

Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance in Tanzania: A Study of Tanzania Institute of Education

Rogith K¹, Mrs Naveena M²

¹MBA Student, School of Arts, Humanities and Management, Jeppiaar University, Chennai, India.

²Associate Professor, School of Arts, Humanities and Management, Jeppiaar University, Chennai, India.

ABSTRACT

This study looks at how job satisfaction affects how well employees perform at the Tanzania Institute of Education. We focused on how work benefits, support from coworkers, and support from managers influence employee performance. We surveyed 99 employees and analyzed the data using descriptive stats and multiple regression analysis in SPSS. The results show that good work benefits, strong coworker support, and effective managerial support all help boost employee performance. Specifically, employees who feel they're getting enough benefits, enjoy good support from colleagues, and have strong backing from their managers tend to be more satisfied with their jobs. That satisfaction then leads to better performance. The study suggests that the Tanzania Institute of Education should focus on improving these areas—especially coworker and managerial support—to help employees perform their best. Overall, creating a positive work environment that promotes employee well-being and motivation is key for better performance in the education sector.

Keywords: Work Benefits, Employee Performance, Tanzania, Tanzania Institute of Education, Co-worker

1. Introduction

The public sector, especially in Tanzania, faces some unique challenges that can affect how employees perform their jobs. Because the sector often operates within a political environment and has strict accountability standards, workers may find it hard to have the flexibility and independence they need. This can lead to lower job satisfaction, as employees feel restricted in their roles (Taylor & Westover, 2011). Still, how well employees perform is really important for an organization's overall success because, after all, people are its most valuable resource (Ngirwa, 2005). Various factors can influence how employees perform, like their ability to adapt, their skills, and the challenges they face at work (Diamantidis & Chatzoglou, 2018). When organizations offer strong support—such as good management, regular training, and meaningful job challenges—it can boost employee performance (Ng & Feldman, 2009). Job satisfaction isn't just one thing; it covers different aspects like core task performance, workplace citizenship behavior, and even negative behaviors (Ariani, 2013; Sajid & Siddiqui, 2017). This study looks into how job satisfaction affects employee performance in Tanzania's public sector. Specifically, it examines how work benefits, support from co-workers, and managerial support influence how well employees do their jobs. These factors are key to understanding how

employees see their jobs and how that impacts their performance. Past research shows that when people are satisfied with their jobs, they tend to perform better across different industries (Octavianna et al., 2017; Stankovska et al., 2017; Asgari et al., 2017). But there's still a need to explore how specific aspects of job satisfaction work within the Tanzanian public sector. This study aims to fill that gap by looking at the relationships among work benefits, coworker support, managerial support, and employee performance. According to existing literature, providing work benefits is essential for boosting motivation and performance (Choma & Baruah, 2014). Support from colleagues can improve the workplace atmosphere and influence how well people perform (Emilova, 2014). Meanwhile, good managerial support can encourage employees to stay committed to their roles over time by giving them a sense of future prospects within the organization (Prince, 2005).

2. Methods

Research design and study area

This research employed a correlational approach to explore how job satisfaction might influence employee performance at the Tanzania Institute of Education (TIE). The study focused specifically on TIE, which was chosen because it's a public institution in Tanzania that's easy to access. The researcher could gather relevant data more conveniently here, thanks to the presence of key staff members willing to support the study. The area was selected mainly for its accessibility and efficiency, allowing the researcher to directly collect the necessary quantitative data by visiting the institute. **Sample Size and Sampling Techniques** The study targeted all 99 employees at TIE, including both management and operational staff. Since the population was small, the entire group was studied to ensure the findings could be representative and meaningful. **Research Instruments** Primary data were gathered through questionnaires, which are common tools used in survey-based or descriptive research. Other methods like interviews or observations are also options, but for this study, questionnaires were the chosen method to efficiently collect data from respondents. **Data Analysis** Analyzing data involves using statistical or analytical tools to find useful insights (Buchbinder, 2011). For this research, multiple regression analysis was used to interpret the quantitative data collected (Hair et al., 2011). After sorting and analyzing the data, the results were summarized in tables and interpreted to draw conclusions and understand the relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance.

3. Results And Discussion

Correlation coefficient

After running a multivariate regression in SPSS, we see that employee performance is strongly and positively related to coworker support (CS) and work benefits (WB). On the other hand, the link between employee performance and managerial support appears to be weak and not statistically important. These findings are summarized in the table below.

Table 1: Correlation coefficient

Variables	MS	CS	WB	EP
EP	0.170	0.870**	0.760**	1

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

Inferential findings

According to Pallant (2002), inferential findings can be classified into three main types: multiple regre-

ssion, and the other two categories include both simultaneous and sequential multiple regressions.

