
Job Attitude as a Factor on Employees Performance

Wendell Cabrera ¹, Dennis Estacio ²

Abstract:

An attitude is a psychological state of mind. It is the way a person thinks about situations, and it ultimately determines a person's behavior. In the workplace, employees can have either a positive or negative attitude about specific work tasks, products or services, co-workers or management, or the company as a whole. Positive attitudes among employees make workdays more enjoyable. Tasks are performed to a higher standard and without complaint. Current study is based on the effect of attitude on employee performance. This study includes the attitude related factors (behaviors of employees and leaders, job satisfaction, job commitment, motivation and training) to investigate their impact on employee performance. This study utilized descriptive method of research. An instrument was developed by the researcher with 8 statements to measure the perceived level of satisfaction, involvement, and performance and then distributed among the respondents with the five- point Likert scale. Result shows that all attitude related factors positively affect the employee performance. Motivation and job commitment has highly significant impact of performance of employees. As a result, organizations should value their experienced personnel and devise effective retention policy by giving competitive salary, experienced base pay and experienced based promotion. That will increase the overall performance of the organization.

Keywords: Attitudes, performance, job satisfaction

¹Department of Education Regional Office III , Philipines. wendell.cabrera@deped.gov.ph

²Department of Education Regional Office III , Philipines. dennis.estacio@bulsu.edu.ph

1. Introduction

Attitudes are the feelings and beliefs that largely determine how employees will perceive their environment, commit themselves to intended actions, and ultimately behave.

Attitudes form a mental set that affects how we view something else. It has an impact on how we view and judge our surroundings at work. Managers of organizational behavior is vitally interested in the nature of the attitudes of their employees toward their Jobs, toward their careers, and toward the organization itself. Job attitudes of the employees are most important to achieve the individual and organizational objectives through their performance. Hence the present study is intended on job attitudes such as job involvement and satisfaction, and employee performance.

Employee involvement refers to the process of engaging employees in their work and increasing their participation in decision-making. In particular, employee involvement ensures that employees who are closet to the work have the power to control work methods, and are able to use their knowledge and skills to improve work process (Lowler,1992) This approach also attempts to move information and power downward in the organization, so that employees can work autonomously and regulate their own behaviors (Cummings and Worley, 1993). As a consequence, organizations that use this approach typically experience a flattening of the organizational hierarchy. Although there is no one theoretical basis for employee involvement, it is derived from a number of key human relation's assumptions (Argyris, 1957). Specifically, it is assumed that when employees are given challenging work. and allowed to participate in decision-making, they will (a) become more motivated and willing to control their own behavior (b) become more involved in their work, (c) increase their commitment to organizational goals, and (d) use their skills and abilities to make valuable contributions to organizational goals.

Job satisfaction is a set of favorable or unfavorable feelings and emotions with which employees view their work. It is an affective attitude - a feeling of relative like or dislike toward something (Newstrom, and Davis, 2001) Job satisfaction studies focus on the various parts that are believed to be important, since these Job – related attitudes predispose an employee to behave in certain way (Hoppock, 1935, Herzberg, 1957, Hulin and Smith, 1964).

Attitudes such as involvement and satisfaction contribute to increase the performance of the employees which is proved by various existing studies (Vroom, 1964, Lawler and Porter, 1967, Velnampy, 2006). Although various research has studied the issue of performance and satisfaction, and explored many facts there is no sufficient studies as a multiple focusing on the public sector organization in the district of Jaffna. In order to fill this gap this study tries to identify the relationship between attitudes and performance.

The following research questions were considered:

1. What are the effects of the attitude of the janitors in their performance at La Consolacion University Philippines?
2. Are the behaviors of co-employees and leaders, job satisfaction, job commitment, motivation and training have impact on janitors' performance?

The main object of the study is to examine the relationship between attitudes and performance and the specific objectives are;

1. To determine the impact of attitudes on employees' performance
2. To suggest the strategies and motivation approach in the LCUP Administration to increase the performance of employees.

