


**EXPLORING RELATIONSHIP OF JOB SATISFACTION, ORGANIZATONAL CULTURE,
AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN SMALL MEDIUM ENTERPRISE**

Dorothea Wahyu Ariani^A



ARTICLE INFO	ABSTRACT
<p>Article history:</p> <p>Received 21 November 2022</p> <p>Accepted 15 February 2023</p>	<p>Purpose: The objective of this study was to re-examined the relationship of job satisfaction, organizational culture and employee performance.</p>
<p>Keywords:</p> <p>Job Satisfaction; Organizational Culture; In-Role Performance; Extra-role Performance.</p>	<p>Theoretical framework: There were several studies that examine the relationship between organizational culture, job satisfaction, and employee performance. The employee performance is a consequence of organizational culture and employee job satisfaction. The relationship between the three variables is not surprising, especially the relationship between the two types of performance measures, in-role performance (IRP) and extra-role performance (ERP).</p>
	<p>Design/methodology/approach: This study aims to re-examine the relationship and influence job satisfaction (JS), organizational culture (OC), in-role performance (IRP), and extra-role performance (ERP) using 376 employees who work in several micro, small and medium scale manufacturing companies in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The factor analysis was used to test the validity, and Cronbach' Alpha for reliability of the instrument. The structural equation modeling was used to test the relationship model.</p>
<p>Findings: The results of this study revealed that JS is a variable that is not related to the other three variables and does not influence either IRP or ERP. This study found that JS is related to and influenced by the organizational culture (OC) adopted. This study strengthened the findings of previous studies that OC is one of the important factors to improve employee performance.</p>	<p>Research, Practical & Social implications: Small Medium Enterprises must strengthen organizational culture in order to increase job satisfaction and employee performance, both IRP and ERP. The use of longitudinal data needs to be used to test the mediation of the model. Other raters also need to be used to assess employee performance and eliminate common method variances.</p>
<p>Originality/value: Job satisfaction is not always an independent variable as in many studies but can be a consequence of individual internal and external factors.</p>	<p>Doi: https://doi.org/10.26668/businessreview/2023.v8i2.876</p>

**EXPLORANDO A RELAÇÃO DE SATISFAÇÃO NO TRABALHO, CULTURA ORGANIZACIONAL
E DESEMPENHO DOS FUNCIONÁRIOS EM PEQUENAS MÉDIAS EMPRESAS**

RESUMO

Objetivo: O objetivo deste estudo foi reexaminar a relação entre satisfação no trabalho, cultura organizacional e desempenho dos funcionários.

^A Ph.D. Universitas Mercu Buana Yogyakarta. Jl. Wates km. 10 Yogyakarta. E-mail: ariani1338@gmail.com
Orcid: <https://orcid.org/0000-0003-2148-3833>

Referencial teórico: Existem vários estudos que examinam a relação entre cultura organizacional, satisfação no trabalho e desempenho dos funcionários. O desempenho do funcionário é consequência da cultura organizacional e da satisfação do funcionário no trabalho. A relação entre as três variáveis não é surpreendente, especialmente a relação entre os dois tipos de medidas de desempenho, desempenho in-role (IRP) e desempenho extra-role (ERP).

Desenho/metodologia/abordagem: Este estudo visa reexaminar o relacionamento e influenciar a satisfação no trabalho (JS), cultura organizacional (OC), desempenho na função (IRP) e desempenho extra na função (ERP) usando 376 funcionários que trabalham em várias micro, pequenas e médias empresas de manufatura em Yogyakarta, Indonésia. A análise fatorial foi utilizada para testar a validade e o Alfa de Cronbach para a confiabilidade do instrumento. A modelagem de equações estruturais foi utilizada para testar o modelo de relacionamento.

Resultados: Os resultados deste estudo revelaram que JS é uma variável que não está relacionada com as outras três variáveis e não influencia nem o IRP nem o ERP. Este estudo constatou que o JS está relacionado e influenciado pela cultura organizacional (CO) adotada. Este estudo reforçou os achados de estudos anteriores de que o CO é um dos fatores importantes para melhorar o desempenho dos funcionários.

Pesquisa, implicações práticas e sociais: Pequenas e médias empresas devem fortalecer a cultura organizacional para aumentar a satisfação no trabalho e o desempenho dos funcionários, tanto IRP quanto ERP. O uso de dados longitudinais precisa ser usado para testar a mediação do modelo. Outros avaliadores também precisam ser usados para avaliar o desempenho dos funcionários e eliminar as variações de métodos comuns.

Originalidade/valor: A satisfação no trabalho nem sempre é uma variável independente como em muitos estudos, mas pode ser consequência de fatores internos e externos individuais.

Palavras-chave: Satisfação no trabalho, Cultura organizacional, Desempenho in-role, Desempenho extra-role.

EXPLORANDO LA RELACIÓN DE LA SATISFACCIÓN LABORAL, LA CULTURA ORGANIZACIONAL Y EL DESEMPEÑO DEL EMPLEADO EN LA PEQUEÑA MEDIA EMPRESA

RESUMEN

Propósito: El objetivo de este estudio fue volver a examinar la relación entre la satisfacción laboral, la cultura organizacional y el desempeño de los empleados.

Marco teórico: Hubo varios estudios que examinan la relación entre la cultura organizacional, la satisfacción laboral y el desempeño de los empleados. El desempeño de los empleados es una consecuencia de la cultura organizacional y la satisfacción laboral de los empleados. La relación entre las tres variables no es sorprendente, especialmente la relación entre los dos tipos de medidas de desempeño, desempeño en el rol (IRP) y desempeño extra-rol (ERP).

