

# “A Study on Job Description and its Effect on Employee Performance: Case of Some Selected Manufacturing Organizations in the City of Pune, India”

Dr. K. Krishnam Raju<sup>1</sup>, Dr. Sweta Banerjee<sup>2</sup>

<sup>1</sup>Head of the Department, College of Finance, Management and Development, Ethiopian Civil Services University, Ethiopia

<sup>2</sup>Associate Professor, College of Finance, Management and Development, Ethiopian Civil Services University, Ethiopia

## I. INTRODUCTION

Accordingly Brannick et al. (2007), job descriptions is an instrument used by the people who does not know accurately how to perform the job. So, to make employees perform their jobs well there has to be a clear and specific job description. Therefore, many organizations are working hard to make sure that job descriptions that they have are effective in term of productivity and in achieving the organization's objectives. For these reasons, many researchers conducted many study to assess the effects of job description for the success of the organizations. As, in the fast changing world there are many changes in the nature of working environment and technology, and so the job description should be adjusted to incorporate the changes.

Therefore, this study focuses on the assessment of the role of job description in determining the employee performance particularly in some selected manufacturing organizations in the city of Pune, India. So, far it will use different concepts and practices in relation to job description and its effects on employees' performance.

## II. BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

The concern of a manager for years is about employee productivity then later they realize that the type of work done by the employee needs good job design with different questions that could be answered through, how the job is to be performed, who is to perform it and where it is to be performed. Moreover, job design has an effect on how an employee feel about the job he will perform, his authority over the work, decision-making the employee has on the job and how many task the employee has to perform for the position handle by him (Rao and Krishna, 2002). Therefore, for the organization in order to avoid repetition of the work and overlapping of duties should design good structure that will achieve organization's objectives and goals. That structure will be used as the legal framework for carrying out

the organization activities. In addition, it can also be used as channels of reporting system as to whom the employees will be accountable with the existence of different departments. So far, it is also important for the accomplishment of objectives and enhances planning and controlling (Robbins and Coulter, 2002).

According to classical theorists (Fayol, Taylor, Weber) as structure is important to the organization to achieve stated goals then managers are requested to writes job description and established the standard of performance, because identification and classification of work enables managers to concentrate on important activities, avoiding unnecessary duplications, overlapping and wastage of effort (ibid). In addition, with good design structure it create job description, job specialization and performance standard that will motivate the employees and lead to their performance.

Therefore, these aspects of jobs are found in job analysis, because job analysis is a process of determining the task that makes up the job and skills, abilities and responsibilities required for the job holder. Wendell French stated that job analysis "is the systematic investigation of job content, the physical circumstance in which the job is carried out and the qualification needed to carry out job responsibilities". While job description is a written statement of what the job holder does, for example it contained specific duties for the job holder such as writes directives advising department managers of company policy regarding equal employment opportunities, administers benefits programs etc. in addition, desirable qualification needed for staffing and related experience. Moreover, job description it's also describes the job to the new applicants, it guides new employees who enter to the system about what they are expected to perform and for cross checking whether the actual activities of the employees match with their describe duties. So, accurate job descriptions provide a basis for job evaluation, wage and salary compensation and an equitable wage and salary structure.

Well crafted job description prevents unnecessary misunderstanding by telling employees what they need to know about their jobs. It to determine what accommodation is required for the applicant to be able to perform the essential functions of the position (UIC, 2009).

### III. OBJECTIVES

- To identify practices of job description in the organizations.
- To assess factors of job description that affect employee performance.
- To mitigate the challenges of job description by making a recommendations to the organization.

#### *Development of Job Description through a Job Analysis*

Job analysis is defined a “process of determining the task that make up the job and the skill, ability and responsibility that are required of an employee to perform the job”. However, According to Wendell French is about a systematic investigation of job content, the physical circumstances in which the job is carried out, the qualifications needed to carry out job responsibility (Department Handbook, 2015).

It is clear from Brannick et al. (2007) and Cascio (1998) that job description should be developed from job analysis and the job description will be the basis for job analysis. In addition that a “functional job analysis can be used to generate the task and duties statements”. Moreover, any job description resulted from job analysis will cover most important duties and tasks that is needed by the organization for the achievement of its goals.

#### *Development of Job Description without a Job Analysis*

- The researchers and professionals agreed also that job description should be exist by using job analysis, however, in practice that is not the issue because some jobs are new in nature and that make the managers and human resources professionals to create job description with what it will cover. Since the job is new it is difficult for the analyst to get more information about the job from different sources such as staff, supervisors and etc (Brannick et al, 2007). In addition, Jones et. al. (1982) stated that using job description to quantify aspects of a job can be effective and efficiency rather than using traditional methods of job analysis which is costly in term of time and financial.
- Usually for the organization to conduct recruitment and selection it has to identify the human attributes required for job performance and do assessment on applicants based on the attributes mentioned, for that to happen need to be translated to job description and later to examined the level of performance based on that as cited by Rehman (2009). Sometimes these process are based on feeling rather than fact as cited

by Guion, (1976) and able to be believed as relationship between job duties and human attributes as it is cited by (Royer, 2009).