2. Theoretical Background

Various studies (Krech, Crutchfield, and Ballachey, 1962, Brown, Galanter, Hess and Mandler 1962, Osgood, Suci, Tannenbaum, 1957, Festinger, 1957, Abelson and Rosenberg, 1958, Kelman and Eagly, 1965, Pushpa Singh, 1981, and Verma 1985) have been done on attitudes. They emphasize the changes in degree of existing attitudes as congruent and changes from positive to negative as incongruent. Attitude change is the consequence of disequilibrium when positive and negative bonds are associated. This disequilibrium initiates change, and change operates in the direction of equilibrium restoration.

A full satisfaction of the employees will make them to give their best to the organization and then improves their performance. Brayfield and Crockett (1955) concluded that there was virtually no evidence of any relationship between satisfaction and performance.

Vroom (1964) up-to-date the study of Brayfield and Crockett and found a median correlation between the two. The high job satisfaction leads to high performance, or that high performers are satisfied with their jobs (Euske et.al, 1980). A number of studies indicate a weak link (Petty et.al, 1984, Laffaladano and Muchinsky, 1985). While others (Caldwell and O' Reilly, 1990, Sector, 1997) suggest a potential relationship between satisfaction and performance. Even though job satisfaction leads to performance, it is not independent in all job facets and that satisfaction with one facet might lead to satisfaction with another (Alf Crossman, and Bassem Abou-Zaki, 2003). Several studies have been done on this area, but a detailed study, in Jaffna district, has not yet been conducted.

Worker Attitude and Job Satisfaction

Worker attitude and job satisfaction deals with how an organization behaves. It involves the management directing employees into improving organizational and

personal effectiveness. It plays an enormous role in determining the attitudes of employees and their job satisfaction. When an employee is happy, it is usually because they are satisfied with their work. This also improves the quality of their work. Attitude and job satisfaction may not fall completely on the management but also on the employees. If employees enjoy their work, they will not need external motivation from management, but instead the satisfaction they attain from completing their work will motivate them (Robbins, 2004).

Job satisfaction is an individual's contentment with their work. Its effect on productivity is either positive or negative. The relationship between job satisfaction and job productivity is however not consistent. An individual may still obtain high job productivity without having the satisfaction in the work. This happens mostly when money is their motivation. Another motivator is improving in his or her work in order to receive a promotion. Other employees may increase their productivity due to the satisfaction they get from their work. A reason for job satisfaction may also come from an employee getting a good salary. It improves job satisfaction as long as an employee has knowledge of the fact that they get fair payment for their efforts at the end of the day.

Job satisfaction has an effect on an individual's satisfaction with life. If an employee does not get satisfaction in their work, they may seek for satisfaction in other work unrelated areas.

This provides fulfillment and balance in their life. He or she may also be content with work as it relates with those work unrelated areas. Job dissatisfaction may also cause an employee to quit (Robbins, 2004).

The Impact of Job Satisfaction and Motivation at Workplace

“Organizational behavior is a field of study that investigates the impact that individuals, groups and structure have on behavior within organizations, for the purpose of applying such knowledge toward improving an organization's effectiveness” (Robbins, Judge and Campbell 2010). The organization's strategic initiatives always depend on the quality and motivation of its workforces which have positive or negative bearing on the organization effectiveness and that importance of workforce cannot be overlooked. One of important work-related attitudes is job satisfaction which is of major interest to the field of organizational behavior. There are different factors affect the level of employee satisfaction at workplace. The job satisfaction levels at any organization either positive or negative reveals a deep impact on the organizations output and productivity. Job satisfaction of employees can be indicative of work behavior such as level of performance, organizational citizenship Behavior and withdrawal behavior such as absenteeism and turnover. In the meantime, motivation is a very important part of understanding workforce behavior since it has a significant impact on organization effectiveness.

Excessive Workload in the Janitorial Industry

Janitors carry out physically demanding work in high-paced environments each day, and these demands have only increased with industry pressures and competitive bidding that result in cheaper cleaning contracts and reduced staff. In California, the union that represents janitors, SEIU-USWW, has raised concerns about the increased workload and resulting injuries their members have experienced since the mid-2000s. In their experience, production rates based on square footage for cleaning have nearly doubled. The union notes that in 2015, it was common for a single janitor to clean as much as 50,000 to 60,000 square feet a night.