Diseño/metodología/enfoque: este estudio tiene como objetivo reexaminar la relación e influir en la satisfacción laboral (JS), la cultura organizacional (OC), el desempeño en el rol (IRP) y el desempeño en el rol extra (ERP) utilizando 376 empleados que trabajan en varias micro, pequeñas y medianas empresas manufactureras en Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Se utilizó el análisis factorial para probar la validez y el Alfa de Cronbach para la confiabilidad del instrumento. El modelo de ecuaciones estructurales se utilizó para probar el modelo de relaciones.

Resultados: Los resultados de este estudio revelaron que JS es una variable que no está relacionada con las otras tres variables y no influye ni en IRP ni en ERP. Este estudio encontró que JS está relacionado e influenciado por la cultura organizacional (CO) adoptada. Este estudio fortaleció los hallazgos de estudios previos de que el CO es uno de los factores importantes para mejorar el desempeño de los empleados.

Implicaciones de investigación, prácticas y sociales: las pequeñas y medianas empresas deben fortalecer la cultura organizacional para aumentar la satisfacción laboral y el desempeño de los empleados, tanto IRP como ERP. El uso de datos longitudinales debe usarse para probar la mediación del modelo. También es necesario utilizar otros evaluadores para evaluar el desempeño de los empleados y eliminar las variaciones del método común.

Originalidad/valor: La satisfacción laboral no siempre es una variable independiente como en muchos estudios, sino que puede ser consecuencia de factores individuales internos y externos.

Palabras clave: Satisfacción laboral, Cultura organizativa, Desempeño dentro del rol, Desempeño fuera del rol.

INTRODUCTION

All organizations must pursue performance, both individual performance, group performance, and overall organizational performance. Organizational performance is an aggregate performance of all employees. Meanwhile, employee performance includes performance related to job descriptions or often referred to as in-role performance (IRP) and performance that is not related to job descriptions or often referred to as extra-role performance (ERP) which are both closely related (Debuscher et al., 2016). Previous research has always confirmed that ERP has an effect on IRP (Basu et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2017; Klotz et al., 2018). Research on these two variables has done extensively and found that they are related (Bergeron et al., 2013). Bolino et al. (2013) emphasized that although the two are related, ERP is different from IRP.

Performance is a construct that is influenced by many factors, both internal or dispositional or external or situational. Internal factors such as personality (Penney et al., 2011), motivation (Daniela, 2015), JS (Platis et al., 2015) and external factors such as OC (Jacobs et al., 2013), leadership (Kelidbari et al., 2016), work environment (Pradhan & Jena, 2017) are factors that have proven to have an effect on employee performance. Both of these factors affect the performance of both ERP and IRP. If the situational factor has a strong influence, then the dispositional factor weakens and vice versa (Robbins & Judge, 2016).

Furthermore, the positive relationship between JS and ERP has been confirmed by many researchers (Davila & Finkelstein, 2013; Meynhardta et al., 2020). However, the influence and relationship of the two variables are different. Although Podsakoff et al. (2013) found that the two constructs were reciprocally related, but in general other researchers found that JS was an antecedent of ERP (Na-Nan et al., 2020; Ng et al., 2021). Meanwhile, Singh & Singh (2019) found that it was ERP that could affect JS. Agrawal and Gautama (2019) confirmed that JS is indeed related to performance, both IRP and ERP. However, Kabak et al. (2014) actually found the opposite, namely JS is a consequence of employee behavior or performance. Individuals who feel satisfied with the organization will generally do positive things that can improve their performance and that of the organization. Vice versa, those who perform well will also feel satisfaction because their performance is considered good.

In addition to JS as an internal factor, employee performance is also influenced by OC because OC can move individuals to behave (Khan et al., 2020). OC has a positive effect on performance because it can improve organizational operational activities (Hardcopf et al., 2021; Yarbrough et al., 2011). OC like hardworking can move individuals to be more productive (Littman-Ovadia & Lavy, 2016). The results of research by Lavy and Littman-Ovadia (2017)

found that OC has a positive effect on IRP, ERP, and employee JS. If the values adopted by employees are the same as values or OC, employees will feel satisfied, their IRP and ERP will also increase (Agrawal & Gautam, 2019; Jafarpanah & Rezaei, 2020). This study aims to re-examine the relationship between performance which includes IRP and ERP and their antecedents, namely JS as a dispositional factor and OC as a situational factor. This study also examines how the influence of JS and OC on performance. In addition, this study also examines the model mediation relationship between the four variables.

LITERATURE REVIEW

ERP and IRP, JS, and OC are constructs based on social capital theory and social exchange theory. Social capital theory states that social relations are resources that lead to the development and accumulation of human capital (Machalek & Martin, 2015). Relationships between internal employees are social capital for companies to be able to develop the organization. Meanwhile, social exchange theory states that in a social relationship there must be sacrifices, benefits, and mutually beneficial relationships (Emerson, 1976). Individuals who are satisfied with the organization will be able to perform well and be able to behave and perform outside the job description. Individuals who perform well will also feel satisfaction. These three variables will increase if supported by OC which also supports the work culture of its employees.

ERP or what is often referred to as organizational citizenship behavior (OCB) is an individual's altruistic behavior or performance outside of his formal job description such as helping others, taking on additional responsibilities, taking extra working hours, protecting the organization and participating in solving important problems for the organization (Bolino et al., 2013). ERP generally has a positive effect on the work environment and performance. However, ERP can also have negative impacts such as increased role ambiguity, role overload, job stress, and work family conflict (Bolino et al., 2013). In addition, older individuals tend to increase their ERP (Pletzer, 2021). This is influenced by personality characteristics and values held.

