



INVESTIGATING THE IMPACT OF BUSINESS ALIGNMENT ON JOB GRATIFICATION IN AN ORGANIZATION: THE CASE OF A UNIVERSITY IN EGYPT

Said Abdo¹⁺
David Edgar²

¹School of Marketing and Management AL Nahda University (NUB),
Egypt.

Email: d.a.edgar@gcu.ac.uk

²Glasgow Caledonian University, Scotland.



(+ Corresponding author)

ABSTRACT

Article History

Received: 4 January 2019

Revised: 13 February 2019

Accepted: 22 March 2019

Published: 20 May 2019

Keywords:

Job gratification
Corporate
Intrapreneurship
Alignment of business strategies
Egypt.

JEL Classification:

M1; C83; C12; M51.

The purpose of this study was to investigate effects of business alignment and job gratifications of employees in a university, viewed as a corporate organization. This study examined if there was an empirically demonstrable connection between these two variables. This empirical research was conducted through a survey on a research sample of 200 employees of an Egyptian University. The results of this study found that there was no significant relationship between these two variables. However, it was found that employees' job gratification can be sensitive to both positive and negative influences from certain business alignments and job gratification factors. The study concluded that there was relatively little impact of business alignment on job gratification while employee performance has only a very small impact on mediating relationship between business alignment and job gratification. Nevertheless, it is concluded that, in the university context, management should address, promote and monitor corporate intrapreneurship in the organization, eventually creating an organization with employees who are satisfied in their jobs. Managements in such organizations should therefore align themselves towards the promotion of corporate intrapreneurship activities by being receptive to, and by encouraging and rewarding innovative suggestions from employees.

Contribution/Originality: As research on the effect of business alignment on job gratification in organizations is scant, and theoretical and practical contributions have not produced a clear answer to the real nature and effect of the influence of business alignment and job gratification on employee performance, this research attempts to provide an additional contribution to knowledge by testing the relationship between business alignment and job gratification in a particular context: the university viewed as a corporate institution.

1. INTRODUCTION

Business alignment has become a central concept in the domain of entrepreneurship. It refers to strategy-making processes that provide organizations with a basis for business decisions and actions. Drawing on prior research on strategy-making processes and entrepreneurship, measurement scales of business alignment and their relationships with job gratification have been developed and widely used (Ginsberg and Hay, 1994).

Although much attention has been paid to study this relationship, there have been surprisingly few studies on interactions between business alignment and job gratification in a university's role as a corporate organization. In order to fill this gap, it was necessary to understand the linkage between business alignment and job gratification,

in the context of a university considered as a corporate organisation, Universities in modern era have a corporate function owing to the competitive atmosphere of international education and also to establish a stronger foundation for understanding these links.

Organizations that encourage entrepreneurship and nurture the talents of their people are very valuable for society. Such organizations are increasingly placed in situations where it is necessary to incline toward entrepreneurial business alignment activities. These organizations foster conditions by which the spirit of entrepreneurship governs the whole organization, and employees can approach business activities, whether individually or in a group (Wiklund, 1999). This may also include the concept of “intrapreneurship, which is used to refer to an entrepreneurial spirit, activities and policies in an established business management activity, and job satisfaction of employees, which is considered as one of the most significant elements of organizational behaviour in businesses” (Yildirim and Pazarcik, 2014). An intrapreneur is a corporate employee who turns an idea into a profitable finished product through risk taking and innovation, which can also be the case in a university, where the intrapreneur fosters creative use of the university’s technical resources and expertise as well as devises ways of improving its internal functions and external competitiveness.

Universities as corporate organizations should promote both entrepreneurial and intrapreneurial business activities and job gratification among their employees. One of the most important factors that facilitate either entrepreneurship or intrapreneurship within a university is a suitable organizational structure that is appropriate to its goals and mission. Any organization that intends to conduct successful business activities must adopt a flexible business structure (McFarlin and Sweeney, 1992). This also applies to modern universities that have to compete in international arena for students and academic status and ranking. Thus universities should act in a more corporate manner than what is traditionally expected.

1.1. Aim and Objectives of the Research

This study aims to investigate effects of business alignment of employees and their job gratification in a university context where the focus is on intrapreneurship rather than entrepreneurship.

Suitable conditions for business alignment activities cannot be created without necessary requirements, but an organization has to lay ground through identifying factors for such a support. The identification of such required factors plays an important role in creating a business space and reinforcing the flow of creativity and innovation in organization. Therefore, the objectives of this research were to investigate the effects of these different factors in a university context. The factors identified for this study were business alignment and job gratification. The study aims to understand their relationships and to find out how employees’ orientations and tendencies are directed toward business activities in order to improve the level of organizational entrepreneurship (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996).

2. LITERATURE REVIEW

Previous studies have focused on:

1. Exploring the relationship between business alignment and job gratification in corporate and for-profit business organisations.
2. Investigating the influence of leadership styles and business alignment of top-level managers’ in SMEs on the performance of businesses.
3. Evaluating the effect of employee’s performance on organizational structure.

This research takes a different focus from previous studies and instead investigates the relationship between business alignment and job gratification, as there has been much debate on the relation of these two concepts. This study examines how this relationship operates in the context of a university viewed as a corporate organisation,

where employee intrapreneurship is seen more beneficial in fulfilling the aims of the organisation. However, the focus of this study was on the relationship of business alignment and job gratification, time and space did not permit exploration of the concept of the modern university as a corporate entity, so in the present context the sampled university will be treated as a functioning business entity in order to undertake a more generally applicable study.

2.1. Business Alignment

Business alignment is conceptualized as factors involved in decision making, taking risks in order to achieve a goal, being innovative, being proactive or reactive in responding to opportunities and facing challenges through competitive aggressiveness and seek competitive advantage (Lumpkin and Dess, 1996; Bruining and Wright, 2002). In other words, business alignment involves having a system, method or plan (Miller, 1983) or it refers to a process, to show how a firm performs certain activities, rather than just what it does (Bruining and Wright, 2002). Business alignment involves leadership skills, proactive decision-making arrangements, and advancing the individual employee's personal autonomy and responsibility to make decisions and undertake actions to take advantage of a competitive environment. This includes the independence or freedom of action of an individual or team in taking up an idea or experience and carrying it through to completion, as well as the capability to be self-directed. The concept of business alignment can apply to individuals as well as organizations, in a multidimensional phenomenon composed of processes, steps and acquired behavior patterns (Bruining and Wright, 2002).