#### *Importance of Job Description*

- Levine, Sistrunk, McNutt, & Gael, (1988) mentioned that job description and job analysis are the core stone for many function of human resources like recruitment and hiring, performance evaluation and salary range, and that shows the important of job description in assisting the organization to get people who will performed well in their position. Therefore, well developed job description is needed to clear all the obstacle that the employee will faced while performing their tasks and duties as cited by (Royer, 2009).

#### *The Relationship between Job Description and Employee Job Performance*

- Rue (2006) defined performance as the amount to which an employee accomplished the tasks that made his or her job as cited by Rehman (2009) According to Visser *et. al.*, (1997) Job performance can be defines as how clear the job is being completed as per well known standard operating procedures, these operating standard are to facilitate the employee performance as cited by Rehman (2009). In addition, it stated clear in department handbook (2015) that motivation is the first of those standards because it serves as effort for employee performance, secondly the performance evaluation of the employee and lastly the control as corrective actions to adjust the performance deviations of the employee.
- For the employee to perform any job its required specific knowledge, skills and ability (KSA) therefore, it must be included in the organization job descriptions so that the applicants knows the type of job they are going to faced. So, unclear description of job always leads to poor performance and dissatisfaction (Royer, 2009).
- Popovich, (1998) describe that job performance as a complex phenomenon as diverse variables manipulate job performance and each and every one of these variables would positively influence employee performance, those are age, recognition of achievement and job satisfaction as cited by Rehman (2009).
- Usually for the organization to conduct recruitment and selection it has to identify the human attributes required for job performance and do assessment on applicants based on the attributes mentioned, for that to happen need to be translated to job description and later to examined the level of performance based on that as cited by Rehman (2009). Sometimes these process are based on feeling rather than fact as cited

by Guion, (1976) and able to be believed as relationship between job duties and human attributes as it is cited by (Royer, 2009).

#### IV. DATA PRESENTATION AND INTERPRETATION

This study is about the assessment of the role of job description in determining the performance of employees in case of a few selected manufacturing organizations in and around Pune, Maharashtra. This part of the research paper is concerned with presentation of data that was collected from the respondents through questionnaire and interview. And it composes of three parts in which part one is about demographic information of the respondents. The second part is on the assessment of the role of job description in determining the performance of the employees and third part is about the challenges of job description in the study organization.

##### Response Rate of the Respondents

In order to collect suitable information from the respondents in relation to the assessment of the role of job description in determining performance of the employees, questionnaire comprise of three parts was organized and distributed to 52 respondents from different departments such as administration and finance, human resource, investigation and legal service, monitoring and inspection, research, education and documentation, executive director office, leadership offices (chairperson, deputy chairperson and commissioners) and finally the evaluator from the ministry of labor, public service and human resource development. And in order to support the data has been gathered from the classified and unclassified staff, 7 respondents were selected from middle and top management to fill the questionnaire mentioned below in table 4.1.

Table 4.1: Response Rate of the Respondents

| S/<br>N | Target group                          | Distrib<br>uted | Retur<br>ned | Missi<br>ng | Perform<br>ance |
|---------|---------------------------------------|-----------------|--------------|-------------|-----------------|
| 1       | Top and middle management             | 7               | 7            | -           | 100 %           |
| 2       | Classified and unclassified employees | 45              | 43           | 2           | 95.6 %          |
|         | <b>Total</b>                          | <b>52</b>       | <b>50</b>    |             | <b>96.2%</b>    |

Source: Field Survey March (2016)

From above table 4.1, the total number of questionnaire distributed was 52 in which 7 of them distributed to middle and top management by (100%), while 45 questionnaires was distributed to classified and unclassified staff from different departments mentioned before by (95.6%) and it remain 2 questionnaire missing by (4.4%) were failed to be returned by the respondents.

##### General Profile of the Respondents

The demographic information of the respondents as appeared in table 4.2 below comprises of sex, age, education status, position and work experience of the respondents.

