Abstract: Research conducted to identify the impact of job satisfaction factors on employee’s performance (employee's impressions, inclinations, desires, and visualizations towards their jobs) in the faculty of science and humanity studies (university of Salman bin Abdul-Aziz-Afaj branch). Research determined the relation, association and impact of job satisfaction factors and its dimensions on employee’s performance in the faculty. Total sample size of research is 86 members of teaching staff from the faculty (male =46 and female =40). SPSS was used to analyze the data. Research applied chi- squared or (x²) and regression analysis. Research examined that there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between job satisfaction factors and employee's performance. The research concluded that whenever there are better (work conditions, pay and promotion, and work relationships) there is a higher job satisfaction.
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1. INTRODUCTION

According to Locke (1976), job satisfaction is defined as “...a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” (p.1304). Implicit in Lock’s definition is the importance of both affect, or feeling, and cognition, or thinking. When we think, conversely, when we have feelings, we think about what we feel. Cognition and affect are thus inextricably linked, in our psychology and even in our biology. Thus, when evaluating our jobs, as when we assess most anything important to us, both thinking and feeling are involved.

Neuman (1989) found that employee develop and perform better if managers control and motivate their employees with participative forms of rewards. Most scales of job satisfaction (Hackman, Oldham, 1975;Herzberg, 1987, Smith, Kendall & Hulin, 1969; Spector, 1997) include such facets as the nature of work, promotion opportunities, and social relations.

2. RESEARCH QUESTIONS

This study explores the answer to the following major research questions (MRQ):
1/ Do the General Working conditions (Location of work, hours worked each week, physical conditions, and communication) have statistically significant impact on employee’s performance.
2/ Do the Pay and promotion potential (Present salary, Opportunity for advancement, opportunity to use one’s abilities, benefits, job security, recognition and appreciation) Have statistically significant impact on employee’s performance.
3/ Do the Working relationships (Relationships with supervisors, cooperation in the department, interpersonal relationships, and general relations in the company) have statistically significant impact on employee’s performance.

3. OBJECTIVES

The main purpose of the study was to identify the impact of job satisfaction factors on employee’s performance.

The following specific objectives were considered:
1. To identify the most effective factor of job satisfaction that has high impact on employee's performance.
2. To find out whether the employees are satisfied with their jobs in the faculty of science and humanity studies /Afaj branch or not.
3. To assess the employees level of satisfaction with all job satisfaction factors.
4. To study about the motivation level In the faculty of science and humanity studies/ Al-Afaj branch.

4. HYPOTHESIS

There is a statistically significant relation between job satisfaction factors in term of (general working conditions - pay and promotion potential - working relationships) and employee's performance.

5. THEORIES OF JOB SATISFACTION

5.1 Maslow's Theory:
According to this theory, a person has five fundamentals needs which are:
1. Physiological: Includes security and protection from physical and emotional needs.(pay, food, shelter, clothing, good and comfortable work conditions etc).
2. Security needs: Includes security and protection from physical and emotional harm (Fair treatment, protection against threat, job security etc).
3. Affiliation needs: Includes affection, belongingness, acceptance and friendship.(The needs of being loved, accepted, part of a group etc).
4. Esteem needs: Includes the needs for recognition, respect, achievement, autonomy, independence etc.

5. Self –actualization needs: Which are the highest in the level of Maslow's need theory include realizing ones' full potential or self-development. According to Maslow, once a need is satisfied, it is no longer a need. It ceases to motivate employee’s behavior and they are motivated by the need at the next level up the hierarchy. However, in spite of Maslow's effort and insights into the theories of motivation, replicate studies failed to offer strong support of the need – based theories. Also studies aimed at validating Mathlow’s failed to find substantiation support of the needs hierarchy. Although many continue to find the hierarchy model very attractive.