Most of these factors can be generalized and grouped according to the members of an organization. For instance, factors like innovation, risk-taking, pioneering, an aggressive approach and autonomy generally work together to improve the business job performance of an organization (Dess and Lumpkin, 2005). Yao *et al.* (2009) believe that "autonomy is the most important factor among the dimensions of the business job performance". They found that autonomy is the most active and adequate agent influencing the performance of the organization. Katsikea *et al.* (2011) also suggest that centralization has a negative relationship with job independence and job diversity.

Innovation is another factor that represents the extent of the willingness of companies to access new ideas and creative procedures whose outcome might be the emergence of a modern product, services and / or technological procedures. Innovation involves differentiating the company from its current technologies and moving above its current condition (Chadwick *et al.*, 2008). Risk-taking means the willingness of the company to allocate its main research efforts to projects that might or might not be achieved. It is possible for these projects to be unfulfilled; however, risk-taking is directed to the rapid seizing of opportunities, and speedy embarking on research (Tabak *et al.*, 2007). Pioneering organizations examine the market processes, figure out the future wishes of the customers, and forecast changes in demand or any problem that can lead to new opportunities for the company.

Business alignment has also been accepted as a means of analyzing the diversity of a firm's performance (Keh *et al.*, 2007). Because business alignment is reflected in the hierarchical arrangement of lines of authority, communication, and the rights and duties of an organization, it can be seen as key evidence of how a business utilizes its opportunities (Wiklund and Shepherd, 2003). It includes the most important and valuable actions and the affective factors in building different dimensions of an organization. In order to successfully respond to the newly emerging conditions, organizations need to orient their employees to behave entrepreneurially. Entrepreneurship is now recognized as an important tool for the development of job performance, because the entrepreneurial person can lay the ground for success. However, it is also possible for individuals in a business to be intrapreneurs. According to Hisrich (1990) an intrapreneur is an individual who has conducted previously non-existent innovative business foundation and market entry for the profit of the organization. Many studies have acknowledged that there is a significant relationship between intrapreneurship and job satisfaction (Weaver and Franz, 1992; Rutherford and Holt, 2007). This was a trigger for our research to investigate this relationship, where the university's employees

can take an intrapreneurial stance to develop innovative products, procedures and practices that will make the university more effective in the activities that fulfil its mission.

In the current context, attention can be drawn to organizational business which, as a component of global economy, is imperative for every manager to know about it, to understand it and create it in their organization (Naumann, 1993). Organizational business refers to innovative products and procedures that are created through building a business culture in a pre-established organization (Hornsby *et al.*, 1993). Such organizations that desire to succeed in organizational business need to execute business alignment. Business alignment in this context refers to the recognition of the strategies that a business adopts (Naumann, 1993). Business alignment also involves a mental framework and a point of view on entrepreneurship that is seen in the current process of the company and the organizational culture of an organization (Naldi *et al.*, 2007). Most findings have agreed that if an organization has a powerful business alignment, it represents the intentions and activities of the key factors in the procedures of changing in the light of the newly emerging opportunities.

2.2 Job Gratification

Job gratification refers to an individual's constructive and enjoyable sense of the consequence of the job he or she performs (Shahmohammadi, 2015) and both the work and the nature of work are regarded as two important factors affecting job gratification (Seashore and Thomas, 1975). According to Locke (1976) job gratification is a self-believed feeling, based on the assessment of one's job or from job experience. Others believe it is not as simplistic as this definition suggests. Instead, it involves multidimensional psychological responses to one's job. Job satisfaction measures vary in the extent to which they measure feelings about the job: these can be affective job gratification or cognitions about the job (cognitive job gratification).

A large number of factors can affect employees' physical or psychological sensations and may be considered independently to job gratification. Porter and Lawler (1968) classify such factors into "Internal gratification factors related to the work itself (such as feeling of achievement, feeling of control, feeling of independence, self-esteem, feeling of victory, feeling of feedback", and the "external satisfactory factors not directly related to work itself (such as receiving praise from the boss, good relationships with colleagues, good working environment, high salary, good welfare and utilities)". In terms of relationships, employees also tend to satisfy their communication desires, such as participation and self-justification through intercommunication with their colleagues and supervisors (Hatfield and Huseman, 1982; Walter *et al.*, 2005). If these desires are met through proper and adequate communication, a positive mutual relation between communication gratification and job gratification may be created (Rings *et al.*, 1979).

The concept of job gratification has been developed in many ways by different researchers and practitioners. While some of the conceptualizations of job gratification focus on the characteristics needed to do the job (Rice *et al.*, 1989), others have attempted a conceptualization based on total overall satisfaction (Levin and Stokes, 1989) a few have used concepts on the intrinsic-extrinsic dimensions (Naumann, 1993). It is assessed at the global level, whether the individual is satisfied with the job overall, or at the facet level, i.e. whether the individual is satisfied with only specific aspects of a job.

Monetary compensation has been found to be one of the most important explanatory variables for job gratification (Kalleberg, 1977; Voydanoff, 1980; Taylor and Vest, 1992). However, it has also been found that employees who conduct tasks which involve high levels of accomplishment will be able to exert control and command over the tasks; thus, autonomy, feedback and knowledge of job significance lead to higher levels of job gratification than those of their counterparts who perform tasks that are low on those attributes (Hackman and Lawler, 1971). Similarly, self-expression in business positions (Voydanoff (1980) as well as individual characteristics (Hackman *et al.*, 1978) have also been found to be associated with job gratification.

