

Zoltan-Bela FARKAS

Politehnica University Timisoara, Romania

Viorica BAESU

Technical University of Cluj-Napoca, Romania

Anca-Diana POPESCU

Politehnica University Timisoara, Romania

RESEARCH ON HUMAN RESOURCES MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION

Empirical
study

Keywords

Human resources

Motivation

Job satisfaction

JEL Classification

O15

Abstract

Many research studies on the human resources performance of the educational system have proved that pupils/students' educational success depends, to a high degree, on the level of human resource motivation, as well as on their degree of professional satisfaction. Teachers' who show a high level of motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic, invest more into their activity, are more creative and more efficient in problem solving. The paper debates the results of an empirical study regarding the influence of pre-university teachers' motivation and satisfaction regarding the general work conditions on their work performance by measuring the present motivation and satisfaction level. Furthermore, the determinant factors of their satisfaction with the work place are determined and analyzed. Finally, based on the statistical data process we will conclude and debate on the research hypothesis validation and the empirical model related to motivation – satisfaction – performance interdependences.

Introduction

Work or job performance is an essential concept in the organizational psychology literature filed of science, with major implications for human resource management practices. The recruitment and selection process aims to employ people believed that they would perform better at work, compared to the other candidates. Employee assessment process aims to identify their strengths, weaknesses, and then design professional development programs in order to increase work performance. Furthermore, human resources managers use performance data about their employees for their supervision, reward or their motivation. According to (Geller, 2003) he developed an integrated approach on performance. According to them, work performance refers to employee's activities, behaviours, and results that contribute to achieve organizational objective. According to (Kuncel et al., 2004) work performance is the result of several employee behaviours. Furthermore, according to the literature review in the field, several models of the work performance are available (Gittell et al., 2010; Bakker & Bal, 2010; Griffin & Moorhead, 2011; Druskat et al., 2013; Schmidt, 2014).

Many research studies on the human resources performance of the educational system have proved that pupils/students' educational success depends, to a high degree, on the level of human resource motivation, as well as on their degree of professional satisfaction (Francis et al., 2010; Jonsson & Rudolphi, 2011; Allen & Burgess, 2013). Teachers' who show a high level of motivation, both intrinsic and extrinsic, invest more into their activity, are more creative and more efficient in educational problem solving (Eyal & Roth, 2011; Rzejak et al., 2014).

In this context, the article will debate the results of an empirical study regarding the link between the pre-university (secondary education) teachers' motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic), and their satisfaction

regarding the general work conditions influence on their work performance by measuring the present motivation and satisfaction level. Furthermore, the determinant factors of teachers' satisfaction with the work place will be determined and analyzed. Finally, based on the statistical data process we will conclude and debate on the research hypothesis validation and the empirical model related to motivation – satisfaction – performance interdependences.

1. Design Research Methodology

This research aims to investigate the influence of pre-university teachers' motivation and satisfaction at work and their work performance. Thus, there have been identified several research questions which can be assimilated to a research questionnaire. First, the research focuses on measuring the teachers' present level of motivation and satisfaction and the factors determining their satisfaction at the work place. Secondly, the research focuses to identify the satisfaction effects at the work place and the motivation level, respectively the level of collective efficiency on human resources work performance. Thirdly, the research aim is to investigate the potential moderating effects on various analyzed relationships. The questions used for the design of the empirical model and also, for the research hypothesis formulation are shown in Table 1.

Management literature review led to the elaboration of some research hypotheses which target the causal connection between different constructs included in the conceptual model used in the present research (Figure 1). The proposed research hypotheses have been established to test the various variables interdependencies that were considered into the conceptual model which might influence satisfaction at the work place, on group and individual performance and on their intention to move to a different work place. Furthermore, these research hypotheses

have been developed to test the validity of the conceptual model proposed in the present study, in the context of pre-university educational system in Romania. Thus, there has been defined a number of 9 research hypotheses which target the connections assessment existing between the professional satisfaction exogenous variables at the work place (organization - employee compatibility, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, the collective efficacy), the construct satisfaction at the work place and the resulted variables (individual and group performance and the intention to change job).

The proposed methodology used in this research consists of the following steps: (1) operationalization of constructs included in the conceptual model and development of the measurement scales; (2) sampling settings and (3) the statistical data analysis plan design.

1.1. Operationalization of Constructs

To measure the employee - organization compatibility we use the approach and tools mention by (Bright, 2008), (Garavan, 2007), and that are all defined in the context of *auxiliary approach* (employee possesses similar attributes like the organization and the other employees). The employee - organization compatibility construct operationalization was defined by 5 items. For the purpose of this research, to operationalize the intrinsic motivation construct we have studied the approaches of (Ryan & Deci, 2000), (Karatepe & Tekinkus, 2006) and we considered the work commitment as a marker of intrinsic motivation, by adjusting certain items of the scale proposed by (Klassen et al. 2012). We also, took into account the research carried out by (Watt et al., 2012) regarding the influence factors in choosing a career in the education field, by considering social value motivational factors as intrinsic factors. The intrinsic motivation construct was defined by 7 items and the extrinsic

and motivation construct was defined by 6 items.

For the purpose of this research, we adapted to measure the collective efficacy construct using a seven-item scale as proposed by Skaalvik and Skaalvik (2007), thus also obtaining a single dimension of the construct. The operationalization of the collective efficacy construct was measured with 7 items.

Professional satisfaction construct assessment was based on the preliminary study of three scales: (1) Overall Job Satisfaction Scale (OJS) with 18 items developed by Brayfield and Rothe (1951) and debated in (Schleicher et al., 2004); (2) Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire (MSQ) developed by Weiss, Dawis and England (1967) and that evaluate cognitive aspects of the work; (3) Job Diagnostic Survey (JDS) developed by Hackman and Oldham (1974). Other important studies in the field of job satisfaction have been considered for the operationalization (Crossman & Abou-Zaki, 2003; Brief & Weiss, 2002; Schleicher et al., 2004; Bright, 2008). The operationalization of the employee's professional satisfaction construct was measured with 25 proposed items.

