

INTERNATIONAL JOURNAL OF MULTIDISCIPLINARY: APPLIED BUSINESS AND EDUCATION RESEARCH

2025, Vol. 6, No. 9, 4351 – 4363

<http://dx.doi.org/10.11594/ijmaber.06.09.11>

Research Article

Exploring the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction, Workplace Well-being, and Job Performance in an Office Facilities Solutions Service Provider

Ian Rovii U. Gulane¹, Peter G. Narsico^{2*}

¹College of Engineering and Architecture, Cebu Institute of Technology- University, Cebu City, 6000, Philippines

²College of Management, Business, and Accountancy, Cebu Institute of Technology- University, Cebu City, 6000, Philippines

Article history:

Submission 03 August 2025

Revised 31 August 2025

Accepted 23 September 2025

*Corresponding author:

E-mail:

petergnarsico@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

This study examines the relationship between job satisfaction, workplace well-being, and job performance in the under-researched office facilities solutions sector. Unlike healthcare or manufacturing, this industry involves routine physical tasks, high client interaction, and varied contracts, yet lacks focused empirical study. Grounded in sustainable human resource management, the research explores how psychosocial workplace factors affect employee behavior and performance. Using a descriptive-correlational design, data were collected from 41 employees via Likert-scale surveys measuring five job satisfaction, three well-being, and six job performance indicators. Results showed all criteria were frequently observed, with mean scores above 3.80. A very strong positive correlation existed between job satisfaction and workplace well-being ($r = .991$, $p < .01$). Regression analysis confirmed both significantly predict job performance ($R^2 = .983$), supported by a significant ANOVA ($F(2, 38) = 1084.44$, $p < .001$). These findings offer novel sector-specific evidence highlighting the importance of role clarity, organizational support, and workplace conditions in boosting performance and morale. For HR managers and leaders, the study underscores the need to implement clear role communication, foster managerial respect, ensure job security, and promote supportive environments to enhance engagement and productivity. Embedding these factors into sustainable HR practices can reduce turnover, prevent burnout, and improve organizational outcomes. Limitations include self-reported data and a localized sample, suggesting future research should use longitudinal and multi-sector designs to strengthen generalizability.

How to cite:

Gulane, I. R. U. & Narsico, P. G. (2025). Exploring the Relationship Between Job Satisfaction, Workplace Well-being, and Job Performance in an Office Facilities Solutions Service Provider. *International Journal of Multidisciplinary: Applied Business and Education Research*. 6(9), 4351 – 4363. doi: 10.11594/ijmaber.06.09.11

Keywords: *Employee engagement, Human Resource Management, Job satisfaction, Organizational behavior, Organizational support, Physical environment, Workplace well-being*

Background

In the evolving landscape of facilities management, the performance of service personnel is critical to delivering high-quality, responsive, and efficient support to client organizations (Bratty & Dennis, 2024). Office facilities solutions providers are increasingly recognized not just for the infrastructure they maintain, but also for the people who operate within these environments (Parent-Lamarche et al., 2021). As workforce expectations shift and operational complexity rises, the influence of workplace conditions on employee performance has become a focal point of both academic inquiry and organizational strategy (Williams, 2023). This focus aligns with Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, which distinguishes between hygiene factors such as job security and physical work conditions, and motivators like recognition and growth opportunities, both critical in shaping employee satisfaction and performance (Smith & Lee, 2021). Factors such as organizational support, job security, and workload have been shown to significantly affect motivation, engagement, and output in service-oriented sectors (Nduati & Wanyoike, 2022). Extensive research demonstrates that higher job satisfaction directly correlates with improved job performance, as satisfied employees tend to exhibit greater commitment, productivity, and lower absenteeism (Chen et al., 2021). Similarly, workplace well-being has been identified as a critical antecedent of performance, with well-supported employees showing enhanced cognitive functioning and resilience, which translate into better task execution and organizational citizenship behaviors (Martinez & Lopez, 2022). These factors are well conceptualized within the Job Demands-Resources (JD-R) model, which posits that job demands can lead to strain unless balanced by adequate job resources, such as managerial support and role clarity, thereby influencing employee well-being and performance (Garcia et al., 2022). Despite this, sector-specific studies in facilities services remain limited, underscoring the need

for targeted research that bridges theoretical frameworks with operational realities (Parent-Lamarche et al., 2021).

Although prior studies have examined job satisfaction and workplace well-being in sectors such as healthcare, manufacturing, and education (Lahti & Kalakoski, 2023; Bourgault, 2022; Zabin et al., 2023), literature specific to business facilities services remains comparatively underdeveloped. Existing frameworks often overlook the unique nature of this industry—characterized by routine physical tasks, high client interaction, and varying contractual arrangements (Nduati & Wanyoike, 2022). This gap leaves limited empirical grounding for managerial decisions that affect service quality and employee well-being, particularly in outsourced or support service environments (Bratty & Dennis, 2024). Prior studies in healthcare and manufacturing sectors have consistently found that job satisfaction and well-being jointly predict job performance, highlighting the mediating role of psychological safety and engagement (Kumar & Singh, 2023). However, these relationships may manifest differently in facilities services due to the sector's unique operational demands, underscoring the need for context-specific research (Alvarez et al., 2023).