Excessive workload is a work organization hazard that can result in sprains and other injuries, especially in an industry that involves high musculoskeletal loads as in the janitorial industry. Excessive workload is also a key contributor to job stress. This report summarizes findings from six focus groups conducted with 59 janitors in the summer of 2016. Five groups were conducted with union janitors in Los Angeles, Orange, Sacramento, San Diego and San Jose, and one was conducted with non-union janitors in Los Angeles. The primary objectives of this study were to better understand: a) the impact of increased workload on the physical and mental health of janitors; b) janitors' concerns with respect to workload and their health and safety at work; c) janitors' experiences with changes in workload in recent years; and d) the extent and types of changes janitors have experienced. Focus group participants were predominantly women and represented an array of ages. Almost all reported their job title was janitor, and a large majority (88%) worked a night shift. One of the criteria used in recruitment was years on the job, in order to compare the changes in workload over time. Janitors had many years of experience working in the industry; 50% had worked as janitors for over 15 years and 28% had worked as janitors for 10 to 14 years. Most of the janitor's clean office buildings. Those in the San Jose group also clean large tech companies, while those in the non-union group also clean movie theaters and malls. Key Findings: □ From the outset, janitors raised explicit workload and workload increases over time as key concerns tied to worker health and safety. In response to a request to estimate to what degree their workload had changed since they began working as janitors, over a third of participants said their workload had increased by 1.5, 28% estimated it had doubled, and 21% stated it had more than doubled. □ Janitors described changes in the areas and spaces they have to clean as one of the main contributors to their increased workload, particularly the impact of changes in density or space design. Though workers are now cleaning more floors overall, these floors have doubled in occupancy as more cubicles and workspaces are fit within floors. For janitors, this represents much more cleaning on each floor. □ There is also reduction in staffing, with fewer workers cleaning these larger, more densely occupied spaces. There is a trend to consolidate or eliminate positions, and hire more part-time staff for shorter shifts, which results in greater staff turnover as the new workers cannot keep up in that short time. Janitors are assigned additional cleaning tasks to complete in the same amount of time, in part

due to staff reductions. □ Scheduling decisions do not include a variety of tasks that take up janitors' time, such as refilling carts or moving from floor to floor, and returning to the office to punch in and out for breaks and lunch. For non-union janitors, time spent driving between buildings is unpaid. In addition, the new "3-2 schedule" in which workers distribute tasks over different days often contributes to increased workload as tasks become more difficult when not completed daily. □ New equipment and supplies, or equipment that is either faulty or in poor condition, also adds to workload. Janitors described, for example, that the new green cleaning solutions do not work efficiently and take much more time and physical effort. □ Concerns about employer treatment shaped employer- worker interactions and workload pressures. An overarching sentiment across focus groups was that workers feel the unrealistic workload represents a lack of respect and being taken advantage of by employers. Stressful supervisor and worker relationships manifested in multiple ways and exacerbated the pressure workers feel about workload. These included supervisors' close monitoring of worker performance, not approving request for leave, adding extra work to others to cover for an absent worker, and retaliating against workers by giving them more difficult tasks or extra work. □ Workers in the non-union group reported similar patterns as contributors to their workload and concerns about employer treatment. Some differences included that this group worked longer days, transportation between job sites was not factored into their workday, and they described instances of not being paid for work completed, as well as having less recourse to address problems. □ Janitors perceived that their demanding workload impacted their health in various ways, including:

- o Bodily injury and broken bones from slips and falls and hitting objects while rushing to complete their work
- o Ergonomic injuries – risk factors such as repetitive work, use of vacuums, lifting heavy items, and using force with the green cleaning supplies are exacerbated because of demands to work at a fast-space, possibly forgoing rest periods.
- o Stress and mental health, including anxiety, frustration and fear. This job stress was described as linked to the high- stress work environment, stressful relationship with supervisors, and the constant adjustments they need to make each day or week to their work plan to meet expectations. The stress and irritability carries over into their family lives, parenting and relationships with their partners.