Based on the relevant reference review there have been operationalized the concept related to the employee's intention to change job (move to a different job and/or organization) (Chang, 1999; Sjöberg & Sverke, 2001; Chiu & Francesco, 2003; Cole & Bruch, 2006; Schyns et al., 2007). In the present research we adopt the approach of Schyns et al. (2007) for the construct operationalization because above mentioned approach allows a more comprehensive measurement. The operationalized concept related to the employee's intention to change job was measured with 3 proposed items.

For the job performance concept operationalization we use the self-evaluation process of each teacher in order to characterize the self-perception about his/her own performance as shown in

previous studies as (Campbell, 1990; Geller, 2003). This assessment was done using the self-evaluation sheet designed by the Romanian Ministry of Education and included in the annual evaluation methodology of teaching staff (<http://www.fsli.ro/metodologii/Anexa%20OMECTS%206143.pdf>). The construct operationalization includes six evaluation dimensions (fields) and totally 31 items.

1.2. Sample Settings. Data collection

Relations between the constructs included in the conceptual model of the present research were investigated in various contexts and cultures (countries) according to the mentioned references. In order to demonstrate the general validity of the constructs and of the scales used for their operationalization, we aim to investigate and validate them in the pre-university educational system in Romania. In the present research, the investigated statistical population is defined as the total number of Romanian pre-university education units (schools); regarding the sample subjects, they will be any teacher that works in the school level mentioned above. The considered research variables are teachers': age, gender, seniority or his/her education status within the institution analyzed.

Since the sampling techniques vary in relation with the accuracy and reliability (Malhorta et al., 1996) states there is recommended to use several sampling techniques. Based on this argument, in this research we use two non-probability sampling techniques: convenience sampling (based on a list with teachers' contacts known by the authors) and sampling type "snowball" (the preliminary list with teachers' contacts will be extend using their contacts lists and so on).

As a data collection method in this research we use the survey based on a questionnaire (quantitative research). The adopted method allow: (1) the possibility to generalize the results obtained in the sample, (2) ease of questionnaire

administration, (3) high level of adequacy in terms of statistical analysis, and (4) the ability to capture/intercept "non-observed" aspects.

The data (fill-up questionnaires) were collected from March to September 2013 using: the on-line questionnaire available on the Google Drive platform (<http://goo.gl/ZzLX3>) and e-mail distribution; face-to-face interview. In totally, there were contacted 500 teachers and the respond rate was 31% (158 questionnaire were processed), but some questionnaires have been not validated in some parts of them (for some variables, the number of responses considered in the statistical analysis was less than 158).

1.3. The Statistical Data Analysis Plan

The statistical analysis plan includes: validation of the data source and of the missing data, the establishment of the statistical methods used for the empirical model generation, the population analysis together with the demography analysis of the responds given.

The research results include: the descriptive analysis for the sample considered; the results of the proposed model constructs; the research hypothesis testing; the analysis of the responds delivered by each group of respondents (according to the established sample settings).

For the purpose of this article, we shall present only the research results regarding the H1 to H9 hypothesis testing that will define the empirical research model.

Research hypothesis testing is the primary objective of the data analysis process and of the entire research. In order to test the established hypothesis, in the earlier stages of the data analysis process, the variables observed in the case of the sample subjects (related to motivation – satisfaction – performance interdependences) were aggregated in constructs (latent variables). Testing research hypotheses included in the proposed conceptual model was performed using SPSS computer program

by using the statistical tool simple and multiple linear regression (if applicable).

2. Research Results. The Empirical Model

H1 was confirmed as there is a significant statistical relation between the compatibility employee - organization and the workplace satisfaction of employees and between compatibility employee - organization and the three dimensions of satisfaction within the workplace (level value the significance being 0.000 for all the analyzed relations). Furthermore, it can be seen that the nature of these relations are positive because the standardized coefficient of the regression function values are positive for each relation separately (Table 3). It is noted that based on the results of the estimated regression four functions, with an average accuracy level of the dependent variables (R values are between 0.435 and 0.655) that the compatibility employee - organization is a primary predictor of satisfaction within the workplace (both the overall size and level). The determination coefficient R^2 values shown that: (1) 42.90% of the variance in satisfaction within the workplace is caused by the variant employee - organization compatibility; (2) 40.10% of the variance related to job characteristics satisfaction is generated by employee - organization variance compatibility; (3) 19.40% of the variance in cognitive satisfaction is caused by various employee - organization compatibility and (4) 18.90% of the variance in satisfaction with the work conditions is caused by various compatibility employee - organization.

H2 hypothesis has been partially confirmed (Table 4). There have been underlined only a statistically significant relation between the intrinsic motivation and workplace satisfaction ($p = 0.000$). Following this analysis, we considered that the relationship between extrinsic motivation and workplace satisfaction is not statistically significant because the significance level ($p = 0.056$) slightly

exceeds the threshold of 0.05. Based on the research results presented in Table 4 there can be concluded: (1) estimated regression function predicts with an average accuracy ($R = 0.451$), the level of workplace satisfaction; (2) 20.40% of the dependent variable variance (workplace satisfaction) is generated by the independent variable variance (such as intrinsic and extrinsic motivation). In addition, Table 4 shows that the only statistically significant relation is between intrinsic motivation and satisfaction with job characteristics ($p = 0.000$). The nature of the relationship between these two variables is positive ($r = 0.415$, Table 4). Thus, increasing the intrinsic motivation will increase the level of satisfaction with job characteristics. Based on the research results presented in Table 4 there can be concluded: (1) estimated regression function predicts average accuracy ($R = 0.439$) the satisfaction by workplace characteristics; (2) 19.30% of the variance in satisfaction by workplace characteristics is likely caused by the variance of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation.