To address prevailing gaps in empirical research, the present study examines the relationship between workplace conditions and job performance among employees of an office facilities solutions service provider. Specifically, it investigates how factors such as the physical work environment, perceived organizational support, job security, and workload contribute to employee output, motivation, and overall effectiveness. By integrating theoretical insights with the operational realities of the facilities services sector, the study seeks to enhance understanding of workplace dynamics and promote employee-centered management strategies. This approach is grounded in Sustainable Human Resource Management (SHRM), which emphasizes the strategic integration of

employee well-being and satisfaction into organizational policies to foster long-term performance and resilience (Nguyen & Hoang, 2023). The research is guided by the following specific questions: (1) How do employees rate their levels of job satisfaction, workplace well-being, and job performance in an office facilities solutions service provider? (2) Is there a statistically significant correlation between job satisfaction and workplace well-being among employees? (3) To what extent do job satisfaction and workplace well-being significantly influence employees' job performance? (4) What are the practical implications of the relationships among job satisfaction, workplace well-being, and job performance for organizational policy, management practices, and employee support systems? To test these inquiries, the study adopts the following null hypotheses: (1) There is no statistically significant correlation between job satisfaction and workplace well-being among employees in an office facilities solutions service provider. (2) Job satisfaction does not significantly influence employees' job performance in an office facilities solutions service provider. (3) Workplace well-being does not significantly influence employees' job performance in an office facilities solutions service provider.

Methods

Research Design and Respondents

This study employed a descriptive-correlational design to examine the relationship between workplace conditions and job performance among employees of an office facilities solutions service provider. This design is appropriate because it allows for the investigation of naturally occurring relationships between variables in a real-world organizational setting without experimental manipulation. It provides valuable insights into how job satisfaction and workplace well-being co-vary with job performance, serving as a foundational step for future research that may employ longitudinal or experimental methods to establish causality. Specifically, the study tested the direct influence of workplace conditions on job performance. The design allowed for the identification of statistical relationships between variables. The target population comprised all

the workers of the specific office facilities solutions service provider, a company located in Cebu City, Philippines. A final sample size of 41 respondents cooperated to participate in the study. Convenience sampling was employed to select participants based on accessibility and willingness to participate. Participation was voluntary and subject to informed consent, thereby maintaining ethical integrity throughout the data collection process.

Instruments

A two-part survey questionnaire was used to assess the study variables, with each item rated on a 5-point Likert scale ranging from 1 (Strongly Disagree) to 5 (Strongly Agree). The first part comprised 8 items that evaluate multiple facets of employee job satisfaction and workplace well-being (Cronbach's $\alpha = .936$). It begins by exploring how opportunities to use one's skills and learn new things enhance intrinsic motivation and engagement (Spector, 2022). Role clarity is highlighted as essential to minimizing ambiguity and optimizing performance (Judge et al., 2021). The availability of time and support directly impacts job effectiveness and helps reduce burnout (Akca & Küçükoğlu, 2020). Physical safety and comfort are foundational to fostering psychological safety and supporting productivity (MacDonald, 2003). Respect and managerial support are shown to nurture trust and decrease turnover intentions (Nielsen et al., 2019), while clear and open communication contributes significantly to job satisfaction and transparency (Enyan et al., 2023). Feelings of job security and recognition for good work are associated with improved emotional well-being and employee retention (Cheng & Chan, 2018). Lastly, a manageable and well-distributed workload remains a key predictor of workplace stress and overall performance (Hasin et al., 2023).

The second part comprised 6 items that evaluate multiple facets of job performance in an office facilities solutions service provider (Cronbach's $\alpha = .939$). The questionnaire captures key behavioral indicators of employee job performance, emphasizing both task execution and organizational alignment. Adherence to job standards and punctuality reflect professional discipline and reliability (Zeng et al., 2025).

Timely task completion and willingness to do overtime work when necessary demonstrate commitment and flexibility, which are linked to enhanced productivity and mental energy recovery (Wang et al., 2021). Supporting company goals and complying with rules and laws indicate a strong sense of organizational citizenship and ethical conduct (Kuiper et al., 2022). Collectively, these behaviors contribute to a dynamic framework of performance that balances individual accountability with broader institutional success.

Data Collection Procedure

Data collection was conducted through direct engagement with the company, following formal approval from relevant authorities and securing the cooperation of prospective respondents. Participants were provided with printed questionnaires for survey completion. Informed consent was obtained electronically, and respondents were clearly assured of the confidentiality of their responses and the voluntary nature of their participation.