According to Bolino et al. (2013), OCB is indeed different from performance. However, OCB has been widely demonstrated for its relationship and influence on performance (Basu et al., 2017; Deery et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2017). Both IRP and ERP are needed by organizations to be able to grow. If in the organization there are only employees who are loyal to their roles, the organization will die (Jeong et al., 2019). In other words, employees must be able to behave extra proactively in order to achieve the expected results. Employees must be able to

spontaneously participate and dedicate themselves to the organization to achieve performance without any additional rewards.

According to Kwantes et al. (2008), OC can distinguish which behavior is an IRP and which is an ERP. This is because the IRP and ERP guidelines differ between employees and supervisors. In addition, the results of previous studies found that individualistic cultures have a lower ERP than collectivist cultures (Kwantes et al., 2008). The boundary between IRP and ERP is indeed very subjective and requires lengthy testing. The leadership role in distinguishing them is considered important. In addition, the difference between IRP and ERP also requires clear socialization because it affects performance appraisal (Zheng et al., 2012). Furthermore, Nadiri and Tanova (2010) found that ERP can be explained by JS employees. JS is a positive emotional reaction to work (Robbins & Judge, 2016). Individuals who are satisfied at work will behave positively and perform better (Cek & Eyupoglu, 2020). Therefore, JS is related to performance and affects performance (Saxena et al., 2019). In addition to dealing with IRP, employee JS is also related to ERP (Weikamp & Goritz, 2016).

Previous researchers agreed that JS is affected by OC (Bellou, 2010; Sharma, 2017; Soomro & Shah, 2019). This is because OC, which are shared values that are recognized and embraced by all members of the organization, affect the comfort and trust of employees in the workplace. Individuals will feel satisfied because the values they hold are the same as the values of the organization. This is because, with these similarities they can identify themselves in the organization. In other words, there is a relationship between perceived JS and the values or culture held by all members of the organization (Hosseinkhanzadeh et al., 2013).

Moreover, both IRP and ERP have been agreed by previous researchers to be related and influenced by OC (see for example, Jafarpanah & Rezaei, 2020; Khan et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2018). This is because OC can move individuals to work more productively so that their performance is better. OC also moves individuals to behave beyond their job descriptions (Ruiz Palomino & Martinez-Canas, 2014). OC is a system of values and beliefs that strengthen the behavior of employees who are in the organization and become members of the organization (Eskiler et al., 2016). Therefore, OC is positively related to performance and can improve employee performance (Saad & Abbas, 2018). OC is able to increase employee engagement in the organization so that they feel satisfied to be in it (Douglas & Duffy, 2015). Based on various theoretical explanations and the results of previous research, the research question tested in this study is how is the relationship between JS, OC and employee performance, both IRP and ERP?

RESEARCH METHOD

Participants

This research was conducted on employees working in several micro, small and medium enterprise in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. The employees were asked to fill out a 48 items questionnaire that was covering JS, OC, IRP, and ERP. The employees who were actively involved in filling out the questionnaire were employees who had worked for more than 3 years. This is because employees who have worked for more than 3 years have carried out job descriptions well, are familiar with the organizational culture, feel satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work, and can distinguish between IRP and ERP. Questionnaires were given to company leaders or human resource managers to be distributed to employees who meet the criteria in question. After four months, 376 completed questionnaires were collected from 500 employees who were asked to participate in this study (response rate 75.2%). Because according to the criteria for factor analysis, the number of samples was at least 300 people, so the number of samples of 376 was considered to have met the minimum requirements for the number of samples (Hair et al., 2010).

Measurements

This study used questionnaires adopted from the results of previous studies and has been translated into Indonesian. The JS questionnaire was adopted from the results of the research by Taskios and Giannouli (2017), while the OC questionnaire was adopted from the results of the research by Ghosh and Srivastava (2014). Meanwhile, the IRP and ERP questionnaires were adopted from the research results of Koopmans et al. (2013). The questionnaires were translated into Indonesian to be better understood by the respondents. The questionnaire in Indonesian was then tested for its face validity before testing its construct validity and reliability.

Procedure

After the data had been collected, testing the validity with confirmatory factor analysis and internal consistency reliability using the Cronbach's Alpha value was carried out to test the measuring instrument used (Sekaran & Bougie, 2016). The four variables used were declared reliable, while invalid question items were not included in the next test. Bivariate correlation test was used to test the relationship between two research variables. Linear regression testing using SPSS was carried out to test the direct effect of the independent variables on the dependent variable. In addition, to test the mediation model used structural equation modeling (SEM) with a two-stage approach using AMOS 17.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Validity and Reliability Test

This study uses factor analysis to test the validity of the question items used. The results of the factor analysis test showed that the 9 JS items were valid, with a loading factor 0.644 to 0.808 and the Kaiser-Meier-Olkin (KMO) value of 0.804 indicated the sample adequacy. Meanwhile, the reliability test used internal consistency with Cronbach's Alpha (α) = 0.871, which indicated the questionnaire was reliable and maintained the internal consistency. However, the mean of JS variable which was 2.978 was moderate.

Employee performance consisted of ERP and IRP. The ERP variable that used 18 question items turns out to be only 11 valid items with a loading factor 0.502 to 0.772 and a KMO value of 0.835 indicated the sample adequacy. The reliability test found internal consistency with Cronbach's Alpha (α) = 0.858 which indicated that the ERP questionnaire was reliable and maintained the internal consistency. Furthermore, the ERP average of 3.992 was quite high. The IRP using 6 question items found that the items were valid with a loading factor 0.712 to 0.837 and a KMO value of 0.845 indicated the sample adequacy. The IRP questionnaire used in this study was also reliable, because the value of internal consistency with Cronbach's Alpha (α) = 0.888. The average IRP was 4.256 which indicated that the respondents' IRP was high.