Steers and Porter (1991) reported that "workers with high achievement motivation perform better in their work than those with low achievement motivation." Achievement motivation plays a particularly significant role in the field of information systems and specialized technologies, where studies have found a positive relationship among information systems and worker achievement motivation and job gratification (Arvey *et al.*, 1976; Harrell and Stahl, 1984; Yasin, 1996). Similarly, in a study of 149 programmers in eight qualified public accounting companies in the southeast of the USA, Couger and Adelsberger (1988) found a positive relationship between achievement motivation and degree of job gratification and concluded that, for this group of workers, "task significance, autonomy, and feedback are connected to job satisfaction". Lastly James *et al.* (1977) "demonstrated that skill variety, task significance and autonomy are all positively related to job satisfaction."

When employees are intrapreneurially oriented in the way they are supposed to, they tend to become satisfied with their jobs and job satisfaction is a major element or key that helps an organization boost or enhance its productivity. An individual's job gratification could have an influence on the power or capacity of the corporate business environment to achieve business actions or performance. Judge *et al.* (2000) derived a model that suggested job complexity or challenge as an important analytical variable in the relationship between the core of self-evaluation (a connection of self-esteem, self-capacity of producing a desired result or effect, place of control, and low criticism) and job gratification, a relationship that continues firmly over time. Based on a meta-analysis, Brief and Weiss (2002) suggested that a "bidirectional" connection existed which gathered together a series of moderators and mediators which produced an effect on the satisfaction-to-performance relationship among variables including personality, autonomy, norms, moral obligation, cognitive accessibility, aggregation and stages of analysis. Other mediators which can act on or produce a change in the performance-satisfaction relationship include achievement, self-efficacy, goal progress and positive attitude. Moderators include performance reward, dependency on chance or the fulfillment of a condition, job characteristics, needs for achievement, work centrality and aggregation.

Despite the existence of a body of research on job satisfaction and performance, it was noted that there had been no attempt to investigate the connection between job gratification and the corporate entrepreneurial actions of managers (Judge *et al.*, 2000). Hence, a second set of propositions was developed, based upon identifying the mediating power of job gratification on the corporate entrepreneurial environment and entrepreneurial actions (Spector *et al.*, 2000)

3. THE RESEARCH PROBLEM

3.1 Research Problem and Overarching Objective

A review of previous studies has revealed a research gap in the studies on the relationship between business alignment and job gratification. Whatever studies have been carried out, they have focused on large commercial firms. Therefore, the aim of this project was to measure to what extent business alignment has an impact on job gratification in the context of a university viewed as a corporate organisation, where intrapreneurship is an equivalent factor similar to entrepreneurship in a commercial corporate. The overarching research objective was to quantitatively examine the relationship between business alignment and job gratification in this context and obtain a clear understanding of these factors of business success, in terms of the aims of the university viewed as a corporate organisation and to provide a sound evidential basis for the linkages between them.

3.2 Research Hypotheses

H1-There is a positive relationship between business alignment and job gratification.

H2-Employee performance mediates the relationship between business alignment and job gratification.

4. RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

This research project being practical in terms of its purpose has used the analytical descriptive method of

analyzing the collected data based on correlation. In order to collect the required data, a questionnaire was distributed randomly among 200 employees of a University based in Egypt. The statements of the questionnaire were about different components related to business alignment, organizational and environmental factors as well as their effects on business alignment and job gratification. A total number of 52 statements were designed. When questionnaires were returned, they were analyzed using the SPSS program to test the relationship between business alignment and job gratification. In the given Hypotheses, Job gratification was considered as the dependent variable. The dependent variable was conceptualized by individual's attitude towards job and was operationalized by using a set of 16 Likert scale statements to measure job satisfaction. The independent variable, Business Alignment, was conceptualized in terms of capacity for competitive attitudes involving innovation and risk taking and allowing autonomy, while the mediating variable was conceptualized by the ability to accept responsibilities and to prevent other problems and to reduce inter-group conflict. The mediating variable was considered to be Employee Performance and was seen as aligning the organizational objectives. It aligned employees' agreed measures of skills and competency requirements, development plans and the delivery of results, by using 5-point Likert scale statements while to measure Intrapreneurial Orientation it used a set of 19 statements on Likert scales, as shown in Table 1.

4.1. Required Data and Sources

4.1.1 Population and sampling

The population for this study was the staff of a university in Egypt, as this research was intended to analyze what universities are best at in order to be entrepreneurially/intrapreneurially oriented organization and ensure job gratification. The sample size was 200. For the purpose of Sampling, convenience sampling method was used as it is ideally recommended for small samples. However, this sampling method was also used for practical reasons, i.e. its low cost, ease of use, and ability to reach the target sample in less time. This method also enables precise measurement of indexes or observable variables. This type of sampling is also, a widely used form of non-probability sampling and popular for its accessibility and proximity to researchers

4.1.2 Required Data

Table 1 shows how the questionnaire was formulated, in terms of the hypotheses, the variables, and the measures used to formulate the questions, the number of questions and the selection of the scale.

Table-1. Data and sources.

Hypothesis	Variables	Items/ Measures	Questionnaire statements	Scale
H1: There is a positive relationship between business alignment and job gratification	Business Alignment (IV)	-Innovativeness	S1	Likert scale
		-Pro-activeness	S2	Likert scale
		-Risk-taking	S3	Likert scale
		-Competitiveness/Aggressiveness	S4	Likert scale
		-Autonomy	S5	Likert scale
	Job Gratification (DV)	-Working environment	S6	Likert scale
		-Learning environment	S7	Likert scale
		-Employee performance	S8	Likert scale
		-Job security	S9	Likert scale
		-Relationship with	S10	Likert scale

		coworkers or supervisors		
		-Reward system	S11	Likert scale
		-Overall compensation	S12	Likert scale
		-Package	S13	Likert scale
		-Job content	S14	Likert scale
		-Work responsibility	S15	Likert scale
		-Individual compensation	S16	Likert scale
		-Togetherness		
		-Incentives	S17	Likert scale
		-Organizational behavior	S18	Likert scale
		-Type of job	S19	Likert scale
		-Supervision	S20	Likert scale
		-Working conditions	S21	Likert scale
		-Respecting the job and other individuals	S22	Likert scale
			S23	Likert scale
H2: Employee performance mediates the relationship between business alignment and job gratification	Employee Performance (MED-V)	-Quality of work	S24	Likert scale
		-Job knowledge	S25	Likert scale
		-Time accomplishment of job	S26	Likert scale
		-Effective usage of work time	S27	Likert scale
		-Work without supervision as necessary	S28	Likert scale
		-Employee commitment	S29	Likert scale
		-Employee performance	S30	Likert scale
		-Effective collaboration with others	S31	Likert scale
		-New opportunities for company	S32	Nominal scale Likert scale
		-Promptness		
		-Firm's performance	S33	
		-Desired needs	S34	Likert scale
		-Entrepreneurial skills	S35	
		-Leadership skills	Q36	Likert scale
		-Employee motivation	S37	Likert scale
		-Effective management of time	S38	Likert scale
		-Organizational culture	S39	Likert scale
			S52	Likert scale