Table 2: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R-squared value	Std. Error in Estimate
1	.920	.847	.841	.19284

Looking at the table above, we can see that the predictors—Managerial Support (MS), Co-worker Support (CS), and Work Benefit (WB)—are all independent variables that together explain about 84.7% of the variation in employee performance. In other words, these factors account for most of what's influencing performance, while the remaining 15.3% is due to other factors not covered here.

ANOVA

Looking at Table 3, the ANOVA count value is 158.434, with a p-value of 0.000, which is less than 0.05. This tells us that the model is statistically important. In simple terms, it effectively predicts how work benefit (x1), support from coworkers (x2), and managerial support (x3) influence employee performance (Y). However, these factors only explain about 31.9% of the variation in performance. The rest, around 68.1%, is likely influenced by other things like motivation, leadership, and discipline that we didn't include in this model.

Table 3: Summary of ANOVA results

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	17.675	3	5.892	158.434	.000 ^b
	Residual	3.198	86	.037		
	Total	20.873	89			

We ran several regression models to see how employee performance is influenced by work benefits, support from colleagues, and support from managers. All three factors turned out to be major predictors of performance: the overall model was strong, with $F(3, 89) = 158.434$ and a p-value of 0.001, and it explained about 84.1% of the variation ($R^2 = 0.841$). When we included all three variables, they each had a meaningful impact, with p-values less than 0.05. This indicates that our model is reliable, and we can confidently reject the null hypothesis.

Coefficient Table for testing hypotheses

Table 4: Coefficient Table- Testing Hypotheses

Model		Beta	T	Sig.
	WB --->EP	.333	6.085	.001
	CS--->EP	.709	12.248	.001
	MS--->EP	.141	3.100	.003

Hypothesis 1: Work benefits influence employee performance at the Tanzania Institute of Education.

This study looked into how work benefits influence how employees perform at the Tanzania Institute of Education. The findings showed a clear, positive link—when work benefits increase, so does employee performance (Beta = 0.333, P-Value = 0.001). Statistically, this means Hypothesis 1 holds up at a 95% confidence level since the P-Value is below 0.05. To put it simply, raising work benefits by one unit can boost employee performance by about 33.3%. These results match what other research has found and are

backed up by recent studies emphasizing the critical role of good work benefits in boosting employee outcomes. The data supports the idea that work benefits (WB) play a important role in improving employee performance (EP) at the Tanzania Institute of Education. The strong link between WB and EP (Beta = 0.333, P-Value = 0.001) emphasizes how essential benefits are as a motivator. This aligns with earlier research by Kerlinger and Lee (2000), who pointed out that organizational incentives shape how employees behave and perform. Recent studies also show that modern work benefits—like health insurance, flexible work options, and opportunities for professional growth—are key to increasing engagement and productivity. For example, Albrecht et al. (2021) found that comprehensive benefits improve employee engagement, and Jiang et al. (2022) reported that organizations with better benefits see higher retention, satisfaction, and output. These findings suggest that work benefits aren't just motivational tools; they're strategic investments in human resources. The results also reflect findings by Ojokuku and Akanbi (2015), who stressed training, rewards, and incentives as ways to boost morale and competitiveness. More recent research by Deery and Jago (2022) supports this, showing that employees who see their benefits as fair and complete tend to be more committed and perform better. This is especially relevant in public organizations like Tanzania's, where tight budgets limit salary offerings, making non-monetary benefits all the more important for motivation. What's more, the study's insights align with broader research linking employee well-being to performance. For example, Kim and Park (2023) found that benefits like mental health support, wellness programs, and work-life balance initiatives can reduce stress and increase job satisfaction, leading to better performance. Overall, adopting a comprehensive approach to work benefits—addressing both physical and mental health—can considerably improve employee outcomes. For leaders and HR teams at the Tanzania Institute of Education, these results suggest that prioritizing work benefits should be a key part of strategic plans aimed at enhancing performance.

Hypothesis2: Co-worker support influences employee performance at Tanzania Institute of Education.

This study looked into how much co-worker support influences employee performance at this institution. The findings show a clear, positive link—more support from colleagues leads to better performance, with a Beta value of 0.709 and a P-Value of 0.001. Because the P-Value is less than 0.05, we can confidently say this is statistically major, meaning a one-unit increase in support results in about a 70.9% boost in employee performance. These results fit well with existing research and recent studies that emphasize the importance of social support at work for improving outcomes. Specifically, the data suggests that strong peer support (CS) plays a critical role in enhancing employee performance (EP). The high correlation (Beta = 0.709, P-Value = 0.001) emphasizes that coworker support is a key driver in this context. This aligns with previous research, like Kerlinger and Lee (2000), who emphasized how social dynamics influence employee behavior. Recent studies, such as Choi et al. (2022), also show that coworker support strengthens performance by promoting a sense of belonging and reducing stress at work. Employees who feel supported tend to be more engaged, creative, and productive. Likewise, Wang et al. (2023) found that social support at work, especially in team settings, is a major predictor of good performance. The findings also reflect the work of Ariko (2014), who stressed the role of workplace relationships in boosting job satisfaction and effectiveness. Grant and Parker (2023) add that in stressful or demanding environments, coworker support becomes even more critical, helping employees manage emotional and practical challenges. This is especially relevant in education, where teamwork and collaboration are essential for reaching organizational goals. Overall, the study supports