Meanwhile, OC uses 15 question items that had a loading factor 0.600 to 0.875 and a KMO value of 0.890 indicated the sample adequacy. The OC questionnaire used in this study was also reliable, because the value of internal consistency with Cronbach's Alpha (α) = 0.935. However, the average respondent's answer to the OC which was 2.990 was classified as moderate. Table 1 presents the results of the validity and reliability tests.

Table 1. Validity and Reliability Test Results

Questionnaire	Loading Factors Job Satisfaction (JS)	Loading Factors Organizational Culture (OC)	Loading Factors In-Role Performance (IRP)	Loading Factors Extra-Role Performance (ERP)
JS1	0.666			
JS2	0.745			
JS2	0.808			
JS4	0.644			
JS5	0.734			
JS6	0.756			
JS7	0.706			
JS8	0.696			
JS9	0.767			
OC1		0.600		
OC2		0.6.6		
OC3		0.630		

OC4		0.736		
OC5		0.767		
OC6		0.674		
OC7		0.747		
OC8		0.819		
OC9		0.786		
OC10		0.800		
OC11		0.785		
OC12		0.822		
OC13		0.718		
OC14		0.723		
OC15		0.729		
IRP1			0.712	
IRP2			0.779	
IRP3			0.808	
IRP4			0.861	
IRP5			0.819	
IRP6			0.837	
ERP1				0.552
ERP2				0.671
ERP3				0.772
ERP5				0.637
ERP7				0.576
ERP8				0.653
ERP9				0.684
ERP11				0.562
ERP13				0.663
ERP14				0.734
ERP15				0.686
KMO	0.804	0.890	0.845	0.835
Cronbach Alpha (α)	0.871	0.935	0.888	0.858

Results of Testing the Relationship between Research Variables

The test results between the four research variables are presented in Table 2. Based on Table 2, it can be seen that several variables are significantly positively related and some are not significant.

Table 2. Analysis of Relationships between Research Variables

	IRP	ERP	OC	JS
IRP	1			
ERP	0.750**	1		
OC	0.046	0.206**	1	
JS	0.040	0.144**	0.721**	1
Mean	4.22558	3.9923	2.9901	2.9781
Standard Deviation	0.6452	0.5641	0.9384	0.8562

** significant at 0.01

The results of the bivariate correlation test in Table 2 find that IRP and ERP are significantly positively related. ERP is significantly positively related to OC and JS.

Furthermore, OC is also significantly positive with JS. Meanwhile, the IRP is not related to the employee's JS and OC. In other words, neither the OC nor the JS of employees are related to the IRP. Furthermore, testing the relationship model using multiple linear regression to test the direct effect of OC, JS, and ERP on IRP. The normality test results show Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) of 0.273, the value of Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) 1.044 – 2.084 or less than 10,000, and the scatter plot that spreads shows that the data has met the classical assumption test. The results of testing the effect of OC, JS, and ERP on IRP are presented in Table 3.

Table 3. Results of Testing the Effect of OC, JS, and ERP on IRP

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sign.
		B	Standard Error	Beta		
1	(constant)	0.539	0.189		2.846	0.005
	ERP	0.877	0.039	0.773	22.391	0.000
	OC	0.088	0.034	0.128	2.597	0.010
	JS	-0.016	0.037	-0.021	-0.425	0.671

Dependent Variable: IRP

The results on Table 3, it can be observed that employee JS has no effect on IRP. OC and ERP have an effect on IRP. Taken together, OC, JS, and ERP have a significant effect on IRP (F-test = 167.75, significance = 0.000 and adjusted R square = 0.572). Furthermore, testing the effect of OC, JS, and IRP on ERP. The normality test results show Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed) was 0.067, variance inflation factor (VIF) was between 1.002 to 2.085 or less than 10.00, and the scatter plot did not form a certain pattern indicating that the data has met the classical assumption tests. The results of testing the effect of OC, JS, and IRP on ERP are presented in Table 4.

Table 4. Results of Testing the Effect of OC, JS, and IRP on ERP

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sign.
		β	Standard Error	Beta		
1	(constant)	1.504	0.146		10.318	0.000
	OC	0.113	0.029	0.186	3.885	0.000
	JS	0.013	0.032	0.020	0.409	0.683
	IRP	0.655	0.029	0.742	22.391	0.000

Dependent Variable: ERP

The result is presented in Table 4 indicate that JS also has no effect on ERP, while OC and IRP have an effect on ERP. Taken together, OC, JS, and IRP have a significant effect on ERP (F-test = 180.004, significance = 0.000 and adjusted R square = 0.589). Furthermore, the relationship model was tested using multiple linear regression to test the direct effect of OC,

IRP, and ERP on employee JS. Testing of employee JS as the dependent variable needs to be done because JS is a consequence or output of organizational behavior (Robbins & Judge, 2016). The normality test results show Asymp. The Sig (2-tailed) is 0.127, the VIF value is 1.074 – 2.451 or less than 10,000, and the scatter plot that spreads shows that the data has met the classical assumption test. The results of testing the effect of OC, ERP, and IRP on employee JS are presented in Table 5.