5. METHOD OF DATA COLLECTION

A quantitative data collection method was used to find out the relationship between business alignment and job gratification. A quantitative method is a prerequisite specifically to collect and test hypotheses in a research study. Closed questions (standard questions), in the form of statements to rate, were used in the questionnaire as they were easy to respond for both respondents and analysts. The whole research process was under the supervision

of a research supervisor. The research study eventually resulted in 52 measurements, and development of a conceptual model to measure the variables of the study. The validity of the questionnaire was tested by collecting opinions of experts. When the questionnaires were returned, the exploratory factor loading was conducted using SPSS 20. Since all extracted values in the communalities table were higher than 0.05, none of the factors was removed from the analysis.

5.1. Data Collection Processes

The research team consisted of one of the authors and a fellow researcher who worked incessantly to achieve the results of the study. Since the type of survey was a closed-ended questionnaire, a conceptual model was built with the purpose to develop some measures. Later, these measures were examined and cross-checked by the supervisor. The designing of the questionnaire took the team over 2 months, after which a pre-test questionnaire was conducted. 200 questionnaires were printed (100 questionnaires for each individual conducting the survey) and were distributed to the target population. After the collection of the questionnaires, the team conducted an SPSS analysis to test the relationship between variables.

5.2. Research Tabulations and Analysis

After the completed questionnaires were received, the results were entered in SPSS software. Frequencies were applied for all questions. To test our hypothesis, statistical tools including chi-square and significance were used.

5.4. Research Limitations

Although some of the results of this study concur with the findings found in the literature, this research suffered some constraints connected with its assumptions. Another restriction was the absence of control variables and the emphasis only on internal variables influencing relationships. It is evident that external elements like monetary conditions could also influence these relationships.

5.5. Research Results and Hypothesis Testing

Table 2 shows the number of female and male individuals who filled the questionnaire, their age, occupation and their level of education.

Table-2. The demographics.

Age	Number	Gender	Number	Profession	Number	Educational level	Number
20 to 25	85	Male	122	Self-employed	47	Secondary	47
26 to 30	33	Female	76	Retired	14	Diploma	40
31 to 35	29			HR officer	92	Post-graduate	44
36 to 40	41			Faculty of medicine	47	BSc	51
41 and over	12					MSc	11
						PhD	7
Total	200		198		200		200

122 male and 76 female individuals completed the questionnaire.. It should be noted that two individuals did not identify their gender.

Table-3. SPSS result 1.

Variables										
Column: Business Alignment (IV) Row: Job gratification (DV)										
	Your organization is a risk taker		Your organization usually competes aggressively		Your organization gives its employees autonomy		Your organization is innovative in many new lines of production and services		Your organization is pro-active in its employees' progress	
Statistics	Chi- sq.	Sig.	Chi- sq.	Sig.	Chi- sq.	Sig.	Chi- sq.	Sig.	Chi- sq.	Sig.
S1 I really appreciate my working conditions	10.361	.016 Sig.	11.068	.011 Sig.	7.083	.069	7.277	.064	4.677	.197
S2 I like my learning environment	5.005	.287	8.467	.076	5.332	.255	1.459	.834	4.404	.354
S3 I am impressed with my subordinates' performance	11.997	.017	18.513	.001 Sig.	15.463	.004 Sig.	5.715	.221	8.169	.086
S4 I am satisfied with my organization's job security	10.648	.031 Sig.	4.674	.322	15.777	.003 Sig.	1.749	.782	6.133	.189
S5 I have a good relationship with my co-workers and supervisors	7.293	.121	9.875	.043 Sig.	11.662	.120	10.678	.030 Sig.	17.521	.102
S6 I like my organization's reward system	6.778	.148	5.995	.200	8.097	.088	17.499	.002	9.019	.061
S7 I strongly accept the overall compensation package	11.593	.071	17.485	.092	7.901	.095	3.694	.449	7.892	.096
S8 I like my job content	10.854	.028 Sig.	4.268	.371	5.206	.267	3.259	.515	8.585	.072
S9 I accept my work responsibility	7.602	.107	.944	.918	16.077	.003 Sig.	3.733	.443	5.998	.191
S10 I am satisfied with the individual compensation	20.236	.000 Sig.	7.334	.119	15.562	.004 Sig.	12.025	.007 Sig.	14.933	.105
S11 I like how the organization collaborates with others	13.372	.060	17.204	.002 Sig.	10.742	.080	8.903	.064	12.083	.017 Sig.
S12 I accept my organization's decision	11.935	.018 Sig.	7.233	.124	12.128	.096	10.849	.068	14.437	.086
S13 I strongly appreciate the organizational behavior toward their employees and customers	9.265	.055	1.708	.789	22.711	.000 Sig.	20.928	.108	19.604	.001 Sig.
S14 I am happy with the organizations' quality of work	2.697	.441	2.453	.484	6.770	.080	2.688	.442	3.313	.346