Data Analysis

To assess the interrelationships among job satisfaction, workplace well-being, and job performance, a series of statistical analyses were conducted. First, Pearson's correlation test was applied to evaluate whether a significant association exists between job satisfaction and workplace well-being. The analysis aimed to confirm or reject the null hypothesis that no statistically significant correlation exists between these constructs. Following this, multiple linear regression analysis was employed to determine the extent to which job satisfaction and workplace well-being predict job performance. Separate regression coefficients were interpreted to examine the individual influence

of each predictor on performance outcomes. Specifically, the analysis tested the null hypotheses that job satisfaction and workplace well-being do not significantly influence employees' job performance. Significance levels were set at $p < .05$, and standardized beta coefficients, R^2 values, and effect sizes were reported to gauge the strength of the relationships. These inferential procedures provided empirical evidence to either retain or reject each null hypothesis, guiding the interpretation of practical implications and informing management recommendations for the office facilities solutions service provider.

Ethical Considerations

Participants received comprehensive information regarding the study's objectives, scope, and any potential risks involved. Data collection was conducted anonymously, ensuring that no personally identifiable information was recorded. Participation was strictly voluntary, and respondents retained the right to withdraw from the study at any stage without consequence. The research protocol was guided by the ethical principles of the APA Ethics Code (2017), with particular emphasis on informed consent, confidentiality, and the responsible handling of research data.

Result and Discussion

Job Satisfaction, Workplace Well-being, and Job Performance Ratings

Job Satisfaction Ratings. Table 1 summarizes the mean scores and corresponding interpretations for various criteria associated with job satisfaction. The data were derived from survey responses using a five-point Likert scale, and the results reflect the perceived frequency with which each criterion was observed among respondents.

Table 1. Mean Scores and Interpretation of Job Satisfaction Criteria

Job Satisfaction Criteria	Mean Scores	Interpretation
1. Skill Utilization and Growth	3.78	Frequently Observed
2. Role Clarity	3.88	Frequently Observed
3. Managerial Respect	3.78	Frequently Observed
4. Effective Communication	3.76	Frequently Observed
5. Job Security and Recognition	3.85	Frequently Observed
Average	3.81	Frequently Observed

Note. Interpretation of mean scores: 1.00–1.80 = Never Observed; 1.81–2.60 = Seldom Observed; 2.61–3.40 = Occasionally Observed; 3.41–4.20 = Frequently Observed; 4.21–5.00 = Always Observed. Adapted from Warmbrod (2014).

The results indicate that all job satisfaction criteria were frequently observed by respondents, with mean scores ranging from 3.76 to 3.88. Notably, Role Clarity received the highest mean score (3.88), suggesting that employees felt confident in their understanding of job expectations. The overall average score of 3.81 reinforces the conclusion that the organization generally succeeds in promoting conditions that foster job satisfaction. These findings highlight areas of strength in employee experience, particularly in communication, respect from management, and perceived job security.

The consistently high mean scores across job satisfaction criteria suggest that the organization has cultivated a work environment conducive to employee engagement and well-being. The prominence of Role Clarity ($M = 3.88$) aligns with recent findings that clear expectations and defined responsibilities significantly enhance employee confidence and performance (Memon et al., 2023). Similarly, frequent observations of Managerial Respect and

Effective Communication reflect a healthy organizational culture, which has been shown to reduce turnover intention and improve retention (Jogi et al., 2024). The overall average score of 3.81 reinforces the notion that employees perceive their workplace positively, particularly in terms of psychological safety and recognition—factors increasingly linked to long-term commitment and productivity (Brower, 2023). These results imply that continued investment in transparent communication, supportive leadership, and recognition systems can further strengthen employee satisfaction and organizational effectiveness.

Workplace Well-being Ratings. Table 2 presents the mean scores and corresponding interpretations for selected indicators of workplace well-being as perceived by respondents. The data were collected using a five-point Likert scale and analyzed to determine the frequency with which key well-being criteria are observed in the workplace environment.

Table 2. Mean Scores and Interpretation of Workplace Well-being Criteria

Workplace Well-being Criteria	Mean Scores	Interpretation
1. Job support	3.93	Frequently Observed
2. Physical Comfort and Safety	3.73	Frequently Observed
3. Workload Balance	3.83	Frequently Observed
Average	3.83	Frequently Observed

Note. Interpretation of mean scores: 1.00–1.80 = Never Observed; 1.81–2.60 = Seldom Observed; 2.61–3.40 = Occasionally Observed; 3.41–4.20 = Frequently Observed; 4.21–5.00 = Always Observed. Adapted from Warmbrod (2014).

The findings show that all three workplace well-being criteria were frequently observed by participants, with Job Support receiving the highest mean score (3.93). This suggests that employees generally feel adequately supported in performing their roles. Workload Balance ($M = 3.83$) and Physical Comfort and Safety ($M = 3.73$) also reflect favorable conditions, indicating that most employees perceive their work environments as safe, comfortable, and manageable. With an overall average of 3.83, the data suggest that the organization fosters a

consistently positive well-being experience. These outcomes may contribute significantly to enhancing employee morale, engagement, and performance.

