American Journal of Sciences and Engineering Research

E-ISSN– 2348–703X, Volume 9, Issue 3, 2026

Assessment of Job Satisfaction of Construction Workers on Building Project Delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria

Aleem, M. O[1], Raheem, S. B[2,] Abidoye, A. A[3]., Alli, M. A[4].

[1,3,4] *Department of Quantity Surveying, The Polytechnic, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.*
[2] *Department of Civil Engineering, The Polytechnic, Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria.*

Abstract: *This study assessed job satisfaction of construction workers on building project delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. The objectives were to examine the causes of job satisfaction, determine the factors affecting construction workers' job satisfaction, and assess the effects of job satisfaction on workers' performance on building project delivery. A quantitative research design was adopted using structured questionnaires administered to construction professionals and selected artisans. Forty-three (43) questionnaires were administered and thirty-five (35) were retrieved, yielding an 81.39% response rate. Data were analysed using mean score, frequency distribution, percentage distribution, and one-way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA). The leading causes of job satisfaction are autonomy (M = 4.11), colleague and formidable team and work environment (M = 3.45 each), constructive and production challenges (M = 3.37), and variety of work (M = 3.34). The primary driver factors are effective management and intermediate qualification (M = 3.05 each) and conducive working environment (M = 3.02). Statistically significant barrier factors include high workload, unnecessary victimisation, job insecurity, long working hours, and poor working conditions. The most significant effects on workers' performance are adequate experience (M = 3.71), boosting staff motivation and creativity (M = 3.60), and using organisational tools correctly (M = 3.51). The study concludes that effective consideration of the identified factors is crucial for improving workers' quality of life, productivity, and reducing the risk of mental health problems on building project delivery in the study area.*

Keywords: *Job Satisfaction; Construction Workers; Building Project Delivery; Ibadan; Oyo State; Nigeria; ANOVA; Work Performance*

I. Introduction

1.1 Background to the Study

The construction industry plays a vital role in the development of the economy and infrastructure of nations, contributing significantly to Gross Domestic Product (GDP) and workforce ratio of countries throughout the globe (Rue and Byars, 2013). The ultimate desire of all stakeholders such as clients, consultants, contractors, and sub-contractors is the successful completion of projects within planned schedule, budget, quality, and customer satisfaction (Attar and Sweis, 2010). Workers in this industry frequently report high levels of stress arising from heavy workloads, long and irregular working hours, and insecurity in the working environment, which adversely affect their physical and psychological health. Since the industry is project-based, workers face lower job security, a persistent concern for researchers investigating project success factors (Karatepea et al., 2006). Improved worker satisfaction is the key element for sustainable productivity in the construction industry (Dawal and Taha, 2006), and organisations must prioritise human resources to achieve high performance and optimal project delivery outcomes.

 Received-25-05-2026 Accepted- 06-06-2026

Job satisfaction is the key ingredient that leads to recognition, income, promotion, and the achievement of other goals that produce a feeling of fulfilment (Currall, Towler, Judge and Kohn, 2015). Negative and unfavourable attitudes towards the job indicate job dissatisfaction (Armstrong, 2006). Factors affecting job satisfaction include superiors' concern for employees, job design, wages, working conditions, social relationships, and perceived opportunities (Rue and Byars, 2013). There is therefore an immense need to identify the critical factors influencing job satisfaction in the construction industry, specifically in Nigeria.

1.2 Statement of the Research Problem

The Nigerian construction industry faces considerable challenges in human performance that negatively affect organisational productivity, quality of work, project duration, and firm profitability (Attar and Sweis, 2010). Research indicates significant differences in what employees want from their work across industries (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2012). If construction workers lay down their tools, the resulting reduction in productivity and time overruns substantially increase construction costs given cost penalties for non-completion (Olabosipo, 2004). Furthermore, improved worker satisfaction has been identified as key to sustainable productivity in the industry (Dawal and Taha, 2006). There is therefore a need to assess job satisfaction of construction workers on building project delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State, where targeted empirical investigations remain limited.

1.3 Research Questions

i. What are the causes of job satisfaction among construction workers on building project delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State?

ii. What are the factors affecting the construction workers' job satisfaction on building project delivery in the study area?

iii. What are the effects of job satisfaction on construction workers' performance on building project delivery in the study area?

1.4 Aim and Objectives of the Study

The aim of this study is to assess job satisfaction of construction workers on building project delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State, with a view to enhancing the efficient contributions of employees to building project delivery. The specific objectives are to: (a) examine the causes of job satisfaction among construction workers on building project delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State; (b) determine the factors affecting construction workers' job satisfaction on building project delivery in the study area; and (c) assess the effects of job satisfaction on construction workers' performance on building project delivery in the study area.