Variables										
Column: Entrepreneurial Orientation (IV) Row: Job gratification (DV)										
Statistics	Chi-square	Sig	Chi-square	Sig.	Chi- square	Sig.	Chi- square	Sig	Chi- square	Sig
S1 I really appreciate my working conditions	12.331	.015 Sig.	8.067	.012 Sig.	7.083	.070	5.388	.068	5.777	.186
S2 I like my working environment	4.007	.345	7.456	.076	2.555	.255	2.544	.433	9.705	.422
S3 I am impressed with my subordinates' performance	13.995	.067	18.513	.091	16.478	.084	6.867	.337	8.177	.033 Sig.
S4 I am satisfied with my organization's job security	11.578	.045 Sig.	4.674	.322	17.787	.004 Sig.	1.656	.121	5.155	.177
S5 I have a good relationship with my co-workers and supervisors	4.478	.141	9.875	.043 Sig.	12.770	.060	12.776	.083	19.557	.003 Sig.
S6 I like my organization's reward system	7.873	.132	5.995	.200	8.089	.077	18.755	.003 Sig.	8.077	.099
S7 I strongly accept the overall compensation package	11.593	.021 Sig.	17.485	.002Sig.	7.701	.075	4.789	.399	9.899	.087
S8 I like my job content	12.542	.037 Sig.	4.268	.371	5.206	4.342	4.322	.616	7.616	.089
S9 I accept my work responsibility	8.701	.105	.944	.918	16.077	.003 Sig.	4.744	.557	6.889	.181
S10 I am satisfied with the individual compensation	10.247	.005Sig.	7.334	.119	15.562	.004 Sig.	12.025	.008Sig. significant	15.844	.006
S11 I like how the organization collaborates with others	15.439	.067	17.334	.119	15.562	.004 Sig.	12.025	.008Sig.	15.844	.006Sig.
S12 I accept my organization 's determination	12.834	.118	7.233	.124	12.128	.016Sig.	11.889	.069	13.115	.00Sig.
S13 I strongly appreciate the organization's behavior toward their employees and customers	9.276	.066	1.708	.789	22.719	.000 significant	20.928	.111	18.787	.102
S14 I am happy with the organization's quality of work	3.555	.551	2.483	.484	6.770	.080	4.677	.557	5.555	.354

Table-4. SPSS result 2.

Variables										
Column: Business Alignment (IV) Row: Employee Performance (MED. V)										
Survey Statements	Your organization is a risk taker		Your organization usually competes aggressively		Your organization gives its employees autonomy		Your organization is innovative in many new lines of production and services		Your organization is pro-active in its employees' progress	
Statistics	Chi- square	Sig	Chi- square	Sig	Chi- square	Sig	Chi- square	Sig	Chi- square	Sig
S15 I appreciate the employees' job knowledge	9.908	.042 Sig.	8.726	.068	14.774	.075	14.783	.105	2.906	.574
S16 I like my organization's time accomplishment of job	8.992	.061	6.252	.181	12.754	.013 Sig.	7.358	.188	5.455	.244
S17 I am careful with the effective usage of work time	15.068	.115	9.314	.054	13.491	.109	5.971	.201	11.977	.018 Sig.
S18 I work without supervision as necessary	10.181	.029 Sig.	8.342	.080	10.231	.037 Sig.	14.136	.388	9.387	.052
S19 I am highly satisfied with the employees' commitment	6.852	.160	12.966	.011 Sig.	6.047	.196	7.853	.097	8.629	.071
S20 I appreciate the employees' effectiveness	6.852	.160	12.966	.011 Sig.	6.047	.196	7.853	.097	8.629	.071
S21 I am always effective collaborating with others	6.739	.150	8.207	.084	7.189	.126	7.201	.126	7.715	.103
S22 I always look forward to finding new opportunities for the organisation	18.159	.088	13.338	.044 Sig.	9.174	.027 Sig.	5.059	.168	6.323	.097
S23 I appreciate the employees' promptness	9.905	.042 Sig.	14.426	.006 Sig.	5.068	.280	3.818	.431	6.861	.142
S24 I like the organization's actions toward their job	8.792	.067	7.192	.126	10.524	.032 Sig.	5.186	.269	6.059	.195
S25 I always help other individuals to achieve their desired need	8.941	.063	4.814	.307	8.270	.082	13.110	.091	13.354	.010Sig.
S26 I like the entrepreneurial skills	9.721	.045 Sig.	8.850	.064	7.879	.096	10.747	.030 Sig	7.206	.125
S27 I like my leadership skills	12.982	.011Sig.	6.309	.177	4.570	.334	11.675	.020Sig.	7.684	.104
S28 I always inspire my colleagues to be motivated	3.344	.502	5.528	.237	3.141	.534	5.699	.223	9.119	.058
S29 I am loyal to the organization's effective management of time	11.801	.019 Sig.	1.851	.763	11.870	.018 Sig.	7.295	.121	7.116	.130
S30 I recommend colleagues in the	11.853	.018	8.666	.070	9.037	.060	15.476	.074	4.848	.303

organization to value the organizational culture		Sig.								
Variables										
Column: Business Alignment (IV) Row: Employee Performance (MED. V)										
Statistics	Chi- square	Sig								
S16 I appreciate the employees' job knowledge	8.709	.053	7.888	.077	13.555	.007 Sig.	15.879	.006 Sig.	3.708	.689
S17 I like my organization's time accomplishment of job	9.887	.051	7.323	.282	12.754	.016 Sig.	8.666	.123	6.544	.233
S18 I am careful with the effective usage of work time	17.078	.117	8.412	.064	12.777	.171	6.887	.201	13.990	.017 Sig.
S19 I work without supervision as necessary	11.727	.037 Sig.	8.223	.070	11.451	.085	4.136	.388	10.339	.073
S20 I am highly satisfied with the employees' commitment	7.678	.232	14.775	.022 Sig.	7.052	.187	7.853	.097	8.729	.071
S21 I appreciate my employees' effectiveness	7.756	.233	8.555	.065	7.053	.189	7.777	.079	9.527	.061
S22 I am always effective in collaborating with others	5.888	.160	7.336	.077	9.188	.134	6.301	.135	5.816	.104
S23 I always look forward to finding new opportunities for the company	18.159	.121	11.449	.070	8.175	.238	5.059	.168	6.323	.097
S24 I appreciate the employees' promptness	9.907	.042 Sig.	13.447	.006 Sig.	4.078	.380	3.818	.431	6.861	.142
S25 I like the organization's actions toward their job	5.879	.067	9.226	.231	11.567	.034 Sig.	5.176	.279	8.078	.187
S26 I always help other individuals to achieve their desired need	9.955	.154	5.751	.407	8.280	.071	14.120	.122	10.342	.020 Sig.
S27 I like my business skills	9.813	.055	8.650	.085	8.980	.678	11.848	.040 Sig.	8.278	.112
S28 I like my leadership skills	10.979	.015 Sig.	5.409	.277	4.888	.447	12.598	.050 Sig.	6.576	.107
S29 I always inspire my colleagues to be motivated	4.478	.702	6.378	.349	4.313	.784	6.788	.116	7.228	.067
S30 I am loyal to the organization's effective management of time	12.701	.118	2.229	.963	14.889	.019 Sig.	1.387	.141	6.332	.140
S31 I recommend employees in the organization to value the organizational culture	13.579	.019 Sig.	4.776	.080	8.039	.720	14.570	.105	5.757	.404