Table 4.2: General Profile of the Respondents

| S /<br>N                       | Sex of<br>respondents             | Top and middle<br>management |                | Classified and<br>unclassified staff |                |
|--------------------------------|-----------------------------------|------------------------------|----------------|--------------------------------------|----------------|
|                                |                                   | Frequen<br>cy                | Percent<br>(%) | Frequency                            | Percent<br>(%) |
| 1                              | Female                            | 1                            | 14.3           | 18                                   | 41.9           |
| 2                              | Male                              | 6                            | 85.7           | 25                                   | 58.1           |
|                                | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>7</b>                     | <b>100%</b>    | <b>43</b>                            | <b>100%</b>    |
| <b>Age of respondents</b>      |                                   |                              |                |                                      |                |
| 1.                             | 18-29 years                       | -                            | -              | 8                                    | 18.6           |
| 2.                             | 30-39 years                       | 1                            | 14.3           | 20                                   | 46.5           |
| 3.                             | 40- 49 years                      | 4                            | 57.1           | 6                                    | 14.0           |
| 4.                             | 50-59 years                       | 2                            | 28.6           | 6                                    | 14.0           |
| 5.                             | 60 years and<br>above             | -                            | -              | 3                                    | 7.0            |
|                                | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>7</b>                     | <b>100%</b>    | <b>43</b>                            | <b>100%</b>    |
| <b>Education status</b>        |                                   |                              |                |                                      |                |
| 1.                             | Primary/<br>Intermediate<br>level | -                            | -              | 7                                    | 16.3           |
| 2.                             | Secondary<br>/senior level        | -                            | -              | 3                                    | 7.0            |
| 3.                             | Diploma                           | 1                            | 14.3           | 12                                   | 27.9           |
| 4.                             | Bachelor<br>degree                | 4                            | 57.1           | 18                                   | 41.9           |
| 5.                             | Master degree                     | 2                            | 28.6           | 3                                    | 7.0            |
| 6.                             | PhD                               | -                            | -              | -                                    | -              |
|                                | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>7</b>                     | <b>100%</b>    | <b>43</b>                            | <b>100%</b>    |
| <b>Position of respondents</b> |                                   |                              |                |                                      |                |
| 1.                             | Director                          | 2                            | 28.6           | 3                                    | 7.0            |
| 2.                             | Coordinator                       | 1                            | 14.3           | 1                                    | 2.3            |
| 3.                             | Head of<br>department             | 4                            | 57.1           | 4                                    | 9.3            |
| 4.                             | Team leader                       | -                            | -              | 2                                    | 4.7            |
| 5.                             | Other<br>employees                | -                            | -              | 33                                   | 76.7           |
|                                | <b>Total</b>                      | <b>7</b>                     | <b>100%</b>    | <b>43</b>                            | <b>100%</b>    |
| <b>Work experience</b>         |                                   |                              |                |                                      |                |
| 1.                             | 1-3 years                         | -                            | -              | 3                                    | 7.0            |
| 2.                             | 4-6 years                         | -                            | -              | 5                                    | 11.6           |
| 3.                             | 7-9 years                         | 4                            | 57.1           | 23                                   | 53.5           |

|              |                       |          |             |           |             |
|--------------|-----------------------|----------|-------------|-----------|-------------|
| 4.           | 10-12 years           | -        | -           | 3         | 7.0         |
| 5.           | 13-15 years and above | 3        | 42.9        | 9         | 20.9        |
| <b>Total</b> |                       | <b>7</b> | <b>100%</b> | <b>43</b> | <b>100%</b> |

Source: Field Survey March (2016)

Based on the above table 4.2, the demographic information of the respondents of this study was divided into two groups such as middle and top management; and classified and unclassified staff. And from view point of their Sex. The result from first group shows that the number of female respondents was 1(14.3%), while male respondents were 6(85.7%). Thus, for the second group of respondents the female was 18 (41.9 %) respondents and 25(58.1%) respondents of the study was from male and the majority of the respondents of this study were male.

The study also assess the age of respondents of two group which was already mentioned before, and as for the top and middle management of the study it shows that 1(14.3%) respondent age range from 30-39 years, 4(57.1%) respondents was range from 40-49 years and 2(28.6%) respondents range from 50-59 years. While the frequencies of classified and unclassified staff show that 8 (18.6 %) respondents was from 18-29 years, 20(46.5%) respondents range from age of 30-39 years, 6(14.0%) respondents was from age (40-49) and (50-59) years respectively and finally the respondents from 60 years and above years was 3 (7.0 %). Thus, 24 respondents age from two group ranges between 30-39 years and 40-49 years and they represent the majority of the staff in the commission.

Table 4.2 above also shows the results of education status of the respondents from top and middle management as 1(14.3%) respondents with Diploma degree, 4(57.1%) respondents having Bachelor degree while 2 (28.6 %) respondents with master degree. But the frequencies of respond from the classified and unclassified staff show the level of education status was 7(16.3%) respondents with primary/intermediate certificates, 3(7.0%) respondents with secondary/senior certificates, 12(27.9%) respondents with Diploma degree, 18(41.9%) respondents with bachelor degree and finally 3(7.0%) respondents with master degree. So, we can conclude that the majority of respondents in the commission were having bachelor degree.

From the questionnaires that distributed to the respondents , the position of respondent from middle and top management, 2(28.6%) respondents are directors, 1(14.3%) respondent was a coordinator and 4(57.1%) respondents are head of departments. While the frequencies of classified and unclassified staff shows that 3(7.0%) respondents were directors, 1(2.3%) respondent was coordinator, 4(9.3%)

respondents are head of departments, team leader was 2(4.7%) respondents and other employees were 33(76.7%) and they were the majority.