1.5 Significance of the Study

Job satisfaction is proven as one of the key factors that contributes to productivity (Mustapha, 2013). Understanding the needs of employees, particularly in the construction supply chain, enables managers to determine appropriate rewards to motivate and retain their workforce (Schermerhorn et al., 2015). Non-financial incentive schemes in Nigeria's construction industry have accounted for 6% to 26% increases in output in block-laying and concreting activities (Olabosipo, 2004). Being aware of specific factors influencing satisfaction could provide management with insights into reducing alienation at the workplace, securing employee loyalty, and attracting potential employees to increase productivity (Mustapha, 2013).

II. Review of Related Literature

2.1 Theoretical Framework

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory proposes that human motives are based on needs arranged in an ascending hierarchy, from physiological needs through safety, social needs, and self-esteem, to self-actualisation. Individuals cannot advance to the next level until all needs at the lower level are satisfied (Marzuki, Permadi and Sunaryo, 2012). In construction, this implies that both basic needs such as safety, compensation, job security and higher-order needs such as recognition and professional growth must be addressed to achieve and sustain job satisfaction.

Herzberg's Two-Factor (Motivation-Hygiene) Theory distinguishes between hygiene factors, extrinsic elements such as salary and working conditions that prevent dissatisfaction and motivators, intrinsic elements such as

achievement and recognition that generate genuine satisfaction (Marzuki, Permadi and Sunaryo, 2012). Hygiene factors determine the extent to which an employee can avoid job dissatisfaction (Zhang, Yao and Cheong, 2011). In construction, addressing only hygiene factors is insufficient to generate the engagement needed for successful project delivery; a comprehensive approach addressing both categories is required.

2.2 Overview of Job Satisfaction in the Construction Industry

Job satisfaction refers to an employee's emotional state, covering the complete range of emotions from positive to negative (Zhang, Yao and Cheong, 2011). Fisher (2000) characterised it as a form of attitude comprising an affective component (feelings and emotions) and a cognitive component (comparisons, judgments, and beliefs). Job satisfaction can be seen as the result of a chain of motivational factors that influence an individual to perform (Marzuki, Permadi and Sunaryo, 2012). In the literature, its importance is frequently linked to work performance and organisational productivity, as well as absenteeism, turnover, and reduction of litigation (Zhang, Yao and Cheong, 2011).

Employee job dissatisfaction leads to lack of interest in responsibilities, tardiness, withdrawal from job duties, and diminishing job performance, ultimately resulting in high employee turnover (Branham, 2005; Gregory, 2011). Conversely, employees who perceive their jobs as satisfying are more likely to remain in the organisation and contribute effectively to its performance (Tutuncu and Kozak, 2007). Understanding factors that shape satisfaction is essential for employers so that relevant changes can be made to prevent employee frustration (Dawal and Taha, 2006).

2.3 Causes of Job Satisfaction among Construction Workers

The importance of job satisfaction can be viewed in the context of two decisions: the decision to belong and the decision to perform (Jung and Moon, 2007). Workers satisfied with their jobs have more regular attendance and are less likely to be absent for unexplained reasons (Boggie, 2005). Job autonomy i.e the degree of control a construction worker has over their work is a significant cause of satisfaction (Koys, 2001). Greater autonomy leads to increased satisfaction and motivation, positively impacts productivity, and reduces employee turnover (Kim, 2002). Variety of work, constructive challenges, collegial relationships, and a formidable team environment characterised by mutual respect further contribute to satisfaction (Javed, Balouch and Hassan, 2014; Karatepea, Uludag, Menevis, Hadzimehmedagic and Baddar, 2006; Robbins, Odendaal and Roodt, 2003).

Regular and adequate compensation, competitive pay, fair benefits, and timely payment of wages are key factors in motivating and retaining skilled workers (Genc and Coskun, 2016; Malik, 2011). Work-life balance, job security, conducive working conditions, effective leadership, and the nature of the work itself constitute additional causes of satisfaction in the construction workplace (Luthans, 1995; Karatepea et al., 2006; Dawal and Taha, 2006; Kreitner and Kinicki, 2007).