H1-There is a positive relationship between business alignment and job gratification.

Table 3 presents the findings of Hypothesis 1 which says that there is a positive and direct relationship between business alignment and job gratification. It also presents and tabulation of all measures used in the current study. It was found in the analysis that some measures accepted the hypothesis while other measures rejected the hypothesis because the relationship between these measures was not significant. Thus, the relationship was only partially accepted because significance of some measurements is less than 0.05 while others have values above 0.05.

This hypothesis (H1) is not fully accepted or rejected:

H2- Employee performance mediates the relationship between business alignment and job gratification

Table 4 tests Hypothesis 2, which says: Employee performance mediates the relationship between business alignment and job gratification. It was found in the test that some measures accepted the mediating relationship between business alignment and job gratification while other measures rejected the hypothesis because there was no significant relationship between the two measures.

This hypothesis also was not fully accepted or fully rejected.

Every organization strives to have employees who are satisfied with their job, due to the advantages such job satisfaction holds in terms of a positive organizational climate, leading to a competitive advantage. The findings have shown how sensitive employees' job gratification can have both positive and negative influence on certain business alignment and job gratification factors. The study shows that better salary, working conditions and higher autonomy would increase the level of job gratification among the employees of this organization.

6. CONCLUSION

From the results of this survey of 200 employees of an Egyptian university, it is concluded that Business Alignment is a factor that had both positive and negative effects on employees' job gratification, however, depending upon how they were oriented. Since autonomy is one of the dimensions of business alignment, this research confirms the negative effect of formalization of employees on business alignment in an organization. In organizations with decentralized systems, higher levels of creative ideas are produced, and hence the development of autonomy has a direct relationship with organizations that have a centralized system and is the most important and most effective dimension of business alignment that leads to the improvement of job gratification. This also concurs with the findings of Morgeson *et al.* (2005) who found autonomy was an important factor.

Based on the empirical study and the research hypotheses, the two stated hypotheses are not fully accepted nor rejected, as the statistics have shown that the business alignment has no effect on job gratification and in mediating the relationship between business alignment and job gratification, employee performance has only a small impact on the stated hypothesis. This is in line with the findings of Ahmad *et al.* (2010) which emphasised that there was no significant relation between job satisfaction and performance. Indeed, according to Yvonne *et al.* (2014): "A common concern of whether job satisfaction is positively or negatively related to job performance or even no relationship occurs between them is still left in an ambiguous state." Similarly, a previous review (Judge *et al.*, 2001) concluded that there is no relationship between job satisfaction and job performance, and that the link between job satisfaction and job performance varies. In fact, numerous factors can be utilised to clarify the relation between job gratification and job performance in a business, such as personality (Tett and Burnett, 2003) and motivation (Koestner *et al.*, 2002), however, according to Pushpakumari (2008) there is positive and substantial connection between satisfaction and performance for managers and non-managers. Thus, it can be concluded that the nature of this link is still in a confused state and that future research is needed to clarify the influences involved.

7. RECOMMENDATIONS

Considering the main argument of this study, it is suggested that managers should reduce complexity of the organizational structure on one hand, and instead allow the employees to participate in decision-making practices of the organization to enable them to nurture their entrepreneurial orientation. It is also recommended that organizations give due importance to factors like salaries as per market rates, continuous training and promotion.

It would be interesting to examine how organizations align themselves with corporate entrepreneurship and intrapreneurship activities and whether they are receptive to and encourage innovative suggestions from employees. Management should address, promote and monitor corporate entrepreneurship in an organization, eventually creating a business with employees who are satisfied in their jobs.

8. SUGGESTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

Future exploration could concentrate on undertaking a comparative study to examine entrepreneurial orientation in different countries. Future research may focus on control variables, for example, financial conditions while investigating job gratifications. Likewise, predictors of job satisfaction among private sector employees from different industries or employees from the educational sector sampled from different colleges or universities will also be a good study proposition.

Further, the link between employee satisfaction and customer satisfaction could also be explored additionally; researchers could focus on the other factors that affect entrepreneurial orientation, such as the organizational culture and management styles. Moreover, the researchers can study the barriers that cause difficulties in the establishment of new businesses, from both individual and organizational points of view and study the effect of each of these organizational factors on the different types of individual factors, one of which is the entrepreneurial orientation of the employees. Further studies can investigate the factors that play a mediating role in the relationship between organizational structure and entrepreneurial orientation. Lastly, a more complete analysis of employee satisfaction and organisational performance should be undertaken and examined over a longer period of time, in order to determine a possible time lapse in their intervention and to obtain a clearer picture of the association between these two variables.

Funding: This study received no specific financial support.

Competing Interests: The authors declare that they have no competing interests.

Contributors/Acknowledgement: Both authors contributed equally to the conception and design of the study.