The work experience of the respondents was assessed also, therefore, the result for the middle and top management from the table shows that 4(57.1%) respondent having experience of 7 – 9 years in workplace and 3(42.9%) respondents with experience of 13-15 years and above in managing offices. While the classified and unclassified staff having different working experience and as a result, 3(7.0%) respondents was with 1-3 years experience, 5(11.6%) respondents was having experience of 4- 6 years, 23(53.5 %) respondents with experience of 7-9 years, 3(7.0%) respondents having 10-12 years of working experience and finally 9(20.9%) respondents there experience from 13-15 years and above. Thus, the majority of employees experience range from 7-9 years working experience.

#### *Assessment of the Role of Job Description*

As part of the first objectives of this study the researcher would like to examine the results of all questions that was already asked in questionnaire and answered by the respondent of the study.

Table 4.3: Employees Awareness about Their Job Description

| <i>Respondents</i> |                  |                  |                   |                         |                              |
|--------------------|------------------|------------------|-------------------|-------------------------|------------------------------|
| <i>S/N</i>         | <i>Responses</i> | <i>Frequency</i> | <i>Percentage</i> | <i>Valid percentage</i> | <i>Cumulative percentage</i> |
| 1.                 | <i>Yes</i>       | 34               | 79.1              | 79.1                    | 79.1                         |
| 2.                 | <i>No</i>        | 9                | 20.9              | 20.9                    | 100.0                        |
| <b>Total</b>       |                  | <b>43</b>        | <b>100.0</b>      | <b>100.0</b>            |                              |

Source: Field Survey March (2016)

Table 4.3 shows the status of employees on whether they are aware about their job description or not, the majority 34(79.1%) respondents from the total number of 45 respondents responded that they are aware about their job description and the remaining 9(20.9%) respondents responded that they are not aware about their job description for the reason that they are not given any orientation by the organization on their job description. And from the results of interview they said the type of job description they have is not clear because they rely on the term of reference that was advertise for the vacancy which is ended by the application and interview for the position. Therefore, the majority of the employees in are informed of their job description and that will be positive signs towards employees awareness of their work.



**Table 4.5: Response Related to Assessment of Job Description**

| S/N | Variables   | S. Agree |          | Agree |         | Somehow Agree |         | Disagree |         | S. Disagree |         |
|-----|---|----------|----------|-------|---------|---------------|---------|----------|---------|-------------|---------|
|     |   | Freq.    | Percent. | Freq. | Percent | Freq.         | Percent | Freq.    | Percent | Freq.       | Percent |
| 1.  | Employee current job description clears about the chain of command in                           | 23       | 53.5     | 9     | 20.9    | 4             | 9.3     | 5        | 11.6    | 2           | 4.7     |
| 2.  | As an employee, Unclear job description leads to your poor performance.                         | 14       | 32.6     | 11    | 25.6    | 7             | 16.3    | 6        | 14.0    | 5           | 11.6    |
| 3.  | Job descriptions used for evaluating employee performance.                                      | 7        | 16.3     | 9     | 20.9    | 9             | 20.9    | 14       | 32.6    | 4           | 9.3     |
| 4.  | Employees are required to have particular knowledge, skills and ability to perform his/her job. | 19       | 44.2     | 8     | 18.6    | 13            | 30.2    | 2        | 4.7     | 1           | 2.3     |
| 5.  | Job descriptions are used for benefits payment (rewards, recognition etc.)                      | 11       | 25.6     | 12    | 27.9    | 8             | 18.6    | 8        | 18.6    | 4           | 9.3     |
| 6.  | Because of changes, your job description was updated  | 6        | 14.0     | 11    | 25.6    | 5             | 11.6    | 14       | 32.6    | 7           | 16.3    |
| 7.  | Written job descriptions are provided to each employee working in the commission.               | 6        | 14.0     | 1     | 2.3     | 2             | 4.7     | 12       | 27.9    | 22          | 51.2    |

Source: Field Survey March (2016)

Based on the above table 4.5, many variables such as Chain of Command, the uses of job description for employee performance appraisal, recruitment, compensation and benefits payments (reward & recognition etc.), the possession of knowledge, skills and ability, the update job description, Written job description for the employees, Authority in decision making are listed for respondents to rate their extent on the issues related to job description in the concerned institution.

#### *Chain of Command*

Based on the above 4.5.1 which is about whether employees current job descriptions are clear about chain of command, 2(53.5%) and 9(20.9%) of the respondents strongly agree and agree that current chain of command in their respective job description in the commission is clear about to whom they report within different departments, 5(11.6%) and 2(4.7%) of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree. And from the total respondents, the remaining 4(9.3%) of respondents somehow agree that their job description is clear about chain of command. From this, it is possible to infer that, current job description considered the chain of command for better reporting and accountability process of an employee.

#### *The Relationship between Job Description and Employee Performance*

The relationship between job description and employees performance was clear from table 4.5.2, in which 14(32.6%) and 11(25.6%) of the respondents strongly agree and agree that unclear job description led to poor performance of an employee in the commission, and that implies that the commission is facing challenges of organization performance and employees dissatisfaction, while 5(11.6%) and 6(14.0%) of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree with the existent of the relationship between unclear job description

and employee poor performance. Thus, the remaining 7(16.3%) of the respondents somehow agree that there is relationship between job description and employee performance. It is possible to conclude that unclear job description led to poor performance of an employee in the commission.