The consistently high mean scores across workplace well-being criteria suggest that the organization has successfully cultivated an environment that supports employee morale, engagement, and performance. The prominence of Job Support ($M = 3.93$) aligns with recent findings that managerial and peer support are critical drivers of psychological safety and job

satisfaction (WebMD Health Services, 2025; APA, 2023). Favorable ratings for Workload Balance and Physical Comfort and Safety further reinforce the importance of ergonomic and manageable work conditions, which have been shown to reduce stress and improve retention (Heron & Bharava, 2024). These results imply that organizations prioritizing well-being through structural support and safe environments are better positioned to foster resilience, reduce burnout, and enhance overall productivity. As workplace expectations evolve, embedding well-being into organiza-

tional strategy is not only beneficial for employees—it is essential for long-term sustainability and competitiveness (Thompson & Boulton, 2023).

Job Performance Ratings. Table 3 displays the mean scores and corresponding interpretations for six indicators of job performance among employees, based on responses to a five-point Likert scale. These criteria reflect behavioral and productivity-related dimensions commonly evaluated in organizational performance assessments.

Table 3. Mean Scores and Interpretation of Job Performance Criteria

Job Performance Criteria	Mean Scores	Interpretation
1. Standards Compliance	3.83	Frequently Observed
2. Goal Alignment	3.88	Frequently Observed
3. Timely Task Completion	3.81	Frequently Observed
4. Flexible Commitment	3.71	Frequently Observed
5. Regulatory Compliance	3.93	Frequently Observed
6. Punctuality	3.78	Frequently Observed
Average	3.82	Frequently Observed

Note. Interpretation of mean scores: 1.00–1.80 = Never Observed; 1.81–2.60 = Seldom Observed; 2.61–3.40 = Occasionally Observed; 3.41–4.20 = Frequently Observed; 4.21–5.00 = Always Observed. Adapted from Warmbrod (2014).

The results show that all job performance criteria were frequently observed across the sample, with mean scores ranging from 3.71 to 3.93. Regulatory Compliance received the highest mean score ($M = 3.93$), suggesting that employees strongly adhere to rules and legal standards. Goal Alignment ($M = 3.88$) and Standards Compliance ($M = 3.83$) also received high ratings, reflecting strong alignment with organizational objectives and job expectations. The overall mean of 3.82 indicates that desirable performance behaviors are consistently exhibited in the workplace. These findings suggest a positive and compliant work culture, marked by disciplined task execution, responsible conduct, and commitment to institutional standards.

The consistently high ratings across job performance criteria suggest that the organization fosters a disciplined and goal-oriented work culture. The prominence of Regulatory Compliance ($M = 3.93$) reflects employees'

strong adherence to legal and ethical standards, which is increasingly recognized as a cornerstone of sustainable organizational success (Memon et al., 2023). High scores in Goal Alignment and Standards Compliance further indicate that employees are not only aware of institutional expectations but actively contribute to strategic objectives (Alqarni et al., 2023). These findings align with recent literature emphasizing that performance behaviors such as punctuality, task completion, and rule adherence are closely linked to organizational effectiveness and employee engagement (Nduati & Wanyoike, 2022). Moreover, a culture of compliance and accountability has been shown to reduce operational risks and enhance trust among stakeholders (Alves & Lourenço, 2021). As organizations navigate increasingly complex regulatory and competitive landscapes, reinforcing these performance behaviors through targeted training, recognition systems, and transparent evaluation processes can yield

long-term benefits in productivity, retention, and institutional reputation.

Correlation between Job Satisfaction and Workplace Well-being

Table 4 displays the results of a Pearson correlation analysis and regression model sum-

mary evaluating the strength of the relationship between job satisfaction and workplace well-being. The analysis was conducted to determine how well the variability in workplace well-being can be explained by job satisfaction among the sample population.

Table 4. Pearson Correlation and Model Summary for Job Satisfaction and Workplace Well-being

Model	R	R ²	Adjusted R ²	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.991	.983	.982	.136

Note. R = Pearson correlation coefficient; R² = coefficient of determination.

The Pearson correlation coefficient ($R = .991$) indicates an extremely strong positive relationship between job satisfaction and workplace well-being. The model explains 98.3% of the variance in workplace well-being ($R^2 = .983$), with an adjusted R^2 of .982, confirming a very high level of predictive accuracy even after accounting for degrees of freedom. The standard error of the estimate is low ($SE = .136$), suggesting a close fit between observed and predicted values. These results suggest that job satisfaction is a highly reliable predictor of workplace well-being in the population studied.

The exceptionally strong correlation between job satisfaction and workplace well-being ($R = .991$, $p < .01$) reinforces the strategic importance of fostering positive work environments in contemporary organizations. Recent research highlights that when employees perceive their workplace as supportive and engaging, their overall satisfaction and psychological resilience improve significantly (Kartali & Gkliati, 2024). This relationship suggests that well-being initiatives—such as mental health support, flexible work arrangements, and inclusive leadership—can serve as powerful levers for enhancing job satisfaction (Ahamed &

Pragathi, 2023). Moreover, sustainable human resource management practices that integrate well-being metrics into organizational strategy have been shown to boost employee engagement and retention, thereby reinforcing satisfaction and long-term performance (Sypniewska et al., 2023). These findings align with broader evidence that employee well-being is not only a moral imperative but also a driver of productivity and institutional success (De Neve et al., 2019). Organizations that prioritize holistic well-being are better positioned to cultivate a resilient, motivated workforce capable of thriving in dynamic and demanding environments.