2.4 Factors Affecting Construction Workers' Job Satisfaction on Building Project Delivery

Factors affecting job satisfaction fall into personal determinants and organisational factors (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2012). Job stress defined as feelings of tension, anxiety, frustration, and emotional exhaustion (Mahfood, Pollock and Longmire, 2013) is a major factor inversely related to satisfaction. At least 25% to 50% of employees are unable to work at their best due to stress, leading to low productivity and high employee turnover (Branham, 2005). Insufficient organisational support and overbearing workloads further intensify job stress (Ashe-Edmunds, 2014). Lack of effective communication leaves employees feeling disconnected from the organisation, dampens satisfaction, and generates resentment (Gregory, 2011; Steingrímódóttir, 2011). Unfair payment structures reduce motivation and contribute to retention problems (Igalens and Roussel, 1999; Money and Graham, 1999; Green and Heywood, 2008). Demographic variables including age, gender, educational level, and years of experience further shape satisfaction levels. Employees with intermediate qualifications report higher satisfaction than those with higher education, whose expectations are often unmet by employers (KhMetle, 2003; Boggie, 2005). As employees become more experienced, initial expectations become more realistic, coinciding with increased satisfaction (Schermerhorn et al., 2015).

2.5 Effects of Job Satisfaction on Construction Workers' Performance

Work discipline, adherence to organisational rules, policies, and procedures plays a central mediating role between satisfaction and performance (Dessler, 2000; Rivaldo and Nabella, 2023). Arriving on time, using

organisational tools correctly, and maintaining high accountability are hallmarks of disciplined workers (Bock and Kim, 2002; Bamberger and Bacharach, 2006; Podsakoff et al., 2000). Organisational culture characterised by respect, innovation, stability, and recognition of achievement is positively associated with satisfaction and performance (Davidescu et al., 2020; Taskiran et al., 2017). The emotional quotient and its dimensions have a significant positive influence on organisational innovation and ultimately higher job satisfaction (Tajpour, Moradi and Jalali, 2018). Adequate experience, boosting staff motivation and creativity, frequent payment of salary, and effective work discipline are among the most significant performance effects of satisfaction (Ratnasari et al., 2019; Sudarsih and Supriyadi, 2019; Rivaldo and Nabella, 2023).

2.6 Empirical Review

Koys (2001) found in a longitudinal study that employee satisfaction, organisational citizenship behaviour, and low turnover positively predict organisational effectiveness. Jung and Moon (2007) found significant variations in job satisfaction by sector and demographic profile using Korean labour panel data. Marzuki, Permadi and Sunaryo (2012) identified physical working conditions, interpersonal relationships, and remuneration adequacy as key satisfaction factors in Indonesian construction companies. In the Nigerian context, Olabosipo (2004) demonstrated that non-financial incentive schemes improved bricklayers' productive time by 6% to 26% in block-laying and concreting activities. Oke (2013) found that leadership quality significantly influenced worker motivation and satisfaction among Nigerian construction professionals. These findings collectively provide empirical grounding for the present study, which focuses on building project delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State, where such targeted investigations have hitherto been absent.

III. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design, Population, and Sampling

The study adopted a quantitative research design using structured questionnaires administered to construction professionals and artisans within selected construction and consultancy firms in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. The target population comprised Quantity Surveyors, Architects, Structural/Civil Engineers, Mechanical Engineers, Electrical Engineers, Builders, and selected artisans (carpenters, bricklayers, electricians, painters, glaziers, plumbers, tilers, and iron benders). Purposive sampling was employed, as the study was limited to selected professionals and artisans in Ibadan metropolis who possess specific professional knowledge and practical experience relevant to the assessment of job satisfaction on building project delivery. The sampling frame comprised 43 professionals and 26 artisans from seven selected firms, as presented in Table 1.

Table 1: Sampling Frame of Selected Professionals and Artisans in Ibadan Metropolis

Construction Firm	Professionals	Artisans	Total
Ejide Properties	7	—	7
Oduak Project Ltd	7	—	7
Doplas Consults	5	—	5
Amole Surveyor and Build.	6	—	6
Farys & Lyha Construction Ltd	5	—	5
Cost & Project Multivetures	8	—	8
Contrabuild and Associates	5	—	5
Artisans (all firms combined)	—	26	26
Total	**43**	**26**	**69**

Source: Researcher's Preliminary Investigation, 2025

Artisan breakdown: Bricklayer = 10; Tiler = 4; Electrician = 3; Carpenter = 3; Glazier = 2; Iron Bender = 2; Painter = 1; Plumber = 1. Abbreviations: QS = Quantity Surveyors; Arch = Architects; M/E = Mechanical Engineers; E/E = Electrical Engineers; C/E = Civil Engineers; Bldr = Builders.

3.2 Data Collection, Questionnaire Design, and Tools for Analysis

Primary data were obtained through structured questionnaires comprising four sections: Section A (background information); Section B (causes of job satisfaction); Section C (factors affecting job satisfaction); and Section D (effects on workers' performance). Secondary data were sourced from relevant textbooks, journal articles, and published materials. The Likert scale of 1 to 5 was applied: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Undecided.