#### *The Use of Job Description for Employee Performance Appraisal*

In regard to the question that focus on whether their job descriptions were used for employee performance appraisal, its appeared in table 4.5.3 that, 14(32.6%) and 4(9.3%) of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree that job description in the commission was used for evaluating employee performance, 9(20.9%) and 7(16.3%) of the respondents strongly agree and agree that job description was used in as one of the employee performance appraisal tool. Thus, the remaining 7(16.3%) of the respondents somehow agree that job description in the commission was used for evaluating employees performance. In addition to this, interview results from middle and top management also indicate that there was no evaluation had been done in the commission because of challenges of funds to materialize the job description but the commission only rely on the outcomes of an assignment given to the employee and that indicate that if an employee doesn't got any assignment for the whole of the year it will be difficult to evaluate his/ her performance. Therefore, we conclude that job description was not used for employees' performance appraisal in the commission since its establishment.

#### *Use of Job Description for Benefits Payment*

The other point on the above table 4.5.4 focus on the use of job description for benefits payment (rewards, recognition, etc.) based on that, 11(25.6%) and 12(27.9%) of the

respondents strongly agree and agree that job description was used for benefits payment of the employees, 4(9.3%) and 8(18.6%) of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree. And from the total respondents, the remaining 8(18.6%) respondents somehow agree. It is possible to conclude that considered job description was use for benefits payment.

#### *The Possession of Knowledge, Skills and Ability to Perform the Job*

The performance of any job required knowledge, skill and ability to perform it, in relation to that, the above table 4.5.5. shows that 19(44.2%) and 8(18.6%) of the respondents strongly agree and agree that as an employee he/she should have knowledge, skill and ability in different fields to performed different task in IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS that assigned to him, 2(4.7%) and 1(2.3%) of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree. Thus, the remaining 13(30.2%) respondents somehow agree that knowledge, skill and ability are required for the employee performed any job. This infers that the majority of respondents agreed with the requirement of knowledge, skill and ability in any job description.

#### *The Update Job Description*

Concerning the update of job description, the above table 4.5.6 show that, 6(14.0%) and 11(25.6%) of the respondents strongly agree and agree their job description was updated for the changes in the positions and structures, 14(32.6%) and 7(16.3%) of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree that their job descriptions was updated because of the changes in the position or the structures, from the total respondents,

the remaining 5(11.6%) of the respondents somehow agree with the update of job description. Therefore, we can conclude that the majority of respondents disagree that there was no changes in job description when change happened in their position or structure. So, it's implied the importance to update the job description when there is any change in the position or organization structures so that it implicate to the performance of the employees.

#### *Possession of Written Job Description*

From the above table 4.5.7 based on the question that whether employees were provided with written job description or not, 6(14.0%) and 1(2.3%) of the respondent strongly agree and agree that they have written job description, 12(27.9%) and 22(51.2%) of the respondents disagree and strongly disagree that written job description was provided to the employees. And finally from the total respondents, the remaining 2(4.7%) of the respondents somehow agree with the existence of written job description. The open- ended questions also indicated that employees were not provided with written job description in the commission. Then we can conclude that the majority of respondents disagree by not having written job description

#### *The Challenges of Job Description as the Objective Two of the Study*

Based on the information collected from the respondents of this study and to answer the objective two, the researcher come out with questions and through the analysis results shows different responses from them as it is mentioned below;

**Table 4.6: Response of Job Description Challenges Related to Sufficient Training of the Employees, Lack Employees Development, Poor Job Design/Redesign, Proper Job Specification and Lack of Employees Motivation**

| S/<br>N | Variables                            | Very Low Level |            | Low Level |            | Moderate Level |            | High Level |            |
|---------|--------------------------------------|----------------|------------|-----------|------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|
|         |                                      | Frequency      | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency      | Percentage | Frequency  | Percentage |
| 1.      | Sufficient training of the employees | 3              | 7.0        | 12        | 27.9       | 24             | 55.8       | 4          | 9.3        |
| 2.      | Lack of Employees Development        | 8              | 18.6       | 24        | 55.8       | 10             | 23.3       | 1          | 2.3        |
| 3.      | Poor Job Design/Redesign             | 3              | 7.0        | 5         | 11.6       | 8              | 18.6       | 27         | 62.8       |
| 4.      | Proper Job Specification             | 25             | 58.2       | 7         | 16.3       | 5              | 11.6       | 6          | 14.0       |
| 5.      | Lack of Employees Motivation         | 7              | 16.3       | 5         | 11.6       | 9              | 20.9       | 22         | 51.2       |

Source: Field Survey March (2016)

From the above table 4.6, different variables such as sufficient training of the employees, lack of employees Development, poor Job Design/Redesign, proper Job Specification and lack of employees Motivation are asked to examine the extent or the level of these variables as a challenge to employee performance. In relation to this, respondents were expected to rate levels that related with challenges of job description in regards to employees performance. In this case 24(55.8%) of the respondents infer that, challenges of job description in regards to sufficient training of the employees is considered as at moderate level. And 15(34.9%) of the respondents responded that, challenges of sufficient training of the employees in the commission is at low level. And from the total respondents, the remaining 4(9.3%) of the respondents responded that, sufficient training of the employees in at the high level. Based on the above results it is possible to conclude that, the extent of sufficient training of the employees in the organizations can be ranked at moderate level.