The research results presented in Table 4 show a statistically significant relation between intrinsic motivation and cognitive satisfaction ($r = 0.219$ at a significance level $p = 0.309$). Otherwise, with increasing intrinsic motivation will increase the cognitive satisfaction level. The estimated regression function predicts a low accuracy ($R = 0.166$) of the cognitive satisfaction related to the workplace; only 2.70% of the cognitive satisfaction variance is determinate by the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations variance.

From Table 4 it is observed that there is a statistically significant relation between the intrinsic motivation and emotional satisfaction, and also, between extrinsic motivations and emotional satisfaction ($p = 0.000$, for both relations). The relationship between intrinsic motivation and emotional satisfaction is positive ($r = 0.653$), which means that an increase in

intrinsic motivation will increase the level of emotional satisfaction. Regarding the nature of the relationship between extrinsic motivations and emotional satisfaction, it is negative ($r = -0.346$), emotional satisfaction are negatively affected by extrinsic motivations increasing.

H3 hypothesis has been confirmed by the research results because there is a significant statistically relation between the collective efficacy and the employees' satisfaction within the workplace and its characteristics, the cognitive satisfaction and emotional satisfaction ($p = 0.000$ for all dependencies analyzed). Furthermore, it can be seen that the nature of these dependencies are positive because the standardized coefficient of the regression function values are all positive (Table 5). There have been observed that collective efficacy is a strong predictor of employees' workplace satisfaction (at both the whole and the dimensions of the construct) (correlation coefficient R values between 0.464 and 0.687).

By analyzing the determination coefficient R^2 there have been conclude that: (1) 47.40% of the workplace satisfaction variance is caused by the collective efficacy variance; (2) 33.20% of the workplace characteristics satisfaction variance is generated by the collective efficacy variables; (3) 30.20% of the cognitive satisfaction variance is generated by the collective efficacy variance, and (4) 21.60% of the emotional satisfaction variance is generated by collective efficacy variance.

H4 hypothesis is confirmed as both the relation between collective efficacy and workplace performance and the relationships between collective efficacy and the six dimensions of workplace performance are statistically significant ($p = 0.000$ for each investigated links). In addition, it can be seen that the nature of these links are positive because the standardized coefficient of the regression function values are positive for each link (Table 6). The collective efficacy is a

strong predictor of the workplace performance, both overall and at each level of the six performance dimensions, we considered in the research model (R between 0.321 and 0.516). Analyzing the determination coefficient R^2 there have been conclude that: (1) 26.70% of the workplace performance variance is caused by collective efficacy variance; (2) 22.30% of the performance - design activities variance is generated by collective efficacy variance; (3) 19% of the performance - activities development variance is caused by collective efficacy variance; (4) 10.30% of the performance - pupils achievements evaluation variance is generated by collective efficacy variance; (5) 21.80% of the performance - classroom management variance is generated by collective efficacy variance, (6) 16.80% of the performance - professional development and leadership variance is generated by collective efficacy variance; (7) 10.30% of the performance - school development and promotion variance is generated by the institution collective efficacy variance (Table 6).

H5 has been partially confirmed. From Table 7 it can be observed the statistically significant relation between intrinsic motivation and workplace performance ($p = 0.000$). Regarding the nature of the relationship between these two variables, there can be seen from Table 7 that it is positive and strong one ($r = 0.594$). Thus, increasing the intrinsic motivation will increase the level of workplace performance. On the basis of other factors listed in Table 7 we can draw two conclusions: (1) the two types of motivations are strong predictors of performance on the job, the estimated multiple regression function accurately predicting high enough level of workplace performance ($R = 0.538$); (2) 28.90% of the dependent variable variance (workplace performance) is generated by the variance of the independent variable (such as intrinsic and extrinsic motivations). Furthermore, the coefficients calculations presented in Table 7 show the

only statistically significant relation is between intrinsic motivation and performance related to activities design ($p = 0.000$). The relationship between the two variables is positive ($r = 0.499$), which means that an increase in intrinsic motivation will increase the performance indicator level for activities design. In addition, the predictive value estimated for the regression function is an average one ($R = 0.418$), while 17.50% of the performance related to activities design variance is determined by the variance of the independent variable (such as the intrinsic and extrinsic motivations).

The statistical analysis results in Table 7 show that only a statistically significant relation is between intrinsic motivation and performance related to activities development variable ($p = 0.000$). The relationship between these two variables is positive and strong ($r = 0.739$ which means that an increase in intrinsic motivation will increase the performance indicator level for activities development. Moreover, the predictive value of the estimated regression function is quite high ($R = 0.682$), while 46.50% of the performance related to activities development variance is determined by the independent variable variance (such as intrinsic and extrinsic motivations).

Statistical coefficients calculations results in Table 7 show that there is a statistically significant relation between both motivations indicators (intrinsic and extrinsic) and performance related to pupils' achievements evaluation (p values are below 0.05). The relationship between intrinsic motivation and evaluation of pupils achievement is positive ($r = 0.508$), which means that an increase in intrinsic motivation will increase the performance related to pupils' achievements evaluation. Regarding the nature of the relationship between extrinsic motivation and performance related to pupils' achievements evaluation, it is negative ($r = -0.258$).

Table 7 show that there is a statistically significant relation only between the intrinsic motivation and performance related to the classroom management ($p = 0.000$). The relationship between these two variables is positive ($r = 0.556$), which means that an increase in intrinsic motivation will increase the performance level related to the classroom management. In addition, intrinsic motivation is a strong predictor of performance in the classroom management ($R = 0.543$), while 29.50% of the variance in classroom management variable is determined by the variance of the independent variable (intrinsic and extrinsic motivations).

In the case of the dependent variable performance related to the professional development and leadership (Table 7) there have been shown that there is only one statistically significant relationship with the intrinsic motivation ($p = 0.012$). The relationship between the two variables is positive ($r = 0.257$), which means that an increase in intrinsic motivation will increase the performance indicator level related to professional development and leadership. Hence, motivation is a relatively poor predictor of performance related to professional development and leadership ($R = 0.310$), while only 9.60% of the variance in professional development and leadership variable is determined by the variance of the independent variable (intrinsic and extrinsic motivation).