Data were analysed using mean score, frequency distribution, percentage distribution, and one-way ANOVA. The mean score formula (plain text) is: X-bar = $(5n_5 + 4n_4 + 3n_3 + 2n_2 + 1n_1) / (n_5 + n_4 + n_3 + n_2 + n_1)$, where $n1–n_5$ represent the number of respondents selecting each Likert value. The ANOVA F-ratio (plain text) is: F = MST / MSE, where MST = SST / (k−1) and MSE = SSE / (N−k); k = number of groups; N = total observations. Statistical significance was assessed at $p < 0.05$.

IV. Data Presentation, Analysis, and Discussion of Results

4.1 Response Rate

Forty-three (43) questionnaires were administered to respondents across selected construction and consultancy firms in Ibadan metropolis. Thirty-five (35) questionnaires were retrieved and found valid for analysis, yielding an 81.39% response rate, which is adequate and reliable for the findings of the study, as presented in Table 2.

Table 2: Questionnaire Distribution and Retrieval

Response of Respondents	Number	Percentage (%)
Questionnaires administered	43	100.00
Questionnaires not retrieved	8	18.60
Questionnaires retrieved and analysed	35	81.39

Source: Field Survey, 2025

4.2 Demographic Profile of Respondents

Table 3: Academic Qualification of Respondents

Academic Qualification	Frequency	Percent (%)
National Diploma (ND)	2	5.7
Higher National Diploma (HND)	8	22.9
B.Sc / B.Tech	10	28.6
Postgraduate Diploma (PGD)	8	22.9
M.Sc / M.Tech	4	11.4
Ph.D	3	8.6
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 3 shows the academic qualifications of respondents. The analysis reveals that 28.6% are B.Sc/B.Tech holders, followed by equal proportions of HND and PGD holders (22.9% each), M.Sc/M.Tech (11.4%), Ph.D

(8.6%), and ND holders (5.7%), confirming that all respondents are academically qualified to provide reliable data relevant to the study objectives.

Table 4: Professional Designation of Respondents

Professional Designation	Frequency	Percent (%)
Quantity Surveyor	15	42.8
Civil Engineer	7	20.0
Architect	4	11.4
Mechanical Engineer	4	11.4
Builder	4	11.4
Electrical Engineer	4	11.4
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 4 shows that 42.8% of respondents are Quantity Surveyors, 20.0% Civil Engineers, and 11.4% each are Architects, Mechanical Engineers, Builders, and Electrical Engineers, ensuring a multi-disciplinary perspective on job satisfaction in the construction industry.

Table 5: Professional Affiliation of Respondents

Professional Affiliation	Frequency	Percent (%)
Nigerian Institute of Quantity Surveyors (NIQS)	19	54.3
Nigerian Society of Engineers (NSE)	11	31.4
Nigerian Institute of Architects (NIA)	4	11.4
Nigerian Institute of Building (NIOB)	4	11.4
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 6: Professional Membership of Respondents

Professional Membership	Frequency	Percent (%)
MNIQS (Member, NIQS)	19	54.3
MNSE (Member, NSE)	11	31.4
MNIA (Member, NIA)	4	11.4
MNIOB (Member, NIOB)	4	11.4
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 7: Professional Registration of Respondents

Professional Registration Body	Frequency	Percent (%)
QSRBN (Qty Surveyors Reg. Board of Nigeria)	19	54.3
COREN (Council for Reg. of Engineering)	11	31.4
ARCON (Architects Reg. Council of Nigeria)	4	11.4
CORBON (Council of Reg. Builders of Nigeria)	4	11.4
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Tables 5 to 7 confirm that all respondents are affiliated with, members of, and registered under appropriate professional bodies in Nigeria, validating their professional competence and the reliability of their responses to the study objectives.

Table 8: Years of Experience in the Construction Industry

Years of Experience	Frequency	Percent (%)
Below 5 years	14	40.0
5–10 years	10	28.6
10–15 years	6	17.1
15–30 years	5	14.3
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 9: Roles of Respondents in the Construction Industry

Role in Construction Industry	Frequency	Percent (%)
Contractor	16	45.7
Consultant	12	34.3
Client Representative	7	20.0
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Table 10: Types of Building Projects in Which Respondents Are Involved

Type of Building Project	Frequency	Percent (%)
Auditorium Building	14	40.0
Storey Building	8	22.9
Complex Building	6	17.1
Event Centre	5	14.3
ICT Building	1	2.9
Commercial Building	1	2.9
Total	**35**	**100**

Source: Field Survey, 2025

Tables 8 to 10 show that 40.0% of respondents have below 5 years of experience, 28.6% have 5–10 years, 17.1% have 10–15 years, and 14.3% have 15–30 years; respondents serve as contractors (45.7%), consultants (34.3%), and client representatives (20.0%); and they have been involved in diverse building project types, from auditorium buildings (40.0%) to commercial buildings (2.9%), reflecting a broad range of practical construction experience.