the idea that a supportive work environment — where colleagues help and encourage each other — is key to better performance and employee well-being. For leaders and HR managers at the Tanzania Institute of Education, these results emphasize the importance of promoting a culture of support. Prioritizing coworker support should be part of strategic plans to improve how employees perform and feel at work.

Hypothesis 3: There is a relationship between managerial support and employee performance at the

Tanzania Institute of Education.

The study looked into this and found that managerial support actually had a negative effect on employee performance, which was statistically important (Beta= 0.141, P=0.003). Since the P-value is less than 0.05, we can be 95% confident in this result, meaning that a one-unit increase in managerial support is linked to a 14.1% change in employee performance. The regression analysis gave us a clear equation: the intercept (B0) is 0.402, meaning that even if work benefits, coworker support, and managerial support are all zero, employee performance is still positive. The coefficient for work benefits (B1=0.333) indicates that each additional unit of work benefit boosts employee performance by about 33.3%, assuming other factors stay the same. Interestingly, coworker support (B2=0.709) has a negative association, suggesting that increased coworker support correlates with a 70.9% decrease in performance, which might seem counterintuitive. Managerial support (B3=0.141), on the other hand, is positively related but still negatively impactful overall, increasing performance by 14.1% for each unit rise in managerial support, holding other variables constant. The key finding is that, surprisingly, at the Tanzania Institute of Education, more managerial support appears linked to lower employee performance. This aligns with previous research emphasizing how leadership style and managerial approaches can shape employee behavior and outcomes (Hoy & Tarter, 2011). For example, Muhamed (2016) emphasized that better job satisfaction, often tied to higher performance, plays a important role. The regression model shows that even when all three variables are zero, employee performance remains positive, indicating other factors also matter beyond these variables.

4. Conclusion And Recommendations

Conclusion

This study looked into how job satisfaction affects how well employees perform in the public sector here in Tanzania. We focused on the roles that work benefits, support from colleagues, and support from managers play in employee performance. The findings show that better work benefits are linked to higher performance—specifically, if work benefits improve by one unit, employee performance goes up by about 33.3%. Support from co-workers also has a strong positive effect: every one-unit increase in co-worker support is associated with a 70.9% boost in performance. Interestingly, managerial support seems to have a negative relationship with performance—meaning, when managerial support increases by one unit, employee performance decreases by roughly 14.1%. Overall, these results emphasize the importance of work benefits and peer support but suggest that certain types of managerial support might not always have the desired impact.

Here are some recommendations based on what we found: First, organizations should focus on offering good pay and benefits to boost employee morale and motivation. Second, encouraging a team-oriented culture through open communication and sharing ideas can help colleagues support each other. Third, managers should work on providing regular feedback, recognizing achievements, and offering growth

opportunities to improve overall performance. Fourth, it's important to acknowledge and reward employees for their contributions, which can increase satisfaction and motivation. Lastly, creating a positive work environment that supports well-being and job happiness can make a big difference.

Recommendations

Here are some recommendations based on what we found: First, organizations should focus on offering good pay and benefits to boost employee morale and motivation. Second, encouraging a team-oriented culture through open communication and sharing ideas can help colleagues support each other. Third, managers should work on providing regular feedback, recognizing achievements, and offering growth opportunities to improve overall performance. Fourth, it's important to acknowledge and reward employees for their contributions, which can increase satisfaction and motivation. Lastly, creating a positive work environment that supports well-being and job happiness can make a big difference.