In the case of the dependent variable performance related to the school development and promotion (Table 7) there have been shown only one statistically significant relationship with the intrinsic motivation ($p = 0.014$). The relationship between these two variables is positive ($r = 0.257$), which means that an increase in intrinsic motivation will increase the level of performance indicator related to the school development and promotion. In addition, motivation is a poor predictor of performance related to the school development and promotion (R

= 0.254) while only 6.50% of the dependent variable variance is determined by the variance of the independent variable (intrinsic and extrinsic motivation).

The statistical analysis partially confirmed **H6** hypothesis. From Table 8 it is shown that the only statistically significant relationship is between intrinsic motivation and the intention to change the job ($p = 0.007$). The nature of the relationship between these two variables is negative ($\beta = -0.292$); increasing the intrinsic motivation will lead to a reduction of the teaching staff intention to change jobs. Based on other factors listed in Table 8 we can draw two conclusions: (1) the two types of motivation are poor predictors of the teaching staff intention to change their jobs ($R = 0.220$); (2) only 4.90% of the dependent variable variance (intention to change job) is generated by the variance of the independent variable (intrinsic and extrinsic motivation).

Hypothesis **H7** has been confirmed because the link between workplace satisfaction and workplace performance is statistically significant ($p = 0.000$) as data in Table 9 have shown. In addition, it can be seen that the nature of this relationship is positive because the standardized coefficient regression function shows a positive ($\beta = 0.636$). Therefore, the increase of workplace satisfaction will increase work performance and vice versa. Looking at the other two coefficients shown in Table 9 we have drawn two conclusions: (1) workplace satisfaction is a strong predictor of work performance ($R = 0.636$); (2) 40.40% of the variance in work performance is caused by workplace satisfaction variance.

Based on this research hypothesis, we have analyzed the relation of the workplace satisfaction dimensions with the work (Table 9a). There are two statistically significant relations, namely that between satisfaction with workplace characteristics and work performance ($p = 0.000$) and between emotional satisfaction and work performance ($p = 0.000$); both connections

are positive ($\beta = 0.374$, $\beta = 0.456$, respectively), which means that an increase in satisfaction with job characteristics, and an increase of emotional satisfaction will increase the level of work performance. The relation between the cognitive satisfaction and work performance is no statistically significant ($p = 0,873$). Furthermore, there have been observed that the three dimensions of workplace satisfaction are strong predictors of work performance on the job ($R = 0.698$), while 48.80% of the variance in job performance is determined by the variance of the independent variable (satisfaction with job characteristics, satisfaction of cognitive and emotional satisfaction).

The sub-hypothesis related to workplace satisfaction and the six dimensions of work performance are confirmed ($p = 0.000$ for all the relationships). In addition, it can be seen that the nature of these relations are positive because the standardized coefficient of the regression function values are positive for each relationship separately (Table 9a). Analyzing other statistical coefficients presented in Table 9a, there has been concluded that workplace satisfaction is a reasonable predictor for at least six dimensions of work performance (even strong performance in the design activities), the correlation coefficient R taking values between 0.430 and 0.611. Foreword, there have been underlined that: (a) 37.40% of the variable performance - design activities variance is influenced by the workplace satisfaction variance, (b) 29.50% of the variable performance - activities development variance is generated by workplace satisfaction variance, (c) 18.50% of the variable performance - evaluating pupils achievements variance is generated by workplace satisfaction, (d) 26.80% of the variable performance -classroom management is generated by the workplace satisfaction variance, (e) 23.80% of the variable performance - professional

development and leadership variance is generated by workplace satisfaction variance (f) 19% of the variable performance –school development and promoting variance is generated by workplace satisfaction variance.

In the last part of Table 9a there are shown the statistical coefficient that characterized the relations between the different dimensions of workplace satisfaction and performance related to activities design. We note that two of the three relations are statistically significant (significance level value being 0.000 for the satisfaction with the workplace characteristics and emotional satisfaction, in relation with performance – activity design). Both connections are positive ($\beta = 0.319$, $\beta = 0.377$ respectively), which means that an increase in satisfaction with workplace characteristics and an increase of emotional satisfaction level will increase performance indicator - activities design. In addition, we note that the three satisfaction dimensions are considered strong predictors of performance -activities design ($R = 0.636$), while 40.40% of the variable activities design variance is determined by the variance of the three dimensions of satisfaction.

The statistical data process in the case of H7 hypothesis continue with the analysis of the relation between the three dimensions of satisfaction and the performance related to activities development. In this case, research results in Table 9b have shown that all relations are statistically significant (significance level values are below 0.05). Regarding the nature of the links, it appears that two of them are positive and one is negative. Therefore, an increase in satisfaction with job characteristics, namely an increase in emotional satisfaction will increase the performance indicator level for activities development ($\beta = 0.414$, $\beta = 0.435$, respectively), while increasing cognitive satisfaction leads to a decrease in the performance indicator level for activities development ($\beta = -0.155$). In addition, the

three dimensions of satisfaction are considered strong predictors of performance in the design activities ($R = 0.661$), while 43.70 % of the variable performance - activities development variance is determined by the variance of the three dimensions of satisfaction.

According to the established research model there have been analyzed the relations between the three dimensions of satisfaction and performance related to pupils' achievements evaluation. The statistical coefficient calculations presented in Table 9b have shown that the only statistically significant relation is between the emotional satisfaction and performance related to pupils' achievements evaluation ($p = 0.000$). The relationship between the two variables is positive ($\beta = 0.534$), which means that an increase in emotional satisfaction will increase the performance indicator level related to pupils' achievements evaluation. We note that the three dimensions of satisfaction are considered strong predictors of performance related to pupils' achievements evaluation ($R = 0.581$), while 33.80% of the variance in pupils' achievements evaluation variable is determined by the variance of the three dimensions of satisfaction.