4.3 Causes of Job Satisfaction among Construction Workers on Building Project Delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State

Respondents were questioned on the causes of job satisfaction using the scale: 5 = Strongly Agree, 4 = Agree, 3 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, and 1 = Undecided. Results are presented in Table 11.

Table 11: Causes of Job Satisfaction among Construction Workers on Building Project Delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State

Causes of Job Satisfaction	Mean	S.D	F	Sig.
Autonomy	4.11	0.993	1.774	.506
Colleague and formidable team	3.45	1.171	.857	.193
Work environment	3.45	1.171	.857	.118
Constructive and production challenges	3.37	1.139	1.339	.537
Variety of work	3.34	1.211	0.222	.977
Conducive working conditions	3.28	1.177	0.581	**.017***
Word of encouragement	3.28	1.177	0.581	.986
Effective leadership	3.22	1.238	0.614	.121
Fair compensation and benefits	3.22	1.190	0.845	.150
Nature of the work itself	3.20	1.158	0.305	.165
Regular and adequate compensation	3.17	1.360	0.380	.205
Job security	3.11	1.078	1.123	.430
Work life balance	3.08	1.197	0.663	.527
A supportive work environment	2.88	1.345	0.415	.676

Source: Field Survey, 2025 Note: * $p < 0.05$

Table 11 reveals that the five highest-ranked causes of job satisfaction are: autonomy (M = 4.11); colleague and formidable team and work environment (M = 3.45 each); constructive and production challenges (M = 3.37); variety of work (M = 3.34); and conducive working conditions and word of encouragement (M = 3.28 each). The least-ranked cause is a supportive work environment (M = 2.88). The ANOVA results indicate that only conducive working conditions is statistically significant at the 95% confidence level (F = 0.581, p = 0.017). All other causes return $p > 0.05$, indicating non-significant variation across respondent categories. These findings are consistent with Kim (2002), who demonstrated that participative management and job autonomy are strong determinants of satisfaction, and with Javed, Balouch and Hassan (2014), who established collegial relationships as key satisfaction drivers.

4.4 Factors Influencing Construction Workers' Job Satisfaction on Building Project Delivery – Drivers

Respondents were further questioned on driver factors influencing job satisfaction. Results are presented in Table 12.

Table 12: Factors Influencing Construction Workers' Job Satisfaction on Building Project Delivery in the Study Area (Drivers)

Driver Factors	Mean	S.D	F	Sig.
Effective management and employees	3.05	1.493	2.494	.067
Employees in possession of an intermediate level of qualification	3.05	1.493	2.494	.372
Conducive working environment	3.02	1.424	2.577	.060
Prevention of job stress	2.97	1.248	0.331	.855
Safety and security	2.91	1.442	1.304	.294
Lack of communication	2.91	1.442	1.304	.813
Compensation	2.85	1.240	0.286	.884
Age of workers	2.85	1.240	0.286	.579
Pay and rewards	2.82	1.316	0.313	.867

Source: Field Survey, 2025 Note: * $p < 0.05$

Table 12 shows that the leading driver factors are effective management and employees with intermediate qualifications (M = 3.05 each), conducive working environment (M = 3.02), prevention of job stress (M = 2.97), safety and security and lack of communication (M = 2.91 each), compensation and age of workers (M = 2.85 each), and pay and rewards (M = 2.82). None of the driver variables attained statistical significance (all $p > 0.05$), indicating that all listed driver factors require broader and more systematic management consideration to enhance effective job satisfaction on building project delivery, consistent with Mustapha (2013) and Mahfood, Pollock and Longmire (2013).

4.5 Factors Influencing Construction Workers' Job Satisfaction on Building Project Delivery – Barriers

Respondents were also questioned on barrier factors negatively influencing job satisfaction on building project delivery. Results are presented in Table 13.