5.2 Herzberg et al.’s two factor theory:

Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman’s (1959) two-factor theory is heavily based on need fulfillment because of their interest in how best to satisfy workers. They carried out several studies to explore those things that cause workers in white–collar jobs to be satisfied and dissatisfied. The outcome of their study showed that the factors that lead to job satisfaction when present are not the same factors that lead to dissatisfaction when absent. Thus, they saw job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as independent. They referred to those environment factors that cause workers to be dissatisfied as hygiene factors. The presence of these factors according to Herzberg et al. does not cause satisfaction and consequently failed to increase performance of workers in white–collar jobs. The hygiene factors are company policy and administration, technical supervision, salary, interpersonal relationship with supervisors and work conditions; they are associated with job content. Herzberg et al, indicated that these factors are perceived as necessary but not sufficient conditions for the satisfaction of workers. They further identified motivating factors as those factors that make workers work harder. They posited that these factors are associated with job content. Herzberg et al, indicated that these factors are perceived as necessary but not sufficient conditions for the satisfaction of workers. They further identified motivating factors as those factors that make workers work harder. They posited that these factors are associated with job content. Herzberg et al, indicated that these factors are perceived as necessary but not sufficient conditions for the satisfaction of workers. They further identified motivating factors as those factors that make workers work harder. They posited that these factors are associated with job content.

5.3 Theory X & Y (Douglas McGregor) (1960)

• External control and threat are not the only means for producing effort. People can practice self-direction and self-control in achieving objectives.
• The degree of commitment to objectives is determined by the size of rewards attached with achievement.
• Under proper conditions, human beings learn and not only accept responsibility but also.

5.4 Theory of needs – Achievement theory (McClelland, David 1961)

McClelland and Associates postulated that some people have a compelling drive to succeed and therefore strive for personal achievement rather than the rewards of success themselves. They have the desire to perform better than before, therefore they like challenging jobs and behave as high achievers. This theory focuses on the achievement.

Motive thus, called achievement theory but it is founded on achievement, power and affiliation motives:

Achievement: This is the drive to excel and achieve beyond the standards of success.

Power: It refers to the desire to have an impact, to be influential, and to control others.

Affiliation: It is the desire for having friendly and close interpersonal relationships.

5.5 ERG Theory (Alderfer, Clayton P.) (1969)

Clayton Alderfer (1969) explored the Maslow’s theory and linked it with practical research. He regrouped the Maslow’s list of needs into three classes of needs: Existence, relatedness, and growth, thereby calling it ERG theory. His classification absorbs the Mathlow’s division of needs into: Existence (physiological and security needs), Relatedness (social and esteem needs) and growth (self-actualization). Alderfer suggested a continuum of needs rather than hierarchical levels or two factors of needs. Unlike Maslow and Herzberg, Alderfer does not suggest that a lower-level need must be fulfilled before a higher level need becomes motivating or that deprivation is the only way to activate a need.

5.6 Process theories

Process theories are more concerned with how motivation takes place? Similarly, the concept of expectancy from cognitive theory plays dominant role in the process theories of job-satisfaction. Thus, these theories strive to explain how the needs and goals are satisfied and accepted cognitively. Several process-based theories have been suggested. Some of such theories have been used by researchers as hypotheses, tested and found them thought-provoking. The well known theoretical models for process motivation are:

Equity theory (J.Stacy Adams) (1963)

This theory suggest that employees weigh what they put into a job (input) against what they get from it (outcome) and then compare this ratio with the input-outcome ratio of other workers. If they find this ratio equal to that of the relevant others, a state of equity is said to exist.

Vroom’s Expectancy Theory (1964)

Victor H. Vroom asserts that people are motivated to work to achieve a goal if they believe that that goal is worthy and there is the probability that what they do will help them in achieving their goals. Vroom’s theory is based on three major variables: Valance, expectancy and instrumentality. Valance is the strength of an individual’s preference (or value, incentive, attitude, and expected utility) for a particular output. Expectancy is the probability that a particular effort will lead to a particular first-level outcome while instrumentality is the degree to which a first-level outcome will lead to a desired second-level outcome.

Porter/Lawler Expectancy Model (1968)

This model is very popular explanation of the job satisfaction process. Porter and Lawler stress that effort (force or strength of motivation) does not lead directly to performance. It is rather moderated by the abilities and traits and the role perceptions of an employee. Further more, satisfaction is not dependent on performance rather determined by the probability of receiving fair rewards.
Goal-Setting Theory (Locke, 1968)

Edwin Locke (in late 1960s) asserted that intentions can be a major source of motivation and satisfaction. Some specific goals (intentions) lead to increased performance, for example, difficult goals (when accepted) lead to higher performance, than easy goals and that feedback triggers higher performance than no feedback.

Job Characteristics theory (Hackman & Oldham) (1975-76)

Job characteristics are aspects of the individual employee’s job and tasks that shape how the individual perceives his or her particular role in the organization. Hackman and Oldham’s (1980) original formulation of job characteristics theory argued that the outcomes of job redesign were influenced by several moderators. These moderators include the differences to which various employees desire personal or psychological progress. The clarity of tasks leads to greater job satisfaction because greater role clarity creates such workforce, which in turn increases the likelihood of desired outcomes.