Job Satisfaction and Workplace Well-being Influencing Job Performance

Table 5 presents the results of an analysis of variance (ANOVA) conducted to assess the overall significance of the regression model predicting job performance based on job satisfaction and workplace well-being. This test determines whether the model explains a statistically significant portion of the variance in the dependent variable compared to unexplained variation.

Table 5. Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) for the Regression Model

Source	df	SS	MS	F	p-value
Regression	2	39.88	19.94	1084.44	< .001
Residual	38	0.70	0.018		
Total	40	40.58			

Note. The ANOVA indicates that the regression model is statistically significant, $F(2, 38) = 1084.44$, $p < .001$.

The ANOVA results reveal a highly significant regression model, $F(2, 38) = 1084.44$, $p < .001$, indicating that the predictors collectively explain a substantial portion of the variance in job performance. The model's mean square for regression ($MS = 19.94$) far exceeds the mean square for residual error ($MS = 0.018$), demonstrating that the variation explained by the model is meaningfully greater than what remains unexplained. This strongly supports the hypothesis that job satisfaction and workplace well-being are statistically significant contributors to job performance in the population studied.

The highly significant regression model ($F(2, 38) = 1084.44$, $p < .001$) underscores the powerful predictive influence of job satisfaction and workplace well-being on job performance. This finding aligns with recent research emphasizing that employees who experience psychological comfort and satisfaction in their roles are more likely to demonstrate higher productivity, engagement, and organizational commitment (Dumitriu et al., 2025; Aggarwal

et al., 2023). The substantial difference between explained and unexplained variance suggests that these psychosocial factors are not peripheral but central to performance outcomes. Moreover, studies have shown that supportive work environments and well-being initiatives—such as flexible work arrangements, recognition systems, and mental health resources—can significantly enhance employee output and reduce turnover (Krekel et al., 2019; Sironi, 2019). These results advocate for a strategic shift in human resource management, where fostering well-being and satisfaction is not merely a cultural goal but a measurable driver of institutional success.

Table 6 presents the results of the multiple linear regression analysis examining the predictive relationship between job satisfaction and workplace well-being on the criterion variable, job performance. The table includes unstandardized coefficients (B), standard errors, test statistics (t), significance levels (p-values), and 95% confidence intervals for each predictor.

Table 6. Regression Coefficients for Predicting Job Performance from Job Satisfaction and Workplace Well-being

Predictor	B	Std. Error	t	p-value	95% CI Lower	95% CI Upper
(Intercept)	-0.374	0.093	-4.03	<.001	-0.562	-0.186
Job Satisfaction	0.627	0.081	7.72	<.001	0.462	0.791
Workplace Well-being	0.472	0.082	5.75	<.001	0.306	0.638

Note. Both predictors—Job Satisfaction and Workplace Well-being—significantly contribute to the regression model predicting job performance.

The regression results indicate that both job satisfaction and workplace well-being are statistically significant predictors of job performance, with $p < .001$ for each. Specifically, for every one-unit increase in job satisfaction, job performance is expected to increase by approximately 0.627 units, while a one-unit increase in workplace well-being corresponds to an increase of 0.472 units. The narrow confidence intervals and large t-values further confirm the precision and strength of these relationships. The negative intercept suggests that, in the absence of the predictors, the model estimates a baseline job performance score below zero, which may reflect the scaling or nature of the measurement. Overall, the model

demonstrates strong predictive utility in explaining variations in job performance based on psychosocial workplace factors.

The regression results affirm that both job satisfaction and workplace well-being are powerful predictors of job performance, reinforcing the strategic value of psychosocial factors in organizational success. Recent studies emphasize that employees who experience high levels of satisfaction and well-being are more likely to demonstrate increased productivity, engagement, and resilience (Dong & Yan, 2022; Ahamed & Pragathi, 2023). The strong predictive coefficients in this model suggest that even modest improvements in these areas can yield

measurable gains in performance. Organizations that invest in mental health support, inclusive leadership, and flexible work arrangements not only enhance employee morale but also drive operational efficiency (Krekel et al., 2019; Sironi, 2019). Moreover, the precision of the model underscores the reliability of these relationships, encouraging HR professionals to embed well-being metrics into performance management systems. As workplace dynamics evolve, prioritizing employee satisfaction and well-being is not just ethically sound—it is a data-driven imperative for sustainable growth.

Despite these significant findings, several limitations should be acknowledged. The use of self-reported data may introduce response biases such as social desirability and common method variance, which could inflate the observed relationships. Furthermore, the study's sample was limited to a single organization within a specific geographic and industry context, restricting the generalizability of the results to other sectors or cultural settings. Additionally, the cross-sectional design prevents conclusions about causality or changes over time. Addressing these limitations in future research through longitudinal designs, multi-source data collection, and broader sampling would strengthen the robustness and applicability of the findings.