Janitors provided recommendations to address workload and reduce their risks for injury and illness, including:

- o Involving workers in decisions that affect their health and recognizing the importance of worker voice and experience
- o Engaging the variety of stakeholders including contractors, unions, supervisors, building owners, tenants, and property managers

Excessive Workload in the Janitorial Industry – 2017

- 5 Providing improved training for supervisors and clarifying the employer-worker systems of communication for problem-solving
- Defining realistic workload expectations and tasks and providing written job descriptions or
- Developing policies to protect against excessive workload.

The School Janitor: A Study of the Functions and Administration of School Janitor Service

There are three reasons why the following study of the school janitor service has been made:

(1) The importance of the janitor's position in a modern school system. This is seen by a consideration, especially, of his relation to the up-keep and sanitation of buildings in his charge, the health and safety of their occupants, the educative value of the janitor's work, and his influence upon pupils from a moral standpoint during the years most vital in the formation of character; (2) The nonappreciation of the janitor's importance on the part of school officials the public generally; and (3) No comprehensive study of the subject has heretofore been made. From these considerations, the need for such a study seems conclusive. If school boards, superintendents, principals, teachers, parents, and janitors themselves can be led to understand and appreciate the importance of the janitor as a responsible school officer, and can be shown wherein the service should be improved and the methods by which this may be accomplished, it is believed that a valuable service will have been rendered to the cause of public education.

3. Methodology

This study makes use of the descriptive survey method to obtain data and information needed in determining the Support Services Satisfaction Survey. This survey was devised based upon the criteria formulated by the researcher. Questionnaires were also utilized to gather relevant and pertinent data and information needed to answer the questions of the study. The satisfaction survey was perceived and expressed by the respondents using a five-point likert scale

Methods and Techniques Used

The first step of this research paper was to review the literature on various aspects of values and attitudes and its effect to performance.

The second step was the administration of surveys. This study makes use of the descriptive survey method to obtain data and information needed in determining Survey. This survey was devised based upon the criteria formulated by the researcher. Questionnaires were also utilized to gather relevant and pertinent data and information needed to answer the questions of the study.

Population and Sample of the Study

The researcher decided to conduct the survey to the janitors, administrators, regular teaching and non-teaching personnel at LCUP SY. 2020-2021. The researcher involved selected janitorial workforce and administrators, faculty and non-teaching personnel as respondents representing administrators, regular teaching and non-teaching personnel population drawn using the random sampling method.

Construction of the Instrument

The construction of the instrument of the University Buildings and Maintenance Services Unit Satisfaction Survey was based on the following criteria to wit:

1. Values and Attitudes towards performance
2. Values and Attitudes perception

An instrument was developed by the researcher with 8 statements to measure the perceived level of satisfaction, involvement, and performance and then distributed among the respondents with the five- point Likert scale interpreted as follows:

Table 1: Likert Scale

<i>Point Scale</i>	<i>Interpretation</i>
1	Poor
2	Fair
3	Good
4	Very Good
5	Excellent

After the questionnaires were gathered, they were sorted, tabulated and treated in the following manner.

Mean Scores were computed to describe the level of satisfaction of the respondents on the services provided by the University Buildings and Campus Grounds Maintenance Unit.

4. Empirical Findings/Result

Research demonstrates that interrelationships and complexities underlie what would seem to be the simply defined term job attitudes. (Judge and Muller 2012). “Attitudes are evaluative statements—either favorable or unfavorable—concerning objects, people, or events. They reflect how one feels about something” (Robbins and Judge 2013). Typically researches have assumed that attitudes have three

components: cognition, affect and behavior (Robbins and Judge 2007). These components are closely related.

Components of Attitude



Figure 1 - Components of Attitude, adapted from Robbins and Judge (2007)

Most organizational behavior researches have been concerned with job satisfaction as one of the major work-related attitudes. Job satisfaction means what are the feelings of different employees about the different dimensions of their jobs (Robbins, 2003). Mullins (2010) “A person with a high level of job satisfaction holds positive feelings about the job, while a person who is dissatisfied holds negative feelings about the job”.