5.7 Reinforcement theories

Reinforcement theories, which assume that people’s behavior is determined by its perceived positive or negative consequences. The consequences of behavior may be tangible, such as money, or intangible, such as praise. In this regard, reinforcement theory was highly influential in firmly establishing the ideas relating to incentive and reward systems that are applied in most organizations today. As such, it provided the basis for the notion that rewards should be contingent with individual units of productivity.

6. RESEARCH VARIABLES

Research conducted on the basis of job satisfaction and employee’s performance. Research determined the impact of job satisfaction factors on employee’s performance. The independent variable of the study is job satisfaction factors (working conditions – pay and promotion potential – work relationships). It is a descriptive variable in five format options (strongly disagree – don’t agree – neutral – I agree – strongly agree). As graduated levels, reflecting the respondents’ views about the phrases. Each option is given the numerical values (1, 2, 3, 4, 5) respectively. The total answers of every single of the sample is put in the form of four categories with length equal to the number of phrases that concerning the variable. Each category is given the numerical values (1, 2, 3, 4,) respectively.

There is a statistically significant relation between job satisfaction factors in term of (general working conditions - pay and promotion potential - working relationships) and employee’s performance.

General Working conditions include (Location of work, hours worked each week, physical conditions, and communication).

Pay and promotion potential include (Present salary, opportunity for advancement, opportunity to use one’s abilities, benefits such as health insurance, job security, recognition and appreciation).

Working relationships (Relationships with supervisors, cooperation in the department, interpersonal relationships, and general relations in the company).

-Pay: Amount and fairness or equity of salary according to the qualification. Findings from several studies underline pay as one of the most important factors influencing one’s level of job satisfaction. In a study conducted by Lawler (1971), pay has been identified as a determinant factor as most employees rated it as the most influential factor related to job satisfaction. Furthermore, according to Herzberg (1959), employees who are dissatisfied with their pay, is likely that they are also dissatisfied with their work.

-Promotion potential: Employee perceptions about opportunity for promotion are also another determinant that influences job satisfaction.

-Job security: The importance of Job security comes from the fact that it is vital for influencing work-related outcomes. It has attracted a great deal of research interest in recent years.

-Recognition and appreciation: In some studies, recognition and appreciation were found to be motivating factors responsible for increased effectiveness of employees at work and their high levels of job satisfaction.

-Demographic factors: Studies have shown that age, race and gender have important effects on job satisfaction.

-Working hours and physical conditions: Two elements related to job satisfaction are the working hours and the physical conditions under which workers spend their working days.

-Opportunity to use one's abilities: Employees generally need and like jobs that make use of their abilities.

-Interpersonal relationships: An individual's level of job satisfaction might be a function of personal characteristics and the characteristics of the groups to which she or he belongs to. The social context of work is likely to have a significant impact on a worker's attitude and behavior.

-Work situation: The nature of the work itself often called ‘‘intrinsic’’ job characteristics. It generally emerges.
as the most important job factor.
- Supervision: Fairness and competence at managerial tasks by ones supervisor.
- Nature of work: It means the job tasks. It includes the challenging work and sense of pride.
- Communication: It explains the communication between the team members or between the employees within the organization.

7. RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This section identified the methodological strategy. Data collection tools selected to analyze the relationships between variables. Research targeted the (86) respondents from faculty of science and humanity studies. (male=46 and female =40). Total number of male respondents in details is (teaching assistants = 3, lecturers = 18, assistant professors = 20, associates = 4, professors =1). Total number of female respondents in details is (teaching assistants = 0, lecturers = 25, assistant professors = 15, associates = 0, professors =0). The aim is to identify the impact of job satisfaction on employee’s performance. The Questionnaire was used for collecting the data. Due to the small size of the community, a comprehensive inventory method was used. Taking the whole vocabulary in the sample for the analysis. Eighty six questionnaires were dispatched to these respondents. A total of (86) filled questionnaires were received which were used for data analysis. The Questionnaire measured four groups. The first group of working conditions contained (4 items), The second group of pay and promotion potential contained (6 items), the third group of working relationships contained (4 items) respectively. Respondents were asked to rate their answers on multi-item scale. The scaling is: (5 for strongly agree, 4 for agree, 3 for neutral, 2 for don't agree and 1 for strongly disagree) has been given in order to analyze the data.