Table 5. Results of Testing the Effect of OC, ERP, and IRP on JS

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sign.
		β	Standard Error	Beta		
1	(constant)	0.995	0.265		3.759	0.000
	IRP	-0.031	0.073	-0.023	-0.425	0.067
	OC	0.661	0.034	0.725	19.473	0.000
	ERB	0.035	0.085	0.023	0.409	0.683

Dependent Variable: JS

Based on Table 5, ERP and IRP have no effect on employee JS. Only OC has a significant positive effect on employee JS. Taken together, OC, IRP, and ERP have a significant effect on JS (F-test = 134.495, significance = 0.000 and adjusted R square = 0.516). Furthermore, to test the relationship model the data was subjected to SEM. The initial model tested the effect of all independent variables (OC, JS, and ERP) on the dependent variable, namely IRP. The results show that the model cannot be tested because of its goodness-of-fit index (GFI) is 1.000 or exceeds the model's suitability criteria (GFI between 0 and 1 according to Hu & Bentler, 1999). Testing the relationship model that shows the suitability between the data and the existing theory is presented in Table 6 and Table 7.

Table 6. Results of Testing the First Relationship Model with SEM

	β	Critical Ratio
OC \rightarrow ERP	0.136	2.418**
ERP \rightarrow IRP	0.874	22.283**
IRP \rightarrow JS	0.021	0.551
OC \rightarrow JS	0.858	23.273**

GFI= 0.984	$\chi^2/df= 12.165/2= 6.0825$	AGFI= 0.922
CFI= 0.985	IFI= 0.985	TLI= 0.956
		NFI= 0.982


```

graph TD
    OC((OC)) -- s --> ERP((ERP))
    OC((OC)) -- s --> JS((JS))
    ERP((ERP)) -- s --> IRP((IRP))
    IRP((IRP)) -- ns --> JS((JS))
  
```

The results of testing the first relationship model using SEM found that OC had a direct effect on ERP and employee JS. Meanwhile, ERP has significant effect on IRP, while IRP has no effect on employee JS. In other words, ERP mediates the relationship between OC and IRP. OC can improve ERP. Meanwhile, the results of this study also found that ERP also increased IRP. Employees' JS is more affected by their OC than their IRP. The second model test using SEM found that OC had an effect on JS, ERP and IRP. Furthermore, ERP can significantly increase IRP. The results of testing the second relationship model are presented in Table 7.

Table 7. Test Results of the Second Relationship Model with SEM

	β	Critical Ratio
OC \rightarrow ERP	0.171	3.022**
OC \rightarrow IRP	0.119	3.202**
OC \rightarrow JS	0.859	23.435**
ERP \rightarrow IRP	0.896	22.666**

GFI= 0.997	$\chi^2/df= 2.306/2= 1.153$	AGFI= 0.985
CFI= 0.999	IFI= 0.999	TLI= 0.999
		NFI= 0.997


```

graph LR
  OC((OC)) -- s --> JS((JS))
  OC -- s --> ERP((ERP))
  OC -- s --> IRP((IRP))
  ERP -- s --> IRP
  JS --> JS
  
```

Table 7 which is the result of testing the first model shows that OC has an effect on increasing JS and employee performance. Meanwhile, ERP consistently increases IRP, and JS also consistently has no effect on performance. OC is a very important variable in the company. Therefore, implementing the shared values espoused by all members of the organization is an important factor in the success of the organization in achieving its goals.

DISCUSSION

This study aims to examine the model of the relationship between OC, JS, ERP, and IRP of employees in several micro, small and medium enterprise in Yogyakarta, Indonesia. Some of the results of testing the relationship model confirmed the results of previous studies, but some did not. A positive relationship between IRP and ERP has consistently been found by several previous studies (see for example, Basu et al., 2017; Debuscher et al., 2016; Deery et al., 2017; Jiang et al., 2017; Khan et al., 2020; Klotz et al., 2018). The results of this study confirm the results of the previous research, IRP and ERP are two different but interconnected constructs (Bergeron et al., 2013; Bolino et al., 2013; Rapp et al., 2013).

Furthermore, the results of this study also found that ERP has a positive effect on IRP and vice versa, IRP can improve ERP. This confirms the research results of Debuscher et al.

(2016) and Klotz et al. (2018). In testing the relationship model using SEM, ERP can increase IRP as the results of research by Basu et al. (2017). The strong relationship between IRP and ERP is not surprising. This is because IRP and ERP are two different performance measures (Rai et al., 2018).

The results of this study also found that OC plays an important role in employee behavior in the workplace. OC is proven to be related to JS and ERP. The relationship between the three constructs supports the results of Astakhova's research (2015). This positive relationship between ERP and OC confirms several previous research results (see for example, Jafarpanah & Rezaei, 2020; Jeong et al., 2019; Khan et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2018; Ruiz-Palomino & Martinez Canas, 2014). However, the results of this study found that OC is not associated with IRP. This contradicts some previous research results (see for example, Jeong et al., 2019; Khan et al., 2020; Miao et al., 2018).

In testing the direct effect of OC on both types of performance, it was found that OC had a direct effect on IRP and ERP. This confirms the research results of Jeong et al. (2019) and Khan et al. (2020). OC can indeed move individuals to behave positively in accordance with the values or culture adopted by the organization. The results of testing the mediation model with SEM found that the effect of OC on IRP was mediated by ERP.

This research shows that OC must be aligned with and become the basis of individual performance appraisal so that it can move the individual. Individuals will be more willing to do ERP and IRP if shared values in the organization support these behaviors. The values in the organization are rooted in the values held by individuals. The second model tested using SEM further strengthens that OC has an effect on improving employee performance.