References

1. Albrecht, S. L., Breidahl, E., & Marty, A. (2021). Work benefits and employee engagement: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(3), 345–362.
2. Ariani, A. (2013). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance: A study of bank employees. *Journal of Management and Organization*, 19(2), 141–158.
3. Ariko, P. (2014). Impact of work happiness on employee performance in public service: A study of the commission. Unpublished dissertation.
4. Asghari, S., Ghasemi, R., & Abedi, H. (2017). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance in Iran's insurance companies. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 12(1), 145–156.
5. Borman, W. C., Hanson, M. A., & Hedge, J. W. (2001). *Personnel selection: Theory and application*. McGraw Hill.
6. Buchbinder, S. B. (2011). *Essentials of management*. John Wiley & Sons.
7. Choi, Y., Kim, M., & Lee, J. (2022). The impact of co-worker support on employee performance: The mediating role of workplace belonging. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 43(4), 512–528.
8. Choma, S., & Baruah, S. K. (2014). The impact of work-life balance on job satisfaction and employee performance. *Journal of Management and Marketing Research*, 9(1), 1–12.
9. Deery, M., & Jago, L. (2022). The role of work benefits in employee retention and performance: Evidence from the hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 98, 103–112.
10. Diamantidis, A., & Chatzoglou, P. D. (2018). The role of adaptability and skill flexibility in enhancing employee performance. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 29(1), 144–164.
11. Emilova, E. (2014). Coworker support and job satisfaction: An empirical study in the Bulgarian banking sector. *International Journal of Business and Social Research*, 4(1), 1–11.
12. Gajendran, R. S., Harrison, D. A., & Delaney-Klinger, K. (2023). Flexible work arrangements and employee performance: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(2), 210–225.
13. Grant, A. M., & Parker, S. K. (2023). Social support in the workplace: A review and future directions. *Annual Review of Organizational Psychology and Organizational Behavior*, 10, 1–25.

14. Hair, J. F., Anderson, R. E., Tatham, R. L., & Black, W. C. (2011). *Multivariate data analysis*. Pearson Prentice Hall.
15. Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L., & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Personnel Psychology*, 55(2), 295–317.
16. Hoy, W. K., & Tarter, C. J. (2011). *Organizational leadership: A reader*. Routledge.
17. Jiang, K., Lepak, D. P., Hu, J., & Baer, J. C. (2022). How does human resource management influence organizational outcomes? A meta-analytic investigation of mediating mechanisms. *Academy of Management Journal*, 65(4), 1267–1302.
18. Johnson, S. K., Nguyen, H., & Groth, M. (2022). Workplace conflict and co-worker support: Implications for employee performance. *Journal of Management Studies*, 59(3), 789–812.
19. Katz, D., & Krueger, A. B. (2016). The rise and nature of alternative work arrangements in the United States, 1995–2015. National Bureau of Economic Research.
20. Kerlinger, F. N., & Lee, H. B. (2000). *Foundations of behavioral research: Educational and psychological inquiry*. Thomson Learning.
21. Kim, H., & Lee, S. (2023). Co-worker support and employee well-being: A longitudinal study. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 28(2), 123–137.
22. Kim, S., & Park, S. (2023). Employee well-being and performance: The role of mental health support and wellness programs. *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 28(1), 45–60.
23. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting: A 35-year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57(9), 701–710.
24. Muhamed, M. (2016). The impact of leadership style on job satisfaction and employee performance in the public sector in Tanzania (Master's thesis). Mzumbe University.
25. Ng, T. W., & Feldman, D. C. (2009). Organizational support systems and employee performance: A review of the literature. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 11(2), 147–167.
26. Ngirwa, J. C. (2005). Public sector reform and its impact on employee morale in Tanzania: A study of the Ministry of Health and Social Welfare (Doctoral dissertation). University of Dar es Salaam.
27. Octavianna, A., Rodriguez-Rodriguez, R., & Vargas-Treviño, L. (2017). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance: An analysis of the Spanish hotel industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 61, 131–140.
28. Ojokuku, R. M., & Akanbi, F. K. (2015). Strategic human resource management practices and performance in Nigerian public universities. *Journal of Resources Development and Management*, 10, 221–247.
29. Pallant, J. (2002). *SPSS survival manual: A guide to data analysis using SPSS for Windows (Version 11)*. Allen & Unwin.
30. Podsakoff, P. M., MacKenzie, S. B., & Rich, B. L. (2007). Transformational leadership and follower development: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 92(2), 308–322.
31. Prince, R. A. (2005). Managerial support as a predictor of employee commitment: An examination of the mediating role of job satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 17(1), 31–46.
32. rez, M., & Gati, E. (2004). The effects of job characteristics on motivation: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89(6), 1059–1071.
33. Sajid, M., & Siddiqui, J. (2017). Job satisfaction and employee performance: An empirical study in Pakistani public sector banks. *Journal of Business and Economics Research (JBER)*, 15(5), 1–10.

34. Stankovska-Popova, I., Popovska-Markovska, O., & Stefanoski-Baechevski, D. (2017). The relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance: An empirical study in Macedonian companies. *Economic Studies Journal*, 26(2), 139–154.
35. Taylor, M., & Westover, T. (2011). *Managing human resources in the public sector: An introduction to public human resource management*. Routledge.
36. Wang, Y., Zhang, X., & Li, J. (2023). Workplace social support and employee performance: A meta-analytic review. *Human Resource Management Review*, 33(1), 100–115.
37. Zhang, L., Chen, Y., & Liu, R. (2023). Building co-worker support through team-building and mentorship programs. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 108(3), 456–470.