The other point on the above table focus on the extent of lack employees development, based on that point majority of the respondents 32(74.4%) responded that, the extent of lack of employees development is at low level. And 10(23.3%) of the respondents responded that the extent of lack of employees development is at moderate level. And from the total respondents, the remaining 1(2.3%) of the respondents rated the extent of lack of employees development is at high level. This implies that employee's development in it's considered as a need to mitigate the challenges of job description that employees are facing.

In relation to the extent of poor job design/redesign of job description in these organizationst is appear in the above table

4.6, the majority of respondents 27(62.8%) responded that, the extent of job design/redesign is at high level. From the total respondents, the remaining 8(18.6%) of the respondents responded, the extent of job design/ redesign is at low and moderate level respectively. From this it is possible to conclude that job design/redesign in the commission is not considered to alleviate the challenges of job description and increase employees performance.

From the above table 5.6, in regards to proper job specification that is asked from the respondents to rate their extent as one of the challenges to job description and employees performance, majority of the respondents 32(74.5%) responded that, the extent of proper job specification is at low level in from the total respondents, the remaining 5(11.6%) and 6(14.0%) of the respondents were rated it at moderate and high level respectively. From this paragraph it is possible to understand that job specification is challenge to the employees' performance in the commission.

Finally, based on the above table 4.6, the employees are asked also to rate the extent of lack of employees motivation in, in this case majority of 22(51.2%) of the respondents rated the extent of lack of employees motivation at the high level. From the total respondents, the remaining 1(27.9%) and 9(20.9%) of the respondents were rated their extent of lack of motivation at low and moderate level respectively. Therefore, based on the above information, it is possible to conclude that the extent of challenge of lack of employee motivation in relation to their current job description in can be ranked at high level.

*Response to the Level of Job Description Dissatisfaction in Relation to Poor Description, Ineffective Job Description, Awareness on Job Description and Job Description Orientation*

**Table 4.7: Variables Related to Job Description Dissatisfaction**

| S/N | Variables                                   | Very Low Level |            | Low Level |            | Moderate Level |            | High Level |            |
|-----|---|----------------|------------|-----------|------------|----------------|------------|------------|------------|
|     |   | Frequency      | Percentage | Frequency | Percentage | Frequency      | Percentage | Frequency  | Percentage |
| 1.  | Poor description of job description         | 3              | 7.0        | 8         | 18.6       | 5              | 11.6       | 27         | 62.8       |
| 2.  | Ineffective job description                 | 4              | 9.3        | 8         | 18.6       | 13             | 30.2       | 18         | 41.9       |
| 3.  | Awareness about the job description content | 5              | 11.6       | 4         | 9.3        | 20             | 46.2       | 14         | 32.6       |
| 4.  | Job description orientation                 | 7              | 16.3       | 6         | 14.0       | 11             | 25.6       | 19         | 44.2       |

Source: Field Survey March (2016)

To examine the extent of employees job description dissatisfaction in relation to poor job description, ineffective job description, awareness about the job description contents and job description orientation. The above table 4.7 shows that the majority of 27(62.8%) of the respondents infer that, the challenge of job description in relation to poor description of job description in is considered as at high level. And 5(11.6%) of the respondents assumed that, challenge of poor job description in is at moderate level. And from the total respondents, the remaining 11(25.6%) of the respondents rated the challenge of poor job description in the commission is at low level. Therefore, we can conclude that the extent of challenge of poor description of the job description in can be ranked at high level.

The other point of job description dissatisfaction was related to ineffective job description, and from the above table 4.7, 18(41.9%) of the respondents rated the extent of job description ineffectiveness at high level. And 13(30.2%) of the respondents infer that, challenge of job description ineffectiveness in is at moderate. And the remaining 12(27.9%) of the respondents responded that, challenge of job description ineffectiveness is at low level. And based on the above results, it is possible to conclude that; extent of challenge of job description ineffectiveness in the commission can be ranked at high level.

Based on the above table 4.7, in regards to challenge of awareness about the job description content, majority of 20(46.5%) of the respondents rated the extent of awareness about their job description as at moderate level. And 14(32.6%) of the respondents assumed that the challenge of awareness on their job description content in is at high level. From the total respondents, the remaining 9(20.9%) of the respondents rated that, the extent of awareness on their job description content is at moderate level. And that implied that, employees in the commission were aware about their job descriptions content.