Implications of the Study

The findings underscore the critical role of job satisfaction and workplace well-being as foundational drivers of job performance. The strong statistical relationships—highlighted by a near-perfect correlation ($r = .96$) and highly predictive regression coefficients ($R^2 = .983$)—suggest that when employees feel supported, respected, and secure in their roles, they are significantly more likely to perform effectively and align with organizational goals. This reinforces the importance of cultivating a work environment that prioritizes role clarity, managerial respect, effective communication, and job support. Moreover, the consistently high mean scores across all criteria indicate that employees perceive their organization positively in terms of both experience and behavior. These perceptions are not only linked to individual outcomes like engagement and satisfaction but

also to broader organizational benefits such as retention, productivity, and compliance (Sypniewska et al., 2023; Memon et al., 2023). The study also supports the integration of sustainable human resource management (SHRM) practices, where well-being and satisfaction are treated as strategic assets. Organizations that embed these values into their culture and policies are better positioned to foster resilience, reduce burnout, and maintain high performance standards (Krekel et al., 2019; Alves & Lourenço, 2021).

Summary of Findings

The study found that employees frequently observed job satisfaction, workplace well-being, and job performance behaviors in their organization. Specifically, role clarity, job support, and regulatory compliance were among the highest-rated criteria in each category, with overall averages above 3.80 on a five-point scale. Statistical analyses revealed an extremely strong positive correlation between job satisfaction and workplace well-being ($r = .96$), and both were significant predictors of job performance, as confirmed by regression results ($R^2 = .983$) and ANOVA significance ($F(2, 38) = 1084.44, p < .001$). These findings suggest a work environment characterized by clear roles, supportive conditions, and disciplined performance—all contributing to positive organizational outcomes.

Conclusion

This study examined the relationships among job satisfaction, workplace well-being, and job performance in an office facilities solutions provider. Employees reported high levels of role clarity, managerial respect, and support. A very strong positive correlation between job satisfaction and well-being ($r = .96, p < .01$) was found, and both significantly predicted job performance, explaining 98.3% of its variance ($R^2 = .983, F(2, 38) = 1084.44, p < .001$). These findings confirm the research objectives by showing that satisfaction and well-being are closely linked and strongly influence performance.

Managers should act on these insights by implementing wellness programs, employee support systems like mentoring and counseling, clear communication to reinforce roles and

respect, manageable workloads, and recognition initiatives. Such practices foster engagement, reduce burnout, and enhance performance and organizational success.

Future research should validate these findings across cultures, use longitudinal designs to track changes over time, and compare sectors to understand contextual differences. These steps will strengthen the generalizability and depth of understanding of these critical workplace dynamics.

Acknowledgement

We would like to express my deepest gratitude to our postgraduate studies professors and instructors for their guidance, encouragement, and support throughout the development of this research. This work would not have been possible without the generous help and assistance of Ms. Janeth Balansag, Center Manager of XOffice Cebu – thank you for your unwavering support. We are also thankful to the CIT-U RASAP Program for the opportunity and resources it provided. Lastly, we extend my heartfelt appreciation to my family for their love, patience, and constant inspiration.

References

- Aggarwal, A., Sharma, D., Vohra, P., Sharma, S., & Sharma, V. (2023). Work environment and job satisfaction among employees. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, 11(1), 126. <https://ijip.in/wp-content/uploads/2023/03/18.01.126.20231101.pdf>
- Ahamed, M. I., & Pragathi, A. S. (2023). Investigating the relationship between employee well-being programs and job satisfaction. *Journal of Survey in Fisheries Sciences*, 10(2S), 2798–2812. <https://www.sifish-eriessciences.com/index.php/journal/article/download/2798/2000/3514>
- Akca, M., & Küçükoğlu, M. T. (2020). *Relationships between mental workload, burnout, and job performance: A research among academicians*. In A. Realyvásquez-Vargas et al. (Eds.), *Evaluating mental workload for improved workplace performance* (pp. 49–68). IGI Global. <https://doi.org/10.4018/978-1-7998-1052-0.ch003>
- Alqarni, S., Hamsan, H., Rasdi, R. M., & Rahman, H. A. (2023). A systematic literature review on job performance in diverse organizations from 2010 to 2023. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(18), 1–41. <https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i18/19960>
- Alvarez, M., Torres, J., & Ramirez, L. (2023). Understanding employee engagement in facilities management: A sector-specific approach. *Journal of Facilities Management*, 21(2), 150–168. <https://doi.org/10.1108/JFM-08-2022-0067>
- Alves, I., & Lourenço, S. M. (2021). Subjective performance evaluation and managerial work outcomes. *Accounting and Business Research*, 53(2), 127–157. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00014788.2021.1959292>
- American Psychological Association. (2023). *2023 Work in America™ Survey: Workplaces as engines of psychological health and well-being*. <https://www.apa.org/pubs/reports/work-in-america/2023-workplace-health-well-being>
- Bourgault, A. M. (2022). The nursing shortage and work expectations are in critical condition: Is anyone listening? *Critical Care Nurse*, 42(2), 8–11. <https://doi.org/10.4037/ccn2022909>
- Bratty, A. J., & Dennis, N. C. (2024). The efficacy of employee strengths interventions on desirable workplace outcomes. *Current Psychology*, 43(18), 16514–16532. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-05607-9>
- Brower, T. (2023, June 4). *Job satisfaction is rising: What's behind the surprising trend*. Forbes. <https://www.forbes.com/sites/tracybrower/2023/06/04/job-satisfaction-is-rising-whats-behind-the-surprising-trend>
- Chen, Y., Zhang, H., & Li, X. (2021). The impact of job satisfaction on employee performance: A meta-analytic review. *Journal of Business Research*, 134, 1–12. <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusres.2021.04.012>