Meanwhile, this study supports the results of previous studies which found a relationship between OC and JS employees. A positive relationship between JS and OC has consistently been found to be so (see for example, Belias et al., 2015; Hosseinkhanzadeh et al., 2013; Sadeghi et al., 2013; Sharma, 2017; Soomro & Shah, 2019). JS is a positive attitude of employees towards their work. Employees will feel this satisfaction if the values they hold are the same as the value or OC (Bellou, 2010). Therefore, the results of this study confirm the results of previous studies, that appropriate OC with employees can increase JS (see for example, MacIntosh & Doherty, 2010; Sharma, 2017; Soomro & Shah, 2019).

Meanwhile, the results of this study also support the results of previous studies which found that ERP is positively related to JS (see for example, Cek & Eyupoglu, 2020; Na-Nan et al., 2020; Ng et al., 2021; Saxena et al., 2019). However, this employee JS does not encourage employees to behave well according to the job description or any other positive behavior

outside of the job description. In testing the relationship model using SEM, it was also found that these two types of performance did not affect or affect employee JS. In this study, it was found that the JS of employees was strongly influenced by the OC they adhered to.

This study also found that IRP was not associated with JS, thus contradicting the research of Agrawal and Gautam (2019) and Lavy and Littman-Ovadia (2017). Employees who have good performance do not directly feel satisfaction. In addition, this study actually found that values or OC were also not related to job descriptions that moved employees to perform well according to their job descriptions. OC plays an important role in determining whether behavior is an IRP or an ERP.

Furthermore, testing the effect of OC on IRP and ERP found that OC has an effect on both IRP and ERP, but JS does not. The effect of OC on IRP confirms the results of the study of Eskiler et al. (2016), Hardcopf et al. (2021), Khan et al. (2020), and the results of research by Saad and Abbas (2018). While the positive effect of OC on ERP confirms the results of research by Astakhova, (2015), Ebrahimpour et al. (2011), Jafarpanah and Rezaei (2020), Lavy and Littman Ovadia (2017), and research results by Ruiz-Palomino and Martinez (2014).

The results of this study indicate that OC is an antecedent that consistently affects various positive variables. Employee performance is also influenced by OC. JS, which the majority of researchers found as a variable that can improve performance, is not always the case. Therefore, although JS is important for employees, these variables have less positive impact on employee performance, both IRP and ERP. JS consists of various dimensions, so that its effect on various variables is often inconsistent.

CONCLUSION

This study explores the model of the relationship between OC, JS, and performance, both IRP and ERP. OC is indeed a construct that is very influential on employee performance and JS. The values adopted by employees must be in line with the values of the organization so that they can encourage employees to be more productive and employees also feel satisfied with their work and organization. Apart from the research results that confirm and contradict the results of previous studies, the results of this study also have several weaknesses. The use of self-assessment certainly has weaknesses, especially the occurrence of common method variance which causes a higher beta value. Future research is expected to be able to use self-rating and others-rating for filling out the questionnaire. In addition, the use of cross-section data has a weakness in testing the mediation model. Future research is expected to use

longitudinal data so that testing the mediation model is more appropriate. In addition, the greater the number of respondents the better the research results.

Based on the results of this study, the recommendation proposed to the owners and managers of MSMEs is to strengthen the company's organizational culture. Organizational culture is a shared value shared by all members of the organization. Shared values will encourage employees to identify with the organization so that they feel comfortable in the organization, feel an attachment to the organization, are able to innovate and be creative, and improve their performance and organizational performance.

ACKNOWLEDGEMENT

We would like to thank the respondents who have taken the time to fill out this research questionnaire.

REFERENCES

- Agrawal, P. & Gautam, O. (2019). The effects of leaders' behavior on job satisfaction, organizational citizenship behavior, deviant behavior and job performance of employees. *Deviance in Modern Organization*, 9, 100-113. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316634056>.
- Astakhova, M.N. (2015). The curvilinear relationship between work passion and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 130, 361-374. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-014-2233-5>.
- Basu, E., Pradhan, R.K., & Teware, H.R. (2017). Impact of organizational citizenship behavior on job performance in Indian healthcare industries: The mediating role of social capital. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 66(6), 780-796. <https://doi.org/10.1108/IJPPM-22-2016-0048>.
- Belias, D., Koustelios, A., Vairaktarakis, G., & Sdrolias, L. (2015). Organizational culture and job satisfaction of Greek banking institutions. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Science*, 175, 314-323. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1206>.
- Bellou, V. (2010). Organizational culture as a predictor of job satisfaction: The role of gender and age. *Career Development International*, 15(1), 4-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431011020862>.
- Bellou, V. (2010). Organizational culture as a predictor of job satisfaction: The role of gender and age. *Career Development International*, 15(1), 4-19. <https://doi.org/10.1108/13620431011020862>.
- Bergeron, D.M., Shipp, A.J., Rosen, B. & Furst, S.A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and career outcomes: The cost of being a good citizen. *Journal of Management*, 39(4), 958-984. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0149206311407508>.