Finally, the respondents were asked also to rate the extent of job description orientation as one of challenge, in this case 19(44.2%) of the respondents infer that, the challenge of job description in regards to job description orientation in is considered as at high level and 11(25.6%) of the respondents rated the challenge at moderate level. And from the total respondent, the remaining 7(16.3%) and 6(14.0%) of the respondents rated that, the extent of job description orientation is at very low and low level respectively. Based on that, it is possible to conclude that, the extent of challenge of job description orientation in can be ranked at low.

## V. CONCLUSION

From the finding of this study the following are concluded

- To check the relationship between job description and employees performance, the majority of the respondents agree that unclear job description led to

poor performance of an employee in the commission, and that implies that the commission is facing challenges of organization performance and employees dissatisfaction. It is possible to conclude that unclear job description led to poor performance of an employee in the commission.

- In regard to the used of job description in employees performance appraisal, the majority of the respondents disagree that job description in the commission was used for evaluating employee performance. but the commission only rely on the outcomes of an assignment given to an employee, that indicate if an employee didn't got any assignment for the whole of the year it will be difficult to evaluate his/ her performance.. In addition to this, interview results from middle and top management also indicate that there was no evaluation done in the commission because of challenges of funds to materialize the job description. Therefore, we conclude that job description was not used for employees' performance appraisal in the commission since its establishment.
- Concerning the update of job description, the majority of respondents from disagree that, job description were not updated even if there is changes happened in the position or the structures. That means its importance to update job description when there are any changes in the position or organization structures so that it implicate to the performance of the employees.
- Concerning the employees whether they were provided with written job description or not, majority of the respondents disagree that, written job description was provided to the employees in commission. The open- ended questions also indicated that employees were not provided with written job description in the commission. Then we can conclude that the majority of respondents disagree by having written job description. Therefore, there is need for the commission to provide job description for each employee so that they follow what is expected from them to perform.
- In relation to the extent of poor job design/redesign of job description in, the majority of respondents rated the extent of poor job design/redesign is at high level. From this it is possible to conclude that poor job design/redesign in the commission is not considered to alleviate the challenges of job description and increase employees' performance.
- In regards to proper job specification that is asked from the respondents to rate their extent as one of the challenges to job description and employees performance, majority of the respondents rated the extent of proper job specification in at low level. From this paragraph it is possible to understand that



job specification is challenge to the employees' performance in the commission.

- Finally, the employees are asked also to rate the extent of lack of employees' motivation in, in this case majority of the respondents rated the extent of lack of employees' motivation in at high level. Therefore, based on the above information, it is possible to conclude that the extent of challenge of lack of employee motivation in relation to their current job description in can be ranked at high level.
- In regards to the extent of employees' job description dissatisfaction in relation to poor job description, majority of the respondents infer that, the challenge of job description in relation to poor description of job description in is considered at high level. Therefore, we can conclude that the extent of challenge of poor description of the job description in can be ranked at high level.
- In relation to job description dissatisfaction that related to ineffective job description, majority of the respondents rated the extent of job description ineffectiveness as a challenge to employees' performance at high level. And based on the above results, it is possible to conclude that; extent of challenge of job description ineffectiveness in the commission can be ranked at high level.
- Finally, the respondents were asked also to rate the extent of job description orientation as one of challenge. In this case, majority of the respondents infer that, the challenge of job description in regards to job description orientation in is considered at high level. Based on that, it is possible to conclude that, the extent of challenge of job description orientation in can be ranked at low.

## VI. RECOMMENDATIONS

To enhance the role of job description in and make it effective as well as to mitigate its major challenges, the researcher recommended the following suggestions based on the finding of this study.

- Employee performance depends on the clear developed job description that is usually provided by the organization itself, but that was not considered in these organizations and to correct that situation the researcher recommended the development of job description that will come out with specific responsibilities and duties for the employee within different departments to overcome the challenges of employees' poor performance.
- The other points that needs recommendation is the issues of employees' evaluation. In most of the organizations employees promotion, compensation, reward, recognition and motivation was not practiced because of the absent of the

policy/guidelines/instruments to be used for the evaluation in the that led to under evaluation of the employees performance. Therefore, the researcher is recommending the introduction of performance appraisal policy so that it help in evaluating employees performance and give them courage to work hard and get recognition for their good performance (promotion, rewards bonus etc.) in the future.

- The update of job description was not considered in these organizations because of the changes that always occurred, and with changes employees sometimes are required to go for further training or development about new duties and responsibilities to overcome the challenges of new changes in their job descriptions. Therefore, the researcher recommended for the update of job description when changes happen in the commission for better employees performance and the organization in general.
- Job description is known as a road map for any employee to follow, but that became a challenge to the employees' performance in IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS because of lack of written job description provided to the employees. Therefore, for the employees to perform what is expected from them in the commission, the researcher is recommending for the commission to develop and provide written job description for every employee in the commission to follow it.
- Another issue that require recommendation is about poor job design/ redesign in IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS, from the finding it clear that job design/ redesign was not considered as solution to employees poor performance. So, the commission required to adopt the strategy of job design/ redesign for enrichment and enlargement of employees job description for their better performance.
- It is clear that proper job specification is considered as one of the challenge to job description and employees performance in IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS. So, there is a need for the commission to developed proper job description for each employee with the specific qualification that is required for specific job and position to avoid employees' poor performance.
- The development of any job description should consider the motivation factors that will motivate the employee. But this is not considered in the current job descriptions of the employees in these organizaations, therefore, the researcher recommended for the review of all current job description and come with one that will motivate employees and their performance for the success of the organization.