REFERENCES

- Ahmad, H., K. Ahmad and I.A. Shah, 2010. Relationship between job satisfaction, job performance attitude towards work and organizational commitment. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 18(2): 257-267.
- Arvey, R.D., H.D. Dewhirst and J.C. Boling, 1976. Relationships between goal clarity, participation in goal setting, and personality characteristics on job satisfaction in a scientific organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 61(1): 103-105. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.61.1.103>.
- Brief, A.P. and H.M. Weiss, 2002. Organizational behavior: Affect in the workplace. *Annual Review of Psychology*, 53(1): 279-307.
- Bruining, H. and M. Wright, 2002. Entrepreneurial orientation in management buy-outs and the contribution of venture capital. *Venture Capital: An International Journal of Entrepreneurial Finance*, 4(2): 147-168. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/13691060110117427>.
- Chadwick, P., M. Hember, J. Symes, E. Peters, E. Kuipers and D. Dagnan, 2008. Responding mindfully to unpleasant thoughts and images: Reliability and validity of the Southampton mindfulness questionnaire (SMQ). *British Journal of Clinical Psychology*, 47(4): 451-455. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1348/014466508x314891>.

- Couger, J.D. and H. Adelsberger, 1988. Environments: Austria compared to the United States. *ACM SIGCPR Computer Personnel*, 11(4): 13-17. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1145/54127.54131>.
- Dess, G.G. and G.T. Lumpkin, 2005. The role of entrepreneurial orientation in stimulating effective corporate entrepreneurship. *Academy of Management Perspectives*, 19(1): 147-156. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.5465/ame.2005.15841975>.
- Ginsberg, A. and M. Hay, 1994. Confronting the challenges of corporate entrepreneurship: Guidelines for venture managers. *European Management Journal*, 12(4): 382-389. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-2373\(94\)90024-8](https://doi.org/10.1016/0263-2373(94)90024-8).
- Hackman, J.R. and E.E. Lawler, 1971. Employee reactions to job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 55(3): 259-286. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/h0031152>.
- Hackman, J.R., J.L. Pearce and J.C. Wolfe, 1978. Effects of changes in job characteristics on work attitudes and behaviors: A naturally occurring quasi-experiment. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 21(3): 289-304.
- Harrell, A.M. and M.J. Stahl, 1984. McClelland's trichotomy of needs theory and the job satisfaction and work performance of CPA firm professionals. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 9(3-4): 241-252. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682\(84\)90010-2](https://doi.org/10.1016/0361-3682(84)90010-2).
- Hatfield, J.D. and R.C. Huseman, 1982. Perceptual congruence about communication as related to satisfaction: Moderating effects of individual characteristics. *Academy of Management Journal*, 25(2): 349-358. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/255996>.
- Hisrich, R.D., 1990. Entrepreneurship/intrapreneurship. *American Psychologist*, 45(2): 209-222. Available at: [10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.209](https://doi.org/10.1037/0003-066X.45.2.209).
- Hornsby, J.S., D.W. Naffziger, D.F. Kuratko and R.V. Montagno, 1993. An interactive model of the corporate entrepreneurship process. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 17(2): 29-37. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879301700203>.
- James, L.R., A. Hartman, M.W. Stebbins and A.P. Jones, 1977. Relationships between psychological climate and a VIE model for work motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 30(2): 229-254. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1111/j.1744-6570.1977.tb02091.x>.
- Judge, T.A., J.E. Bono and E.A. Locke, 2000. Personality and job satisfaction: The mediating role of job characteristics. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2): 237-249. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.2.237>.
- Judge, T.A., C.J. Thoresen, J.E. Bono and G.K. Patton, 2001. The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychological Bulletin*, 127(3): 376-407. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0033-2909.127.3.376>.
- Kalleberg, A.L., 1977. Work values and job rewards: A theory of job satisfaction. *American Sociological Review*, 42(1): 124-143. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/2117735>.
- Katsikea, E., M. Theodosiou, N. Perdiki and J. Kehagias, 2011. The effects of organizational structure and job characteristics on export sales managers' job satisfaction and organizational commitment. *Journal of World Business*, 46(2): 221-233. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jwb.2010.11.003>.
- Keh, H.T., T.T.M. Nguyen and H.P. Ng, 2007. The effects of entrepreneurial orientation and marketing information on the performance of SMEs. *Journal of Business Venturing*, 22(4): 592-611. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.jbusvent.2006.05.003>.
- Levin, I. and J.P. Stokes, 1989. Dispositional approach to job satisfaction: Role of negative affectivity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(5): 752-758. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.5.752>.
- Locke, E.A., 1976. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*. Chicago, IL: Rand McNally. pp: 1297-349.
- Lumpkin, G.T. and G.G. Dess, 1996. Clarifying the entrepreneurial orientation construct and linking it to performance. *Academy of Management Review*, 21(1): 135-172. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/258632>.