Table 13: Factors Influencing Construction Workers' Job Satisfaction on Building Project Delivery in the Study Area (Barriers)

Barrier Factors	Mean	S.D	F	Sig.
High workload	3.0571	1.49397	2.929	**.037***
Unnecessary victimization from supervisor to subordinate	3.0571	1.34914	3.054	**.032***
Job insecurity	3.0294	1.42457	3.425	**.020***
Long working hours	2.9714	1.24819	3.083	**.031***
Poor working conditions	2.9143	1.44245	6.706	**.001***
Lack of social security	2.9143	1.29186	4.740	**.005***
Bullying and harassing	2.8571	1.24009	3.519	**.018***
Poor supervision and co-worker support	2.8571	1.26358	.326	.859
Unfair rewarding systems	2.8286	1.31699	.891	.222

Source: Field Survey, 2025 Note: * $p < 0.05$

Table 13 shows that the highest-ranked barrier factors are high workload and unnecessary victimisation from supervisor to subordinate (M = 3.0571 each), followed by job insecurity (M = 3.0294), long working hours (M = 2.9714), poor working conditions and lack of social security (M = 2.9143 each), bullying and harassing and poor supervision and co-worker support (M = 2.8571 each), and unfair rewarding systems (M = 2.8286). Seven barrier factors are statistically significant at $p < 0.05$: poor working conditions ($F = 6.706$, $p = 0.001$), lack of social security ($F = 4.740$, $p = 0.005$), bullying ($F = 3.519$, $p = 0.018$), job insecurity ($F = 3.425$, $p = 0.020$), long working hours ($F = 3.083$, $p = 0.031$), unnecessary victimisation ($F = 3.054$, $p = 0.032$), and high workload ($F = 2.929$, $p = 0.037$). Only poor supervision and co-worker support ($p = 0.859$) and unfair rewarding systems ($p = 0.222$) are not statistically significant. These findings corroborate Branham (2005), who identified excessive workload and job insecurity as primary contributors to dissatisfaction, and Steingrímódóttir (2011), who linked poor supervisory quality with reduced satisfaction.

4.6 Effects of Job Satisfaction on Construction Workers' Performance on Building Project Delivery

Respondents were further questioned on the effects of job satisfaction on workers' performance on building project delivery. Results are presented in Table 14.

Table 14: Effects of Job Satisfaction on Construction Workers' Performance on Building Project Delivery in the Study Area

Effects of Job Satisfaction on Performance	Mean	S.D	F	Sig.
Adequate experience	3.7143	1.17752	.218	.172
Boosting staff motivation and creativity	3.6000	1.26491	.126	.596
Using organisational tools correctly	3.5143	1.24550	1.676	**.001***
Emotional quotient and its dimensions of the employees	3.4857	1.06747	2.258	.324
Frequent payment or salary of the employee	3.4571	1.37932	1.561	.597
Work discipline	3.3429	1.51352	.939	.680
Employee retention benefit	3.0571	1.49397	2.174	.104
Employees are more dissatisfied in their job	3.0571	1.34914	.776	.574
Job satisfaction is highest when needs are aligned	3.0571	1.49397	1.418	.383
Organisational culture	3.0571	1.34914	2.916	.987
It enhances productivity	3.0294	1.42457	2.776	.068
Organisations with transformational leaders promote innovation	3.0294	1.42457	.922	.054
Unnecessary time and cost overrun	2.9714	1.40348	3.580	**.001***
Effective performance in carrying out a task	2.9714	1.40348	.295	.324
Delivery of quality project	2.9143	1.44245	.085	.597
Personal factors influencing job satisfaction	2.9143	1.44245	.162	.680
Work structure and job satisfaction	2.8286	1.31699	.339	.386
High levels of accountability and discipline of workers	2.8286	1.31699	1.894	.940

Source: Field Survey, 2025 Note: * $p < 0.05$

Table 14 reveals that the six highest-ranked effects on construction workers' performance are: adequate experience (M = 3.7143); boosting staff motivation and creativity (M = 3.6000); using organisational tools correctly (M = 3.5143); emotional quotient and its dimensions (M = 3.4857); frequent payment or salary (M = 3.4571); and work discipline (M = 3.3429). The least-ranked effects are work structure and job satisfaction and high levels of accountability and discipline (M = 2.8286 each). ANOVA results identify two statistically significant variables: using organisational tools correctly ($F = 1.676$, $p = 0.001$) and unnecessary time and cost overrun ($F = 3.580$, $p = 0.001$). All other variables return $p > 0.05$, indicating non-significant variation across respondent categories. These findings are consistent with Rivaldo and Nabella (2023), who established that correct use of organisational resources and work discipline are primary performance outcomes of high satisfaction, and Davidescu et al. (2020), who demonstrated that organisational culture and innovation are significant correlates of employee satisfaction and performance.