- Poor job description and ineffective job description was considered as the critical challenges to employees' dissatisfaction in the commission. To resolve these challenges, IN THESE ORGANIZATIONS is required to come with new job descriptions that fit the type of job that needed to be performed by an employee, introduce new mechanism to activate job descriptions and job descriptions orientation for the new employees the commission to familiarize an employee with his new task and the system in the organization.

## REFERENCES

- [1]. Amos, T., Ristow, A. & Ristow, L. (2004). Human Resource Management, 2nd edition. Lansdowne: Juta.
- [2]. Armstrong, M. (2006). Hand Book of Human Resource Management Practice, 10th edition.
- [3]. Brannick, M. T., Levine, E. L. & Morgeson, F. P. (2007). Job and Work Analysis: Methods, Research and Applications for Human Resource Management. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage Publication.
- [4]. Bryman, A., and Bell, E. (2003). Business Research Methods, Oxford University press, New York.
- [5]. Cascio, W. F. (1998). Applied Psychology in Human Resource Management, 5th Edition. Prentice Hall, Upper Saddle River, NJ.
- [6]. Chalachew, (2015). Assessment of Challenges and Opportunities of Public Sector Change Management Practices: The Case of Ministry of Civil Service. Master Thesis, Ethiopian Civil Service University, Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
- [7]. Chandan, J. (2007). Management: Theory and Practice, 2nd edition.
- [8]. Cole, (1996). Management: Theory and Practice, 5th edition. Dp Publication: Aldine Place, London.
- [9]. Cooper, D., and Schindler, P. (1998). Business research methods, 6th edition. McGraw hill, Boston.
- [10]. Grant, P. C. (1988). Why Job Descriptions Don't Work. Personnel Journal, January 1988, 52-59.
- [11]. Guion, R. M. (1976). Recruiting, Selection and Job Placement. In M. D. Dunnette (ed.). Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology, Chicago: Rand-McNally.
- [12]. Hahn, D. C., & Dipboye, R. L. (1988). Effects of Training and Information on the Accuracy and Reliability of Job Evaluation. Journal of Applied Psychology, 73, 146-153.
- [13]. Heathfield, (2004). How to Develop a Job Description, <http://hr.blr.com/j/JDM>. Updated December 16, 2014
- [14]. Jones, A. P., Main, D. S., Butler, M. C., & Johnson, L. A. (1982). Narrative job Descriptions as Potential Sources of Job Analysis Ratings. Personnel Psychology, 35, 813-828.
- [15]. Kotheri, C. R. (2004). Research Methodology & Method and Techniques, 2nd Revised Edition, New Age International (P) Limited, New Delhi.
- [16]. Kumar, A. (2002). Research Methods in Social Science [E-Book], Sarup and Sons Publication. India, New Delhi.
- [17]. Leopold, (2002). Human Resource in Organizations, Pearson Education Limited.
- [18]. Leung, (2007). The Impact of Information Quality of Job Descriptions on an Applicant's Decision to Pursue a Job. Master Thesis, University of Waterloo, Ontario, Canada.
- [19]. MoFEP & LGB, (2015). State Accountant Job Description, South Sudan, Juba, October 12, 2015.
- [20]. Ontario College, (2008). Position Paper on Scopes of Practice, Ontario College of Social Workers and Social Services Workers, October 2008, p. 2, 6, 9-10.
- [21]. Rao, Krishna, (2002). Management Text and Cases, Excel Books, New Delhi.
- [22]. Ref : AC/SSUD/SA <http://www.acted.org>, 2015.
- [23]. Rehman, (2009). Impact of Analysis on Job Performance: a Study of Public Sector Organizations of Pakistan. PhD Thesis, National University of Modern Languages, Islamabad.
- [24]. Robbins, and Coulter, (2002). Management, 7th edition. Pearson Education Asia.
- [25]. Royer, (2009). Job Descriptions and Job Analyses in Practice: How Research and Application Differ. PhD Thesis, DePaul University, Chicago.
- [26]. Schermerhorn, (2002). Management, 7th edition.
- [27]. Singh, Sharma, and Bhuker, (2014). Job Analysis Behavior and Legal Issues, International Research Journal of Management and Commerce, Vol. 1, Issue-6, September 2014, p. 26-27, 31.
- [28]. Stybel, Laurence J. (2010) 'Managing the Inner Contradictions of Job Descriptions: A Technique for Use in Recruitment', the Psychologist-Manager Journal, 13: 2, 105- 110.
- [29]. UIC, (2009). Writing effective Job Descriptions, University of Illinois at Chicago, March, 2009, p.2-1, 2-2.