, Finance, and Management Studies*, 4(1), pp. 293-298.