Forward, we have analyzed also, the relations between the three dimensions of satisfaction and performance related to the classroom management. Table 9b presents the statistical coefficients. We have observed that two of the three investigated dependencies are statistically significant (significance level value being 0.000 for the satisfaction with job characteristics and classroom management and between emotional satisfaction and classroom management). Both relations are positive ($\beta = 0.339$, $\beta = 0.303$, respectively), which means that an increase in satisfaction with job characteristics and an increase of emotional satisfaction will increase the performance level related to the classroom management. In addition, we noted that the three dimensions of satisfaction are

considered strong predictor of performance related to the classroom management ($R = 0.552$) while 30.50% of the performance variance related to the classroom management variable is determined by variance of the three dimensions of satisfaction.

The statistical analysis continues with the characterization of the dependencies between satisfaction dimensions and the performance variable related to professional development and leadership. As it can be seen in Table 9b, only two of the three investigated links are statistically significant, namely that between satisfaction - workplace characteristics and performance related to professional development and leadership ($p = 0.000$) and between emotional satisfaction and performance related to professional development and leadership ($p = 0.002$). Both relations are positive ($\beta = 0.333$, $\beta = 0.249$, respectively), which means that an increase in satisfaction with workplace characteristics and in emotional satisfaction will increase the performance indicator level related to professional development and leadership. In addition, the three dimensions of satisfaction are considered strong predictors of performance related to professional development and leadership ($R = 0.513$), while only 26.30% of the variance of professional development and leadership variable is determined the variance of the three dimensions of satisfaction.

The last dependencies that were analyzed were between the satisfaction dimensions and the performance variable related to school development and promotion. The statistical coefficients presented in Table 9b have shown that only two of the three investigated dependencies are statistically significant, namely that between satisfaction with job characteristics and the performance related to the school development and promotion ($p = 0.014$) and between emotional satisfaction and performance related to the school development and promotion ($p = 0.000$).

Both relations are positive ($\beta = 0.215$, $\beta = 0.297$, respectively), which means that an increase in satisfaction with job characteristics, namely an increase in emotional satisfaction will increase the performance related to the school development and promotion. In addition, the three satisfaction dimensions are considered predictors of average performance in the case of school development and promotion ($R = 0.460$), while only 21.20 % of the variable performance related to the school development and promotion variance is determined by the variance of the three dimensions of satisfaction.

H8 hypothesis was rejected because between the newly created variable (the interaction between workplace satisfaction and seniority) and the dependent variable (work performance), there is little statistically significant ($p = 0.911$) (Table 10). The antecedent variable (workplace satisfaction) has a positive influence and it is statistically significant with work performance variable ($\beta = 0.643$, $p = 0.000$), fact revealed also, by the H7 hypothesis test. Between the moderator variable (seniority) and the dependent variable (work performance) there is a statistically insignificant relationship ($p = 0.626$).

The statistical analysis partially confirmed **H9** hypothesis. More specifically, workplace satisfaction is a predictor with high enough value for the intention to change jobs ($R = 0.551$) and 30.4% of the variance in the dependent variable is generated by the independent variable ($R^2 = 0.304$). In addition, analyzing the standardized coefficient of the regression function ($\beta = -0.551$), and the level of significance ($p = 0.000$) values we conclude that the relationship between workplace satisfaction and the intention to change jobs is negative (Table 11). Regarding the link between the three dimensions of workplace satisfaction and the intention to change jobs we have seen that only two of the three dimensions have

significant influence on the intention to change location employment. Thus, the link between cognitive satisfaction and the intention to change jobs is negative ($\beta = -0.200$) and statistically significant ($p = 0.008$). In addition, the link between emotional satisfaction and intention to change jobs is negative ($\beta = -0.479$) and statistically significant ($p = 0.000$). Regarding the link between satisfaction with the workplace characteristics and the intention to change jobs, from Table 11 it is seen that it is statistically insignificant ($p = 0.426$). However, whether this link should be statistically significant, its nature would be negative ($\beta = -0.064$). Based on the other two factors shown in Table 11 we can conclude that satisfaction with work by its size is a predictor of high value for the intention of changing jobs ($R = 0.606$) and 36.70% of the variance in the dependent variable (intention to change jobs) is generated by the variance of the three dimensions of workplace satisfaction.

3. Conclusions

Based on the considerations outlined in this article we intend to measure the work performance in the case of teachers from the secondary education schools in Romania (mainly the research sample consists teachers from schools located in the West Region). In order to attend the research objective there have been define and implemented a survey based on a questionnaire. Teachers, analyzing the perception of their own performance to work, did the work performance measurement through a process of self-evaluation (using the deigned questionnaire).

The proposed research design methodology was inspired by the view expressed by Brief and Weiss (2002) and empirical approach of Schleicher et al. (2004), under which the job satisfaction refers to a cognitive evaluation of employment and position held, lived affective experiences at work and beliefs

related to work. The presented research results (together with the research hypothesis) have confirmed that the employee - organization compatibility, significantly influences workplace satisfaction. The employee-organization compatibility has been considered as a one-dimension construct that refers to the existence of a mechanism for matching the individual employee's values and the organizational, employer values of the (Bright, 2008; Christensen and Wright, 2011). The research results have underlined the conclusion that an increase in employee - organization compatibility will increase the satisfaction level related to workplace, with effects on satisfaction with job characteristics, and also, on cognitive and emotional satisfaction.

Another important research result was the identification of a statistically significant relation between both collective efficacy and satisfaction with the work of the teachers, and between collective efficacy and the three satisfaction dimensions. This result is consistent with the research studies of Klassen et al. (2010), Walumbwa et al. (2004) and Caprara et al. (2003). Overall, the presented research conclusion conducted with the teachers of secondary education is that collective efficacy is an antecedent of teachers' work satisfaction, and this influence is positive. Furthermore, during this article there have been investigated the relationship between the motivation factors (intrinsic and extrinsic) and the teachers satisfaction level. Following the analysis done there have been revealed that intrinsic motivation has a direct and significant influence on overall satisfaction (both to work and on its dimensions). This influence is positive which means that an increase of the intrinsic motivation level will increase the level of the workplace satisfaction. This result is consistent with research conducted by Karatepe and Tekinkus (2006), according to which intrinsic motivation is an antecedent of work satisfaction. Regarding the influence

of extrinsic motivation on work satisfaction and its three dimensions there has been identified a significant relationship only between extrinsic motivations and emotional satisfaction.