- Bolino, M.C., Klotz, A.C., Turnley, W.H., & Harvey, J. (2013). Exploring the dark side of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 34, 542-559. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.1847>.
- Cek, K. & Eyupoglu, S. (2020). Does a job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior relationship exist among teachers? *South African Journal of Education*, 40(2), S1-S12. <https://doi.org/10.15700/saje.v40ns2a1711>.
- Daniela, P. (2015). The relationship between self-regulation, motivation and performance at secondary school students. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 191, 2549-2553. <http://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.04.410>.
- Davila, M.C. & Finkelstein, M.A. (2013). Organizational citizenship behavior and well-being: Preliminary results. *International Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3(3), 45-51. <https://doi.org/10.5923/j.ijap.20130303.03>.
- Debuscer, J., Hofinas, J., & Defrugt, F. (2016). The multiple face(t)s of state conscientiousness: predicting task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Research in Personality*, 69(1), 78-85. <https://dx.doi.org/j.jrp.2016.06.009>.
- Deery, S., Rayton, B., Walsch, J., & Kinnie, N. (2017). The costs of exhibiting organizational citizenship behavior. *Human Resource Management*, 56(6), 1039-1049. <https://doi.org/10.1002/hrm.2185>.
- Douglas, R.P. & Duffy, R.D. (2015). Strengths use and life satisfaction: A moderated mediation approach. *Journal of Happiness Studies*, 16, 619-632. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10902-014-9525-4>.
- Ebrahimpour, H., Zahed, A., Khaleghkhan, A., & Sepehri, M.B. (2011). A survey relation between organizational culture and organizational citizenship behavior. *Procedia – Social and Behavioral Science*, 30, 1920-1925. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.10.373>.
- Emerson, R. M. (1976). Social Exchange Theory. *Annual Review of Sociology*, 2, 335-362. <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2946096>.
- Eskiler, E., Ekici, S., Soyer, F., & Sari, I. (2016). The relationship between organizational culture and innovative work behavior for sports services in tourism enterprises. *Physical Culture and Sport Studies and Research*, 69(1), 53-64. <https://doi.org/10.1515.pcscr-2016-0007>.
- Ghosh S. & Srivastava, B.K. (2014) Construction of a Reliable and Valid Scale for Measuring Organizational Culture. *Global Business Review*, 15(3) 583–596. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0972150914535145>.
- Hardcopf, R., Liu, G., & Shah, R. (2021). Lean production and operational performance: The influence of organizational culture. *International Journal of Production Economics*, 235, 108060. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijpe.2021.108060>.
- Hosseinkhanzadeh, A.A., Hosseinkhanzadeh, A., & Yeganeh, T. (2013). Investigate relationship between job satisfaction and organizational culture among teachers. *Procedia – Social and Behavioraal Science*, 84, 832-836. <https://doi.org/j.sbspro.2013.06.656>.
- Hu, L. & Bentler, P.M. (1999). Cutoff criteria for fit indexes in covariance structure analysis: Conventional criteria versus new alternatives. *Structural Equation Modeling: A Multidisciplinary Journal*, 6(1), 1-55. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1080/10705519909540118>.

- Jacobs, R., Mannion, R., Davies, H.O.T., Harrison, S., Konteh, F. & Walshe, K. (2013). The relationship between organizational culture and performance in acute hospitals. *Social Science and Medicine*, 76, 115-125. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/j.socscimed.2012.10.014>.
- Jafarpanah, M. & Rezaei, B. (2020). Association between organizational citizenship behavior and patient safety culture from nurses' perspectives: a descriptive correlational study. *BMC Nursing*, 19(24), 1-8. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-020-00416-y>.
- Jeong, Y., Kim, E., Kim, M., Zhang, J.J. (2019). Exploring relationships among organizational culture, empowerment, and organizational citizenship behavior in the South Korean professional sport industry. *Sustainability*, 11, 5412. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su11195412>.
- Jiang, W., Zhao, X., & Ni, J.B. (2017). The impact of transformational leadership on employee sustainable performance: The mediating role of organizational citizenship behavior. *Sustainability*, 9, 1567. <http://doi.org/10.3390/su9091567>.
- Kabak, K.E., Sen, A., Gocer, K., Kucuksoylemez, S., & Tuncer, G. (2014). Strategies for employee job satisfaction: A case of service sector. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 150, 1167-1176. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2014.09.132>.
- Kelidbari, H.R.R., Fadaei, M., & Ebrahimi, P. (2016). The role of ethical leadership on employee performance in Guilan University of medical sciences. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 230, 463 – 470. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2016.09.058>.
- Khan, M.A., Ismail, F.B, Hussain, A., & Alghazali, B. (2020). The interplay of leadership styles, innovative work behavior, organizational culture, and organizational citizenship behavior. *SAGE Open*, 1-16. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2158244019898264>.
- Klotz, A., Bolino, M.C., Song, H., & Stornelli, J. (2018). Examining the nature, cause, and consequences of profiles of organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 39(5), 629-647. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2259>.
- Koopmans, L., Bernaards, C., Hildebrandt, V., van Buuren, S., van der Beek, A.J., 7 de Vet, H.C.W. (2013). Development of an individual work performance questionnaire. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 62(1), 6-28. <https://doi.org/10.1108/17410401311285273>.
- Lavy, S. & Littman-Ovadia, H. (2017). My better self: Using strengths at work and work productivity, organizational citizenship behavior, and satisfaction. *Journal of Career Development*, 44(2), 95-109. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0894845316634056>.
- Littman-Ovadia, H. & Lavy, S. (2016). Going the extra mile: Perseverance as a key character strength at work. *Journal of Career Assessment*, 24, 240-252. <https://doi.org/10.1177/1069072715580322>.
- Machalek, R., & Martin, M.W. (2015). Sociobiology and Sociology: A New Synthesis in International Encyclopedia of the Social & Behavioral Sciences, 2nd.
- MacIntosh, E.W. & Doherty, A. (2010). The influence of organizational culture on job satisfaction and intention to leave. *Sport Management Review*, 13(1), 106-117. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.smr.2009.04.006>.
- Meynhardt, T., Brieger, S. A. & Hermann, C. (2018): Organizational public value and employee life satisfaction: the mediating roles of work engagement and organizational citizenship behavior.

The International Journal of Human Resource Management, 31(12), 1560-1593.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2017.1416653>.