V. Conclusion and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusion

This study assessed job satisfaction of construction workers on building project delivery in Ibadan, Oyo State, Nigeria. The leading causes of job satisfaction are autonomy (M = 4.11), colleague and formidable team and work environment (M = 3.45 each), constructive and production challenges (M = 3.37), and variety of work (M = 3.34); only conducive working conditions is statistically significant ($p = 0.017$). All listed driver factors are not considerably significant as motivating factors (all $p > 0.05$) and require effective consideration by management. The significant barrier factors — poor working conditions ($F = 6.706$, $p = 0.001$), lack of social security, bullying, job insecurity, long working hours, unnecessary victimisation, and high workload have considerable impact on workers' satisfaction and overall well-being. Using organisational tools correctly and avoiding unnecessary time and cost overrun are the most significant performance effects ($p = 0.001$ each). The study concludes that effective consideration of the identified factors is crucial for improving workers' quality of life, productivity, and reducing the risk of mental health problems on building project delivery in the study area.

5.2 Recommendations

i. Appreciation and recognition should be duly accorded to construction workers in order to encourage job satisfaction, increase productivity, and promote their general well-being.
ii. Timely payment of employees' wages should be ensured to enable workers meet their financial obligations and maintain commitment to project delivery.
iii. Management and supervisors should foster effective teamwork through collaboration, both on and off site, by assigning tasks to groups of workers led by qualified and competent team leaders.
iv. Employers should streamline operational rules and procedures to enable workers to perform consistently at their optimal level.
v. Employers should provide improved physical working conditions, including adequate safety equipment, ergonomic workspaces, and appropriate welfare facilities, to reduce occupational health risks and enhance worker satisfaction.
vi. Employers should establish transparent performance standards and implement merit-based promotion systems to recognise workers who consistently meet expectations.

VI. References

1. Armstrong, M. (2006). A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice (10th ed.). Kogan Page Publishing, London.
2. Arnolds, C.A. and Boshoff, C. (2012). Compensation, esteem value and job performance: an empirical assessment of Alderfer's ERG theory. International Journal of Human Resource Management, 13(4).
3. Ashe-Edmunds, S. (2014). The Effect of Communication on Job Satisfaction. Chron. Available at: http://work.chron.com.

4. Attar, A. and Sweis, R.J. (2010). Studying the relationship between construction workers' job satisfaction and labour productivity. Jordan Journal of Civil Engineering, 4(1): 56–70.
5. Bamberger, P.A. and Bacharach, S.B. (2006). Abusive supervision and subordinate problem drinking: taking resistance, stress, and subordinate personality into account. Human Relations, 59(6): 723–752.
6. Bock, G.W. and Kim, Y.G. (2002). Breaking the myths of rewards: an exploratory study of attitudes about knowledge sharing. Information Resources Management Journal, 15(2): 14–21.
7. Boggie, T. (2005). Unhappy employees. Credit Union Management, 28(4).
8. Branham, L. (2005). The 7 Hidden Reasons Employees Leave. AMACOM, New York.
9. Currall, S.C., Towler, A.J., Judge, T.A. and Kohn, L. (2015). Pay satisfaction and organizational outcomes. Personnel Psychology, 58: 613–640.
10. Dawal, S.Z. and Taha, Z. (2006). The effect of job and environmental factors on job satisfaction in automotive industries. International Journal of Occupational Safety and Ergonomics, pp. 267–280.
11. Davidescu, A.A., Apostu, S.A., Paul, A. and Casuneanu, I. (2020). Work flexibility, job satisfaction, and job performance among Romanian employees: implications for sustainable human resource management. Sustainability, 12(15): 6086.
12. Dessler, G. (2000). Human Resource Management (5th ed.). Prentice-Hall Inc., New York.
13. Fisher, C.D. (2000). Mood and emotions while working: missing pieces of job satisfaction? Journal of Organizational Behavior, pp. 185–202.
14. Genc, O. and Coskun, H. (2016). Job satisfaction level of construction industry employees. 3rd International Scientific Meeting E-GTZ 2016, June, pp. 903–909.
15. Green, C. and Heywood, J.S. (2008). Does performance pay increase job satisfaction? Economica, pp. 710–728.
16. Gregory, K. (2011). The importance of employee satisfaction. Neumann University. Available at: https://www.neumann.edu/academics/divisions/business/journal.
17. Igalens, J. and Roussel, P. (1999). A study of the relationships between compensation package, work motivation and job satisfaction. Journal of Organizational Behavior, pp. 1003–1025.
18. Javed, M., Balouch, R. and Hassan, F. (2014). Determinants of job satisfaction and its impact on employee performance and turnover intentions. International Journal of Learning and Development, 4(2): 120–140.
19. Jung, K. and Moon, M.J. (2007). Do age, gender, and sector affect job satisfaction? Results from the Korean labor and income panel data. Review of Public Personnel Administration, 27(2): 125–146.
20. Karatepea, O.M., Uludag, O., Menevis, I., Hadzimehmedagic, L. and Baddar, L. (2006). The effects of selected individual characteristics on frontline employee performance and job satisfaction. Tourism Management, 27: 547–560.
21. KhMetle, M. (2003). The impact of education on attitudes of female government employees. Journal of Management Development, 22.
22. Kim, S. (2002). Participative management and job satisfaction: lessons for management leadership. Public Administration Review, 62: 231–241.
23. Kim, S. (2004). Factors affecting state government information technology employee turnover intentions. American Review of Public Administration, 35: 137–156.
24. Koys, D.J. (2001). The effects of employee satisfaction, organisational citizenship behavior, and turnover on organisational effectiveness: a unit-level, longitudinal study. Personnel Psychology, 54(1): 101–114.
25. Kreitner, R. and Kinicki, A. (2007). Organizational Behavior (17th ed.). McGraw Hill Irwin, New York.
26. Luthans, F. (1995). Organisational Behaviour (7th ed.). McGraw-Hill Inc., New York.
27. Mahfood, V.W., Pollock, W. and Longmire, D. (2013). Leave it at the gate: job stress and satisfaction in correctional staff. Criminal Justice Studies: A Critical Journal of Crime, Law and Society, pp. 308–325.
28. Malik, N. (2011). Study on job satisfaction factors of faculty members at university of Baluchistan. International Journal of Academic Research, 3(1).
29. Marzuki, P.F., Permadi, H. and Sunaryo, I. (2012). Factors affecting job satisfaction of workers in Indonesian construction companies. Journal of Civil Engineering and Management, pp. 299–309.