The analysis performed allows us providing an answer to the question: *What kind of motivation has a greater influence on emotional satisfaction?* Thus, the link between motivations and emotional satisfaction is positive which means that an increase in intrinsic motivation will increase the level of emotional satisfaction. Regarding the nature of the relationship between extrinsic motivations and emotional satisfaction, it is a negative one, because emotional satisfaction is negatively affected by increasing extrinsic motivations. The results can be explained by the fact that such extrinsic motivation requires tangible or verbal rewards nature and therefore not of itself, but rather is activated by these rewards. As opposed to this, intrinsic motivation does not need any incentive to behave.

In conclusion, we believe that in the case of the secondary educational system in Romania, the variables forming extrinsic motivation (elements of the remuneration system) can be less influenced and so, they do not have influence in gaining work satisfaction. In addition, we can say that being a teacher is passion, due to the existence of a sense of self-fulfilment and not for material rewards type or due to constraints. Moreover, increasing teachers concerns on the remuneration system and working conditions has as effect the reduced level of emotional satisfaction, and the diminishing of the work passion, interest, and pleasure felt because of the teaching work.

The research results are important for researchers, schools managers, and schools inspectorates that should focus on their quest to increase performance and decrease teacher intention to change their jobs. One of the most important results of the research is that the existence of a high level of satisfaction of teachers towards

work has two key consequences: increase the level of work performance and reduce their intention to change jobs.

4. Research Limits and Future Research Recommendation

One of the main limitations of this research is related to the sampling techniques used in the research (convenience sampling and sampling type "snowball") are part of non-probability sampling techniques. In addition, another limitation of this research is the small sample size used to test the validity of the proposed conceptual model (157 respondents). Therefore, future research that will address the subject of work performance of teachers must find financial resources and time to use probability-sampling techniques and to provide a large enough sample size so, that the results obtained can be generalized to the entire population statistics investigated.

References

- [1] Allen, R., & Burgess, S. (2013). Evaluating the provision of school performance information for school choice. *Economics of Education Review*, 34, 175-190.
- [2] Bakker, A. B., & Bal, M. P. (2010). Weekly work engagement and performance: A study among starting teachers. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 83(1), 189-206.
- [3] Brief, A. P., & Weiss, H. M. (2002). Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual review of psychology*, 53(1), 279-307.
- [4] Bright, L. (2008). Does Public Service Motivation Really Make a Difference on the Job Satisfaction and Turnover Intentions of Public Employees? *The American Review of Public Administration*, Vol. 38, Nr. 2, pp. 149-166.
- [5] Campbell, J. P., McHenry, J. J., & Wise, L.L. (1990). Modeling job performance in a population of jobs. *Personal Psychology*, Vol. 43, pp. 313-333.
- [6] Caprara, G. V., Barbaranelli, C., Borgogni, L., & Steca, P. (2003). Efficacy Beliefs as Determinants of Teachers' Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 95, Nr. 4, pp. 821-832.
- [7] Chang, E. (1999). Career commitment as a complex moderator of organizational commitment and turnover intention. *Human Relations*, Vol. 52, Nr. 10, pp. 1257-1278.

- [8] Chiu, R. K., & Francesco, A. M. (2003). Dispositional traits and turnover intention: Examining the mediating role of job satisfaction and affective commitment. *International Journal of Manpower*, 24(3), 284-298.
- [9] Christensen, R. K., & Wright, B. E. (2011). The effects of public service motivation on job choice decisions: Disentangling the contributions of person-organization fit and person-job fit. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, Vol 21, Nr. 4, pp. 723-743.
- [10] Cole, M. S., & Bruch, H. (2006). Organizational identity strength, identification, and commitment and their relationships to turnover intention: does organizational hierarchy matter? *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 27, Nr. 5, pp. 585-605
- [11] Crossman, A., & Abou-Zaki, B. (2003). Job satisfaction and employee performance of Lebanese banking staff. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 18, Nr. 4, pp. 368-376.
- [12] Druskat, V. U., Mount, G., & Sala, F. (Eds.). (2013). *Linking emotional intelligence and performance at work: Current research evidence with individuals and groups*. Psychology Press.
- [13] Eyal, O., & Roth, G. (2011). Principals' leadership and teachers' motivation: Self-determination theory analysis. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 49(3), 256-275.
- [14] Francis, B., Skelton, C., & Read, B. (2010). The simultaneous production of educational achievement and popularity: How do some pupils accomplish it? *British Educational Research Journal*, 36(2), 317-340.
- [15] Garavan, T. N. (2007). Using assessment centre performance to predict subjective person-organisation (PO) fit: A longitudinal study of graduates. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 22, nr. 2, pp. 150-167.
- [16] Geller, E. S. (2003). Organizational behavior management and industrial/organizational psychology: Achieving synergy by valuing differences. *Journal of Organizational Behavior Management*, 22(2), 111-130.
- [17] Gittell, J. H., Seidner, R., & Wimbush, J. (2010). A relational model of how high-performance work systems work. *Organization Science*, 21(2), 490-506.
- [18] Griffin, R., & Moorhead, G. (2011). *Organizational behavior*. Cengage Learning.
- [19] Jonsson, J. O., & Rudolphi, F. (2011). Weak performance - strong determination: school achievement and educational choice among children of immigrants in Sweden. *European Sociological Review*, 27(4), 487-508.
- [20] Karatepe, O.M., & Tekinkus, M. (2006). The effects of work-family, conflict, emotional exhaustion, and intrinsic motivation on job outcomes of front-line employees, *International Journal of Bank Marketing*, Vol. 24, Nr. 3, pp. 173-193.
- [21] Klassen, R.M., Usher, E.L., & Bong, M., (2010). Teachers' Collective Efficacy, Job Satisfaction, and Job Stress in Cross-Cultural Context. *The Journal of Experimental Education*, Vol 78, Nr. 4, pp. 464-486.
- [22] Kuncel, N.R., Hezlett, S.A., & Ones, D. S. (2004). Academic Performance, Career Potential, Creativity, and Job Performance: Can One Construct Predict Them All?. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, Vol. 84, Nr. 1, pp. 148-161.
- [23] Malhorta, N.K., Agarwal, J., & Peterson, M. (1996). Methodological issues in cross-cultural marketing research. A state-of-the-art-review. *International Marketing Review*, Vol. 13, Nr. 5, pp. 7-43.
- [24] Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L., (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, Vol. 25, Nr. 1, pp. 54-67.
- [25] Rzejak, D., Künsting, J., Lipowsky, F., Fischer, E., Dezhgahi, U., & Reichardt, A. (2014). Facets of teachers' motivation for professional development—Results of a factorial analysis. *Journal for Educational Research Online/Journal für Bildungsforschung Online*, 6(1), 139-159.
- [26] Schleicher, D. J., Watt, J. D., & Greguras, G. J. (2004). Reexamining the job satisfaction-performance relationship: the complexity of attitudes. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, Vol. 89, Nr. 1, pp. 165-177.
- [27] Schmidt, F. L. (2014). A General Theoretical Integrative Model of Individual Differences in Interests, Abilities, Personality Traits, and Academic and Occupational Achievement A Commentary on Four Recent Articles. *Perspectives on Psychological Science*, 9(2), 211-218.
- [28] Schyns, B., Torka, N., & Gössling, T. (2007). Turnover intention and preparedness for change: Exploring leader-member exchange and occupational self-efficacy as antecedents of two employability predictors. *Career Development International*, Vol. 12, Nr. 7, pp. 660-679.
- [29] Sjöberg, A. & Sverke, M. (2001). The interactive effect of job involvement and organizational commitment on job turnover revisited: A note on the mediating role of turnover intention. *Scandinavian Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 41, Nr. 3, pp. 247-252.
- [30] Skaalvik, E. M., & Skaalvik, S. (2007). Dimensions of teacher self-efficacy and relations with strain factors, perceived collective teacher efficacy, and teacher burnout. *Journal of Educational Psychology*, Vol. 99, pp. 611-625.