- Cheng, G. H.-L., & Chan, D. K.-S. (2018). Who suffers more from job insecurity? A meta-analytic review. *Applied Psychology*, 67(3), 623–664.
<https://doi.org/10.1111/apps.12108>
- De Neve, J.-E., Krekel, C., & Ward, G. (2019). Employee well-being, productivity, and firm performance: Evidence and case studies. *Global Happiness and Wellbeing Policy Report*. https://www.hbs.edu/ris/Publication%20Files/gh19_ch5_9e171d71-db54-4e08-a2eb-3cf1587daf4a.pdf
- Dong, J., & Yan, S. (2022). A multicriteria approach for measuring employee well-being. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 13, Article 795960.
<https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2022.795960>
- Dumitriu, S., Bocean, C. G., Vărzaru, A. A., Al-Floarei, A. T., Sperdea, N. M., Popescu, F. L., & Băloi, I.-C. (2025). The role of the workplace environment in shaping employees' well-being. *Sustainability*, 17(6), 2613.
<https://doi.org/10.3390/su17062613>
- Enyan, M., Bangura, J. N., Mangu, M. P. A. A., & Abban, O. J. (2023). Impact of communication on employees' job satisfaction: A review. *EPRA International Journal of Multidisciplinary Research*, 9(6).
<https://doi.org/10.36713/epri13815>
- Garcia, P., Martinez, R., & Torres, L. (2022). The Job Demands-Resources model in service sectors: A systematic review and future directions. *Human Resource Management Review*, 32(3), 100847.
<https://doi.org/10.1016/j.hrmr.2021.100847>
- Hasin, H., Hussain, W. S., Nordin, E., Jamil, A., & Johari, Y. C. (2023). The impact of workload, management factors, and job insecurity on employee well-being: A review of recent research. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 13(4), 1002–1011.
<https://doi.org/10.6007/IJARBS/v13-i4/16703>
- Heron, R., & Bharava, R. (2024). *Measuring what matters: Assessing workplace mental health and well-being*. World Economic Forum. https://www3.weforum.org/docs/WEF_Assessing_Workplace_Mental_Health_and_Well-being_2024.pdf
- Jogi, S., Vashisth, K. K., Srivastava, S., Alturas, B., & Kumar, D. (2024). Job satisfaction and turnover intention: A comprehensive review of the shared determinants. *Human Systems Management*.
<https://doi.org/10.1177/01672533241303286>
- Judge, T. A., Zhang, S. C., & Glerum, D. R. (2021). *Job satisfaction*. In V. I. Sessa & N. A. Bowling (Eds.), *Essentials of job attitudes and other workplace psychological constructs* (pp. 207–241). Routledge.
<https://doi.org/10.4324/9780429325755-11>
- Kartali, A.-M., & Gkliati, A. (2024). The connection among burnout, work engagement, resilience and job satisfaction: Empirical research on the private sector employees in Greece. *International Journal of Education and Psychology in the Community*, 14(1 & 2), 36–58. https://www.mari-anjournals.com/files/IJEPC_articles/Vol_14_no_1_and_2_2024/Kartali_Gkliati_IJEPC_2024_14_1_2_36_58.pdf
- Krekel, C., Ward, G., & De Neve, J.-E. (2019). Employee well-being, productivity, and firm performance: Evidence and case studies. *Global Happiness and Wellbeing Policy Report*. https://www.hbs.edu/ris/Publication%20Files/gh19_ch5_9e171d71-db54-4e08-a2eb-3cf1587daf4a.pdf
- Kuiper, M. E., Chambon, M., de Bruijn, A. L., Reinders Folmer, C., Olthuis, E. H., Brownlee, M., Kooistra, E. B., Fine, A., van Harreveld, F., Lunansky, G., & van Rooij, B. (2022). A network approach to compliance: A complexity science understanding of how rules shape behavior. *Journal of Business Ethics*. Advance online publication. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s10551-022-05128-8>
- Kumar, R., & Singh, P. (2023). Psychological safety as a mediator between job satisfaction, well-being, and performance: A study in healthcare settings. *Work & Stress*, 37(1), 45–62.
<https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2022.2101234>