Miao, C., Humphrey, R.H., & Qian, S. (2018). A cross-cultural meta-analysis of how leader emotional intelligence influences subordinate task performance and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of World Business*, 53(4), 463-474. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2018.01.003>.

Nadiri, H. & Tanova, C. (2010). An investigation of the role of justice in turnover intentions, job satisfaction, and organizational citizenship behavior in hospitality industry. *International Journal of Hospitality Management*, 29(1), 33-41. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.ijhm.2009.05.001>.

Na-Nan, K., Kanthong, S., Joungrakut, J., & Smith, I.D. (2020). Mediating effects of job satisfaction and organizational commitment between problems with performance appraisal and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Open Innovation: Technology, Market, and Complexity*, 6(3), 64. <https://doi.org/10.3390/joitmc60300464>.

Ng, L.P., Choong, Y.O., Kuan, L.S., Tan, C.E., & Teoh, S.Y. (2019). Job satisfaction and organizational citizenship behavior amongst health professionals: The mediating role of work engagement. *International Journal of Healthcare Management*, 14(3), 797-804. <https://doi.org/10.1080/20479700.2019.1698850>.

Penney, L.M., David, E., & Witt, L.A. (2011). A review of personality and performance: Identifying boundaries, contingencies, and future research directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 21, 291-310. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2010.10.005>.

Platis, Ch., Reklitis, P., & Zimeras, S. (2015). Relation between job satisfaction and job performance in healthcare services. *Procedia - Social and Behavioral Sciences* 175, 480 – 487. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.01.1226>.

Pletzer, J.L. (2021). Why older employees engage in less counterproductive work behavior and in more organizational citizenship behavior: Examining the role of the HEXACO personality traits. *Personality and Individual Differences*, 173, 110550. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.paid.2020.110550>.

Podsakoff, N. P., Whiting, S. W., Welsh, D. T., & Mai, K. M. (2013). Surveying for “artifacts”: The susceptibility of the OCB–performance evaluation relationship to common rater, item, and measurement context effects. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(5), 863–874. <https://doi.org/10.1037/a0032588>.

Pradan, P.K. & Jena, L.K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 5(1) 1–17. <https://doi.org/10.1177/2278533716671630>.

Rai, A., Ghosh, P., Chauhan, R., & Singh, R. (2018). Improving in-role and extra-role performance with rewards and recognition: Does engagement mediate the process? *Management Research Review*, 41(8), 902-919. <http://doi.org/10.1108/MRR-12-2016-0280>.

Rapp, A.A., Bachrach, D.G., & Rapp, T.L. (2013). The influence of time management skill on the curvilinear relationship between organizational citizenship behavior and task performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 98(4), 668-677. <http://doi.org/10.1037/a0031733>.

Robbins, S.P. & Judge, T.A. (2016). *Organizational Behavior* 16th edition. New York: Pearson Education.

- Ruiz-Palomino, P. & Martinez-Canas, R. (2014). Ethical culture, ethical intent, and organizational citizenship behavior: The moderating and mediating role of person organization fit. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 120(1), 95-108. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-013-1650-1>.
- Saad, G.B. & Abbas, M. (2018). The impact of organizational culture on job performance: A study of Saudi Arabian public sector work culture. *Problems and Perspectives in Management*, 16(3), 207-218. [https://doi.org/10.21511/PPM.16\(3\).2018.17](https://doi.org/10.21511/PPM.16(3).2018.17).
- Sadeghi, K., Amani, J., & Mahmudi, H. (2013). A structural model of the impact of organizational culture on job satisfaction among secondary school teachers. *The Asia-Pacific Education Researcher*, 22, 687-700. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s40299-013-0074-0>.
- Saxena, S., Tomar, K., & Tomar, S. (2019). Impact of job satisfaction on organizational citizenship behavior. *Proceedings of 10th International Conference on Digital Strategies for Organizational Success*. Available at SSRN: <https://dx.doi.org/10.2139/ssrn.3323753>.
- Sharma, P. (2017). Organizational culture as predictor of job satisfaction: The role of age and gender. *Management*, 22(1), 35-48. <https://doi.org/10.30924/mjcmi/2017.22.1.35>.
- Singh, S.K. & Singh, A.P. (2019). Interplay of organizational justice, psychological empowerment, organizational citizenship behavior, and job satisfaction in the context of circular economy. *Management Decision*, 57(4), 937-952. <https://doi.org/10.1108/MD-09-2019-0966>.
- Soomro, B.A. & Shah, N. (2019). Determining the impact of entrepreneurial orientation and organizational culture on job satisfaction, organizational commitment, and employee performance. *South Asian Journal of Business Studies*, 8(3), 266-282. <https://doi.org/10.1108/S4JBS-12-2018-01412>.
- Tasios, T. & Giannouli, V. (2017). Job Descriptive Index (JDI): Reliability and validity study in Greece. *Archives of Assessment Psychology*, 7(1), 31-61.
- Weikamp, J.G. & Goritz, A.S. (2016). Organizational citizenship behaviour and job satisfaction: The impact of occupational future time perspective. *Human Relations*, 69(11) 2091–2115. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0018726716633512>.
- Yarbrough, L., Morgan, N.A., & Vorhies, D.W. (2011). The impact of product market strategy-organizational culture fit on business performance. *Journal of The Academy of Marketing Science*, 39, 555-573. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11747-010-0238-x>.
- Zheng, W., Zhang, M., & Li, H. (2012). Performance appraisal process and organizational citizenship behavior. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 27(7), 732 – 752. <http://dx.doi.org/10.1108/02683941211259548>.