[31] Walumbwa, F. O., Avolio, B. J., Gardner, W. L., Wernsing, T. S., & Peterson, S. J. (2008). Authentic Leadership: Development and Validation of a Theory-Based Measure. *Journal of management*, 34(1), 89-126.

[32] Watt, H. M., Richardson, P. W., Klusmann, U., Kunter, M., Beyer, B., Trautwein, U., & Baumert, J. (2012). Motivations for choosing teaching as a career: An international comparison using the FIT-Choice scale. *Teaching and teacher education*, 28(6), 791-805.

Appendices

Table 1.

Questions Used in the First and Second Phases of the Research (support the research hypothesis)

First phase of the research

1. What is the teachers' present level of motivation, both intrinsic (achievements, results obtained) and extrinsic (salary, social prestige)?
2. What is the present level of satisfaction at the work place, analyzing both global satisfaction with work place and economic satisfaction (related to remuneration system) and non-economic (related to work place safety, social position, and professional development opportunities)?
3. What is the influence of motivational factors on the satisfaction employees' level? Does intrinsic motivation have a greater impact on satisfaction, compared to extrinsic motivation?
4. The satisfaction level at the work place according to the teachers' status (permanent personnel or substitute personnel)?
5. What are the effects of the "employee - organization compatibility" on the satisfaction teachers' level?
6. What is the effect of teachers' collective efficiency on their satisfaction at the work place?
7. What is the influence of motivational factors on the satisfaction employees' level? Does intrinsic motivation have a greater impact on satisfaction, compared to extrinsic motivation?
8. The level of satisfaction at the work place is different according to the teachers' status (permanent personnel or substitute personnel)?
9. What are the effects of the "employee - organization compatibility" on the satisfaction teachers'?
10. What is the effect of teachers' collective efficiency on their satisfaction at the work place?

Second phase of the research

1. What is the influence of the motivation level on the perception of our own performance at the work place? And on the intention of quitting the job?
2. An increasing satisfaction level will have a direct effect on working performance, respectively the decrease of the intention to quit the job?
3. What type of satisfaction (economic or non-economic) has a greater influence on performance?
4. To what extent does the level of teachers' collective efficiency influence their performance level?

Third phase of the research

1. Is there an influence of teachers' seniority on the connection between motivation and satisfaction? Does the intrinsic motivation have a greater impact on performance compared to the extrinsic motivation amongst teachers' with a lower seniority? And on satisfaction?
2. Are there significant differences between the motivation-satisfaction, motivation-performance and satisfaction-performance relationships, depending on the teaching personnel status (permanent or substitute teacher)?

Table 2
Research Hypothesis

#	<i>The research hypothesis</i>
H1	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between employee-organization compatibility and employee's professional satisfaction within the workplace
H2	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic nature) and employee's professional satisfaction within the workplace
H3	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between collective efficacy and employee's professional satisfaction within the workplace.
H4	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between collective efficacy and the work performance.
H5	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between motivations (such as intrinsic and extrinsic) and job performance.
H6	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic nature) and the intention to change job.
H7	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between employee's professional satisfaction and job performance.
H8	The relationship between employee's professional satisfaction and job performance is moderated by seniority.
H9	There is a direct relation and statistically significant between employee's professional satisfaction and his/her intention to change job.




Figure 1. The proposed research conceptual model related to motivation – satisfaction – performance interdependences.