- McFarlin, D.B. and P.D. Sweeney, 1992. Distributive and procedural justice as predictors of satisfaction with personal and organizational outcomes. *Academy of Management Journal*, 35(3): 626-637. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2307/256489>.
- Miller, D., 1983. The correlates of entrepreneurship in three types of firms. *Management Science*, 29(7): 770-791. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1287/mnsc.29.7.770>.
- Morgeson, F.P., K. Delaney-Klinger and M.A. Hemingway, 2005. The importance of job autonomy, cognitive ability, and job-related skill for predicting role breadth and job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90(2): 399-406. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.90.2.399>.
- Naldi, L., M. Nordqvist, K. Sjoberg and J. Wiklund, 2007. Entrepreneurial orientation, risk. 997-1017.
- Naumann, E., 1993. Antecedents and consequences of satisfaction and commitment among expatriate managers. *Group & Organization Management*, 18(2): 153-187. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/1059601193182003>.
- Porter, L.W. and E.E. Lawler, 1968. *Managerial attitudes and performance*. Homewood, IL: Irwin.
- Pushpakumari, M.D., 2008. The impact of job satisfaction on job performance: An empirical analysis. 89-105. Available from 202.11.2.113/SEBM/ronso/no9_1/08_PUSHPAKUMARI.pdf.
- Rice, R.W., D.B. Mcfarlin and D.E. Bennett, 1989. Standards of comparison and job satisfaction. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4): 591-598. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.74.4.591>.
- Rings, R.L., J.E. Stinson and T.W. Johnson, 1979. Communication behaviors associated with role stress and satisfaction variables. *The Journal of Applied Communication Research*, 7(1): 15-22. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/00909887909365187>.
- Rutherford, M.W. and D.T. Holt, 2007. Corporate entrepreneurship: An empirical look at the innovativeness dimension and its antecedents. *Journal of organizational change Management*, 20(3): 429-446. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1108/09534810710740227>.
- Seashore, S.E. and D.T. Thomas, 1975. Job satisfaction indicators and their correlates. *American Behavioral Scientist*, 18(3): 333-368. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/000276427501800303>.
- Shahmohammadi, N., 2015. The relationship between management style with human relations and job satisfaction among guidance schools' Principals in District 3 of Karaj. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 205: 247-253. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2015.09.069>.
- Spector, P.E., P.Y. Chen and B.J. O'Connell, 2000. A longitudinal study of relations between job stressors and job strains while controlling for prior negative affectivity and strains. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 85(2): 211-218. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.85.2.211>.
- Steers, R.M. and L.W. Porter, 1991. *Motivation and work behavior*. 5th Edn., New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Tabak, B., S. Guerra, E. Lima and E. Chang, 2007. The Stability-Concentration Relationship in the Brazilian Banking System (No. 145). Central Bank of Brazil, Research Department.
- Taylor, G.S. and M.J. Vest, 1992. Pay comparisons and pay satisfaction among public sector employees. *Public Personnel Management*, 21(4): 445-454. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/009102609202100403>.
- Tett, R.P. and D.D. Burnett, 2003. A personality trait-based interactionist model of job performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 88(3): 500-517. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1037/0021-9010.88.3.500>.
- Voydanoff, P., 1980. *The implications of work-family relationships or productivity*. Scar- Sdale, NY: Work in America Institute.
- Walter, H.L., C.M. Anderson and M.M. Martin, 2005. How subordinates' machiavellianism and motives relate to satisfaction with superiors. *Communication Quarterly*, 53(1): 57-70. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1080/01463370500056051>.
- Weaver, C.N. and R.S. Franz, 1992. Work-related attitudes of entrepreneurs, public, and private employees. *Psychological Reports*, 70(2): 387-390. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.2466/pr0.70.2.387-390>.
- Wiklund, J., 1999. The sustainability of the entrepreneurial orientation—performance relationship. *Entrepreneurship Theory and Practice*, 24(1): 37-48. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1177/104225879902400103>.

Wiklund, J. and D. Shepherd, 2003. Knowledge-based resources, entrepreneurial orientation, and the performance of small and medium-sized businesses. *Strategic Management Journal*, 24(13): 1307-1314. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.1002/smj.360>.

Yao, Y.H., R.T. Wang and K.Y. W., 2009. The influence of emotional intelligence on job performance: Moderating effects of leadership. *International Conference On Management Science & Engineering*. pp: 4-16.

Yasin, M., 1996. Entrepreneurial effectiveness and achievement in Arab culture. *Journal of Business Research*, 35(1): 69-77. Available at: [https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963\(95\)00050-x](https://doi.org/10.1016/0148-2963(95)00050-x).

Yildirim, Y.T. and Y. Pazarcik, 2014. The effect of intrapreneurship on job satisfaction: A sectorial research. *CLEAR International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*, 5(10).

Yvonne, W., R.H.A. Rahman and C.S. Long, 2014. Employee job satisfaction and job performance: A case study in a franchised retail-chain organization. *Research Journal of Applied Sciences, Engineering and Technology*, 8(17): 1875-1883. Available at: <https://doi.org/10.19026/rjaset.8.1176>.

APPENDIX

QUESTIONNAIRE

Please rank the following motivational factors according to their importance to you (1 most important and 4 the least)

Monetary compensation () Promotion () Career path () Moral appraisal ()

Please allocate 100 points on the following job satisfaction factors to reflect their motivational importance to you

Working environment () Reward system () Job security () Working conditions ()

Please determine the level of agreement/disagreement toward the following statements.

SPECIFICATION	Highly Agree	Agree	Neutral	Disagree	Highly Disagree
BUSINESS ALIGNMENT:					
Your organization is pro-active in its employees' progress					
Your organization is a risk taker					
Your organization usually compete aggressively					
Your organization give its employees autonomy					
Your organization is innovative in many new lines of product and service					
JOB GRATIFICATION:					
I really appreciate my working environment					
I like my learning environment					
I am impressed with the employees' performance					
I am satisfied with my organization's job security					
I have a good relationship with my co-workers and supervisors					
I like my organization's reward system					
I strongly accept the overall compensation package					
I like my job content					
I accept my work responsibility					
I am satisfied with the individual compensation					
I like how the organization collaborates with others					
I accept my organization 's determination					
I strongly appreciate the organization's behavior toward their employees and customers					
I am happy with the type of job					
I like the supervision of the organization					
I accept my working conditions					
I always respect the job					
I always respect other individuals in the organization					
I am happy with the organizations' quality of work					

EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE					
I appreciate the employee's job knowledge					
I like my organization's time accomplishment of job					
I am careful with the effective usage of work time					
I work without supervision as necessary					
I am highly satisfied with the employees' commitment					
I appreciate the employees' effectiveness					
I am always effective collaborating with others					
I always look forward to finding new opportunities for the organization					
I appreciate the employees' promptness					
I like the organization's actions toward their job					
I always help other individuals to achieve their desired need					
I like the entrepreneurial skills					
I like my leadership skills					
I always inspire my colleagues to be motivated					
I am loyal to the organization's effective management of time					
I recommend employees in the organization to value the organizational culture					

Demographic Questions

Please specify your age

20 – 25 () 26 – 30 () 31 – 35 () 36 – 40 () 41 and more ()

Please specify your gender

Male Female

Which of these best describes your occupation?

Self-employed () Retired () HR officer () Faculty of medicine ()

What is your educational level?

Secondary () Diploma () Postgraduate () Bsc () MSc () PhD ()

Views and opinions expressed in this article are the views and opinions of the author(s), International Journal of Business, Economics and Management shall not be responsible or answerable for any loss, damage or liability etc. caused in relation to/arising out of the use of the content.