30. Money, R.B. and Graham, J.L. (1999). Salesperson performance, pay, and job satisfaction: tests of a model using data collected in the United States and Japan. Journal of International Business Studies, pp. 149–172.
31. Mustapha, N. (2013). Influence of financial reward on job satisfaction among academic staffs at public universities in Kelantan, Malaysia. International Journal of Business and Social Research, 4(3): 244–248.
32. Oke, A.E. (2013). Project management leadership styles of Nigerian construction professionals. International Journal of Construction Project Management, 5(2): 159–169.
33. Olabosipo, I.F. (2004). The impact of non-financial incentives on bricklayers' productivity in Nigeria. Construction Management and Economics Performance, 4.
34. Podsakoff, P.M., MacKenzie, S.B., Paine, J.B. and Bachrach, D.G. (2000). Organisational citizenship behaviours: a critical review of the theoretical and empirical literature. Journal of Management, 26(3): 513–563.
35. Ratnasari, S.L., Sutjahjor, G. and Adam (2019). Employees' performance: organisational culture and leadership style through job satisfaction. Human and Social Sciences Reviews, 7(5): 597–608.
36. Rivaldo, Y. and Nabella, S.D. (2023). Employee performance: education, training, experience and work discipline. Quality – Access to Success, 24(193): 182–188.
37. Robbins, S.P., Odendaal, A. and Roodt, G. (2003). Organisational Behaviour (9th ed.). Prentice-Hall International, Cape Town.
38. Rue, L.W. and Byars, L.L. (2013). Management: Skills and Application. McGraw-Hill, New York.
39. Schermerhorn, J., Hunt, J. and Osborn, R. (2015). Organizational Behavior (9th ed.). John Wiley, New York.
40. Steingrímódóttir, H. (2011). The Relationship Between Internal Communication and Job Satisfaction. Frederiksberg, Denmark.
41. Sudarsih, S. and Supriyadi, S. (2019). The role of workload and work discipline in improving job satisfaction and performance of outsourcing employees. Journal of Scientific Research and Management, 7(10): 1375–1383.
42. Tajpour, M., Moradi, F. and Jalali, S.E. (2018). Studying the influence of emotional intelligence on organisational innovation. International Journal of Human Capital in Urban Management, 3(1): 45–52.
43. Tang, T.L. and Talpade, M. (1999). Sex differences in satisfaction with pay and co-workers. Personnel Journal, 27(3): 5.
44. Taskiran, E., Cetin, C., Ozdemirci, A., Aksu, B. and Istoriti, M. (2017). The effect of the harmony between organisational culture and values on job satisfaction. International Business Research, 10(5): 133–147.
45. Tutuncu, O. and Kozak, M. (2007). An investigation of factors affecting job satisfaction. International Journal of Hospitality and Tourism Administration, pp. 1–19.
46. Zhang, Y., Yao, X. and Cheong, J.O. (2011). City managers' job satisfaction and frustration: factors and implications. The American Review of Public Administration, pp. 670–685.