Table 3
The Results for the H1 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
Employee-organization compatibility	<i>Workplace satisfaction</i>	0.655	0.429	0.655	0.000
	<i>Satisfaction on workplace characteristics</i>	0.633	0.401	0.633	0.000
	<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>	0.440	0.194	0.440	0.000
	<i>Emotional satisfaction</i>	0.435	0.189	0.435	0.000

Table 4
The Results for the H2 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
Intrinsic motivation	<i>Workplace satisfaction</i>	0.451	0.204	0.549	0.000
				- 0.183	0.056
Extrinsic motivation	<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	0.439	0.193	0.415	0.000
				0.035	0.716
Intrinsic motivation	<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>	0.166	0.027	0.219	0.039
				- 0.139	0.189
Extrinsic motivation	<i>Emotional satisfaction</i>	0.500	0.250	0,653	0,000
				- 0,346	0,000

Table 5
The Results for the H3 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
Collective efficacy	<i>Workplace satisfaction</i>	0.687	0.474	0.687	0.000
	<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	0.576	0.332	0.576	0.000
	<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>	0.550	0.302	0.550	0.000
	<i>Emotional satisfaction</i>	0.464	0.216	0.464	0.000

Table 6
The Results for the H4 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation</i>	<i>Determination</i>	<i>Regression</i>	<i>The meaning</i>
--------------------	---------------------------	--------------------	----------------------	-------------------	--------------------

<i>variable</i>	<i>Performance related to:</i>	<i>coef. R</i>	<i>coef. R²</i>	<i>function standard coef. S</i>	<i>level p</i>
Collective efficacy	<i>Work</i>	0.516	0.267	0.516	0.000
	<i>Activities design</i>	0.472	0.223	0.472	0.000
	<i>Activities development</i>	0.436	0.190	0.436	0.000
	<i>Pupils achievements evaluation</i>	0.321	0.103	0.321	0.000
	<i>Classroommanagement</i>	0.467	0.218	0.467	0.000
	<i>Professional development and leadership</i>	0.433	0.168	0.433	0.000
	<i>School development and promotion</i>	0.321	0.103	0.321	0.000

Table 7
The Results for the H5 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable Performance related to:</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
Intrinsic motivation	<i>Work</i>	0.538	0.289	0.594	0.000
				- 0.092	0.306
Extrinsic motivation	<i>Activities design</i>	0.418	0.175	0.499	0.000
				- 0.146	0.133
Intrinsic motivation	<i>Activities development</i>	0.682	0.465	0.739	0.000
				- 0.093	0.236
Extrinsic motivation	<i>Pupils achievements evaluation</i>	0.391	0.153	0.508	0.000
				- 0.258	0.009
Intrinsic motivation	<i>Classroom management</i>	0.543	0.295	0.556	0.000
				- 0.019	0.828
Extrinsic motivation	<i>Professional development and leadership</i>	0.310	0.096	0.257	0.012
				0.073	0.470
Intrinsic motivation	<i>School development and promotion</i>	0.254	0.065	0.257	0.014
				- 0.004	0.972

Table 8
The Results for the H6 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
Intrinsic motivation	<i>Intention to change the job (move to another</i>	0.220	0.049	- 0.292	0.007
				0.176	0.095

<i>motivation</i>	<i>job and/or organization)</i>
-------------------	---------------------------------

Table 9a
The Results for the H7 Hypothesis Testing – part a

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
<i>Workplace satisfaction</i>	<i>Work performance</i>	0.636	0.404	0.636	0.000
<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>				0.374	0.000
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>		0.698	0.488	- 0.011	0.873
<i>Emotional satisfaction</i>				0.456	0.000
	<i>Performance to:</i>				
	<i>Activities design</i>	0.611	0.374	0.611	0.000
	<i>Activities development</i>	0.543	0.295	0.543	0.000
	<i>Pupils achievements evaluation</i>	0.430	0.185	0.430	0.000
<i>Workplace satisfaction</i>	<i>Classroom management</i>	0.518	0.268	0.518	0.000
	<i>Professional development and leadership</i>	0.488	0.238	0.488	0.000
	<i>School development and promotion</i>	0.436	0.190	0.436	0.000
<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	<i>Performance – activities design</i>			0.319	0.000
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>		0.636	0.404	0.094	0.189
<i>Emotional satisfaction</i>				0.377	0.000

Table 9b
The Results for the H7 Hypothesis Testing – part b

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	<i>Performance – Activities development</i>	0.661	0.437	0.414	0.000
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>				- 0.155	0.026
<i>Affective satisfaction</i>				0.435	0.000
<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	<i>Performance – Pupils achievements evaluation</i>	0.581	0.338	0.151	0.058
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>				- 0.112	0.137
<i>Affective satisfaction</i>				0.534	0.000
<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	<i>Performance – Classroom management</i>	0.552	0.305	0.339	0.000
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>				0.021	0.785
<i>Affective satisfaction</i>				0.303	0.000
<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	<i>Performance – Professional development and leadership</i>	0.513	0.263	0.333	0.000
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>				0.039	0.622
<i>Affective satisfaction</i>				0.249	0.002
<i>Satisfaction - workplace characteristics</i>	<i>Performance – School development and promotion</i>	0.460	0.212	0.215	0.014
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>				0.054	0.512
<i>Affective satisfaction</i>				0.297	0.000

Table 10
The Results for the H8 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
<i>Workplace satisfaction</i>	<i>Workplace performance</i>	0.645	0.416	0.643	0.000
<i>Seniority</i>				0.030	0.626
<i>Satisfaction – seniority interaction</i>				0.007	0.911

Table 11
 The Results for the H9 Hypothesis Testing

<i>Independent variable</i>	<i>Dependent variable</i>	<i>Correlation coef. R</i>	<i>Determination coef. R²</i>	<i>Regression function standard coef. S</i>	<i>The meaning level p</i>
<i>Workplace satisfaction</i>	<i>Intention to change the job (move to another job and/or organization)</i>	0.551	0.304	- 0.551	0.000
<i>Satisfaction on workplace characteristics</i>				- 0.064	0.426
<i>Cognitive satisfaction</i>				- 0.200	0.008
<i>Affective satisfaction</i>				- 0.479	0.000