- Lahti, H., & Kalakoski, V. (2023). Work stressors and their controllability: Content analysis of employee perceptions of hindrances to the flow of work in the health care sector. *Current Psychology. Advance online publication*. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s12144-023-04328-3>
- MacDonald, W. (2003). The impact of job demands and workload on stress and fatigue. *Australian Psychologist*, 38(2), 102–117. <https://doi.org/10.1080/00050060310001707107>
- Martinez, S., & Lopez, F. (2022). Workplace well-being and its influence on employee performance: Evidence from service industries. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 33(5), 987–1005. <https://doi.org/10.1080/09585192.2020.1785402>
- Memon, A. H., Khahro, S. H., Memon, N. A., Memon, Z. A., & Mustafa, A. (2023). Relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance in the construction industry of Pakistan. *Sustainability*, 15(11), 8699. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15118699>
- Nduati, M. M., & Wanyoike, R. (2022). Employee performance management practices and organizational effectiveness. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 3(10), 361–378. https://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajhrba_v3_i10_361_378.pdf
- Nduati, M. M., & Wanyoike, R. (2022). Employee performance management practices and organizational effectiveness. *International Academic Journal of Human Resource and Business Administration*, 3(10), 361–378. https://www.iajournals.org/articles/iajhrba_v3_i10_361_378.pdf
- Nguyen, T. H., & Hoang, D. T. (2023). Sustainable HRM and employee well-being: Evidence from service industries. *Sustainability*, 15(4), 3125. <https://doi.org/10.3390/su15043125>
- Nielsen, K., Yarker, J., Munir, F., & Bültmann, U. (2019). Leadership and employee well-being: The role of psychosocial work characteristics. *Work & Stress*, 33(2), 144–164. <https://doi.org/10.1080/02678373.2019.1615561>
- Parent-Lamarche, A., Marchand, A., & Saade, S. (2021). How do work organization conditions affect job performance? The mediating role of workers' well-being. *Journal of Workplace Behavioral Health*, 36(1), 48–76. <https://doi.org/10.1080/15555240.2021.1872382>
- Sironi, E. (2019). Job satisfaction as a determinant of employees' optimal well-being in an instrumental variable approach. *Quality & Quantity*, 53, 1721–1742. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11135-019-00835-3>
- Smith, J., & Lee, K. (2021). Revisiting Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory in contemporary service industries: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 42(7), 865–882. <https://doi.org/10.1002/job.2512>
- Spector, P. E. (2022). *Job satisfaction: From assessment to intervention*. Routledge. <https://doi.org/10.4324/9781003250616>
- Sypniewska, B., Baran, M., & Kłos, M. (2023). Work engagement and employee satisfaction in the practice of sustainable human resource management. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 19, 1069–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-023-00834-9>
- Sypniewska, B., Baran, M., & Kłos, M. (2023). Work engagement and employee satisfaction in the practice of sustainable human resource management. *International Entrepreneurship and Management Journal*, 19, 1069–1100. <https://doi.org/10.1007/s11365-023-00834-9>
- Thompson, R., & Boulton, M. (2023). *2023 Global Workplace Well-Being Summary*. The Myers-Briggs Company. [https://www.the-myersbriggs.com/-/media/Myers-Briggs/Files/GLOBAL/Company/Research/2023 Workplace wellbeing research summary.pdf](https://www.the-myersbriggs.com/-/media/Myers-Briggs/Files/GLOBAL/Company/Research/2023%20Workplace%20wellbeing%20research%20summary.pdf)

- Wang, X., Janiszewski, C., Zheng, Y., Laran, J., & Jang, W. E. (2021). Deriving mental energy from task completion. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 12, Article 717414. <https://doi.org/10.3389/fpsyg.2021.717414>
- Warmbrod, J. R. (2014). Reporting and interpreting scores derived from Likert-type scales. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 55(5), 30–47. <https://files.eric.ed.gov/fulltext/EJ1122774.pdf>
- WebMD Health Services. (2025). *Workplace Well-Being in 2025: Insights from the Workplace and Employee Survey*. <https://www.webmd-healthservices.com/wp-content/uploads/2025/06/WebMD-Health-Services-Center-for-Research-2025-Workplace-and-Employee-Survey-Results.pdf>
- Williams, K. M. (2023, October 1). Measuring bias in job performance evaluation: Applying workplace contextualization and empirical assessment development criteria. *The Score*. <https://www.apadivisions.org/division-5/publications/score/2023/10/bias-in-job-evaluation>
- Zabin, L. M., Abu Zaitoun, R. S., Sweity, E. M., & de Tantillo, L. (2023). The relationship between job stress and patient safety culture among nurses: A systematic review. *BMC Nursing*, 22, Article 39. <https://doi.org/10.1186/s12912-023-01198-9>
- Zeng, Y., Tsai Jan, C., Zhao, M., & Robitaille, N. (2025). More done, more drained: Being further along in a mundane experience feels worse. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 129(2), 244–265. <https://doi.org/10.1037/pspa0000446>