Descriptive statistics, correlation, and linear regression were used to test and analyze the data collected from the respondents. Responses analyzed through the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences).

8. RESULTS AND DATA ANALYSIS

Responses analyzed through the SPSS (Statistical Package for Social Sciences). The following statistical techniques were applied to analyze the data:
1. Chi-squared: Or (x²) to test the independence of each of the three axes of the hypothesis which are as follows:
- Relationship of job satisfaction with working conditions.
- Relationship of job satisfaction with pay and promotion potential.
- Relationship of job satisfaction with working relations
2. Linear regression: The simple linear regression will be used for obtaining linear equation between the independent variable: job satisfaction (Xi) in term of (the general working conditions - pay and promotion potential - and the working relationships). The dependent variable (Y) is employee's performance. The regression equation takes the following form:

\[ \hat{Y}_i = b_0 + b_1X_{1i} + b_2X_{2i} + b_3X_{3i} \]

- b0 = static of the equation. It is the part lump of vertical axis Y which reflects the intrinsic value of the dependent variable. It is a value when the values of the independent variable (Xi) = 0.
- b1 = is the slope of the regression line for the first variable (X1i) It is a value which changes with the change in the dependent variable whenever it changes in one unit.
- b2 = is the slope of the regression line for the second variable (X2i). It is a value that changes with the change in the dependent variable whenever it changes in one unit.
- b3 = is the slope of the regression line for the third variable (X3i). It is a value that changes with the change in the dependent variable whenever it changes in one unit.

From the tables analysis, using (SPSS), it is clear that the value of moral level (Asymp.sig) which is less than the allowable error (α) that has been previously specified as valuing = (0.05). It indicates the rejection of null hypothesis and accept the premise of the study.

When using the chi-squared analysis (x²), the hypotheses will be formulated as follows:

H0: denotes a null hypothesis which means there is no statistically significant relationship between the variables studied.

H1: the alternative hypothesis to the null hypothesis. It implies that there is statistically significant relationship between the variables of the study.

For the case of linear regression method (bi), the null and alternative hypotheses will be in the following form:

\[ b_i = 0 \text{H}_0; \]
\[ b_i \neq 0 \text{H}_1; \]
\[ i = 1,2,3 \]

The designed statistical analysis in this research tries to prove or deny the hypothesis of the study. Through processing the data obtained from the sample by the questionnaire that has been prepared according to the hypothesis of the study. Using Chi-squared or (x²)– and the method of simple linear regression in order to determine the impact of the slope factor (Its’ strength or weakness) of the independent variable on the dependent variable.

Commentary on( iterative dual table) and(regression equation) through their impact. And through the comparison between the calculated value of moral level (Asymp.sig) and the value of moral level (Asymp.sig) set forth and calculated as moral standard equaling = (0.05).

Statistical analysis of the hypothesis of the study:
There is a statistically significant relation between job satisfaction factors in term of (general working conditions - pay and promotion potential - working relationships) and employee's performance.
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conditions promotion Table 13: Pay and promotion potential Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work conditions</th>
<th>Level of job satisfaction</th>
<th>5 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 - 20</th>
<th>20 - 25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 - 8</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>39</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>14.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>39.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 16</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 20</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>10.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (2): Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>119.834</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (3): Pay and promotion potential * Level of job satisfaction Cross tabulation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>pay and promotion potential</th>
<th>Level of job satisfaction</th>
<th>5 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 - 20</th>
<th>20 - 25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>6 - 12</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 18</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>19 - 24</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>3.0</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>10.5</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>29.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>25 - 30</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>15</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (4): Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>106.584</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (5): Work relationships * Level of job satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work relationships</th>
<th>Level of job satisfaction</th>
<th>5 - 10</th>
<th>11 - 15</th>
<th>16 - 20</th>
<th>20 - 25</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4 - 8</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>9.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9 - 12</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>12.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>34.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>13 - 16</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>2.9</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>10.1</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>28.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>17 - 20</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>2.6</td>
<td>15.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>86</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Expected Count</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>31.0</td>
<td>15.0</td>
<td>86.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (6): Chi-Square Tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Value</th>
<th>Df</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Pearson Chi-Square</td>
<td>135.396</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table (7): Leaner regression

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>.088</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>.575</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work conditions</td>
<td>.354</td>
<td>.109</td>
<td>3.252</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Pay and promotion</td>
<td>.250</td>
<td>.080</td>
<td>3.118</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work relationships</td>
<td>.385</td>
<td>.104</td>
<td>3.703</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Dependent Variable: level of employee's performance

\[
\hat{Y} = 0.088 + 3.54 X_{11} + 0.250 X_{12} + 3.85 X_{13}
\]

Schedule No (1): Which expresses the relationship between working conditions and job satisfaction, we note that the first category of the working conditions, contrasting the iteration number 8 individuals, seven (7) of them appear in the lower category of job satisfaction. As for the second category of work condition that contains (39) individuals, most of them fall into the lowest categories of job satisfaction. Conversely, the higher frequencies of work conditions concentrate on the top categories of job satisfaction. This indicates that there is a statistical relationship between the two variables. In order to confirm the moral of this relationship, we can refer to table (2) that shows the Chi-squared test of moral relationship between the variables where the value of moral level = (0) it is less than the previous specified level of moral valuing (.05) this will lead to reject the null hypothesis (no relation) and accept the alternative hypothesis (a relationship). Thus, there is a positive and statistically significant relationship between work conditions and job satisfaction. Whenever there are better working conditions, there is a higher job satisfaction. Whenever there are better working conditions, there is a higher job satisfaction among employees. The same notes are applied to tables (3), (4), (5), (6) which means accepting the premise of the study (of all three pillars). Table: No (7) confirms the above facts. It is reading the
previous tables by using the method of multiple linear regression, which is consistent with the chi-squared method in the presence or absence of relationship between variables and determine the direction (positive or negative), and more than that it has the capability to estimate the predictive values of the dependent variable when the independent variables give certain values. 

For this study, with regard to the regression equation, we note the following points:
1. The value of constant slope = .088 = b0 represents the lump of vertical axis Y and it reflects the intrinsic value of the dependent variable (the value, when the values of the independent variable Xi = zero) we can notice that, it is a small value and not moral (see the value of the contrasting moral level, we find that it is = .567 it is a very large value for the predefined value that equaling = .05 so we can accept the null hypothesis). That means – statistically, the selected variables as key influences on job satisfaction are as well.
2. For the three variables, the regression equations are positive and moral.
(see the corresponding levels of moral values, we find that they are all too small for value .05 consequently we reject the null hypothesis). This means a positive statistically significant relationship between these factors of job satisfaction and employee’s performance.

It is noticed that:
- The .354 = b1 = slope of the regression line for the first variable (X1i) it is the value that is changed by the dependent variable whenever changing the variable of working conditions one unit with constancy of salary, promotion and work relations variables.
- The .250 = b2 = slope of the regression line for the second variable (X2i) it is the value that varies by the dependent variable whenever changing the variable of salary and promotion one unit with constancy of working conditions and work relations variables.
- The .385 = b3 = slope of the regression line for the third variable (X3i) it is the value that varies by the dependent variable whenever changing the variable of work relations one unit with constancy of working conditions, salary and promotion variables.

8. CONCLUSION

The following conclusions were drawn in the light of finding of the study:
1. All members of teaching staff strongly agree that whenever there are better (work conditions, pay and promotion, and work relationships) there is a higher job satisfaction and good performance in the collage.
2. Most members of teaching staff are satisfied with their jobs.
3. The study concluded that the management of the university is just and fair in offering regular payment of salary and other remunerations.
4. The study concluded that members of teaching staff maintain and enjoy good work relationships.
5. Provision of regular payment of salary and other remuneration by the collage promote the performance of members of teaching staff.
6. Good work relationships and co-operation with the administration of the collage including participation in decision making about academic matters enhance members of teaching staff’s performance.
7. Location of work near the residence, hours worked each week, and effective means of communication in the collage definitely promote the performance of teaching staff.
8. The study also concluded that the provision of adequate chances for professional growth, research advancement can promote employee’s performance.

9. RECOMMENDATIONS

- Research recommends that organizations should realize the employee's needs and work for the betterment of the organization environment.
- Research recommends that the organization should motivate the human resources to work hard, efficiently and effectively for attaining the higher satisfaction.
- Research recommends that organization must gratify the employees on the attainment of a specific task and should assist the human resources to feel excellent.
- Research recommends that organization must arrange orientations for the new employees, which will help them to learn their job tasks.
- In future the research can be applied in different sectors with other variables.
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