Table 2: Summary of Responses for Janitor 1

Janitor 1					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Total (N=31)	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, student's good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	7	14	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	8	11	9.5	<i>Very Good</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	6	7	6.5	<i>Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	6	4	5	<i>Fair</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	6	8	7	<i>Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	9	12	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>

Janitor 1					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Total (N=31)	Interpretation
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	3	4	3.5	<i>Fair</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	8	7	7.5	<i>Good</i>
	average	6.63	8	7.5	Good

Majority of the respondents are satisfied with the values and attitudes towards work performance as expressed by the GOOD rating. On the other hand, Janitor No. 1 must develop to offers help or assistance and to show good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant as these two get FAIR ratings.

Table 3: Summary Of Responses For Janitor 2

Janitor 2					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Total (N=31)	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, student's good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	11	16	13.5	<i>Excellent</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	7	16	11.5	<i>Very Good</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/her work.</i>	6	12	9	<i>Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	6	10	8	<i>Good</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	7	14	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	11	15	13	<i>Excellent</i>
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	6	11	8.5	<i>Good</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	9	11	10	<i>Very Good</i>
	average	7.88	13	10.5	Very Good

Janitor No. 2 was rated by the respondents VERY GOOD by her visibility in the assigned area, being pleasing and approachable, and by showing good example of Augustinian and Marian Servant.

Table 4: Summary Of Responses For Janitor 3

Janitor 3					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Total (N=31)	Interpretati on
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, student's good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	6	9	7.5	<i>Good</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	11	10	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/her work.</i>	9	7	8	<i>Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	8	5	6.5	<i>Good</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	10	5	7.5	<i>Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	10	10	10	<i>Very Good</i>
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	4	4	4	<i>Fair</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	9	7	8	<i>Good</i>
average		8.38	7	7.75	Good

Repondents rated Janitor No. 3 with GOOD, being a new employee of having less than a year as janitor, Janitor No. 3 get VER GOOD by being visible in the assigned area, and by being presentable. To show good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant needs further improvement.

Table 5: Summary of Responses for Janitor 4

Janitor 4					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, students good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	11	14	12.5	<i>Excellent</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	9	14	11.5	<i>Very Good</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	9	9	9	<i>Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	9	6	7.5	<i>Good</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	11	11	11	<i>Very Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	3	3	3	<i>Poor</i>
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	7	10	8.5	<i>Good</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	10	10	10	<i>Very Good</i>
average		8.63	10	9.13	Good

Respondents find Janitor No. 4 as a polite employee as he was rated EXCELLENT. Janitor No. 4 is always visible cleaning the assigned area and always approachable expressed by the rating VERY GOOD. Generally, respondent rated Janitor No. 4 GOOD and he should exert more effort in being neat and presentable as this indicator rated POOR.

Table 6: Summary Of Responses For Janitor 5

Janitor 5					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Total (N=31)	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, student's good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	9	17	13	<i>Excellent</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	10	12	11	<i>Very Good</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	10	11	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	8	13	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	11	12	11.5	<i>Very Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	10	10	10	<i>Very Good</i>
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	9	10	9.5	<i>Very Good</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	10	12	11	<i>Very Good</i>
average		9.63	12	10.88	Very Good

Generally, respondents are very satisfied with the values and attitudes manifested by the work performance of Janitor No. 5 as expressed in all indicators and by the total of VERY GOOD rating.

Table 7: Summary of Responses for Janitor 6

Janitor 6					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Total (N=31)	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, students good</i>	7	14	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>

Janitor 6				
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Total (N=31)
	<i>morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>			
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	7	7	7
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	6	4	5
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	4	2	3
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	7	6	6.5
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	4	6	5
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	3	7	5
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	8	10	9
average		5.75	7	6.38
				Fair

Janitor No. 6 needs further self-evaluation to correct his values and attitudes as the respondents rated the following indicators: Looks presentable, neat and tidy/ Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant./ Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work were all rated FAIR. and by the general average of FAIR rating.

Table 8: Summary of Responses for Janitor 7

Janitor 7				
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, students good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	7	15	11
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	7	7	7

Janitor 7					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	10	5	7.5	<i>Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	9	3	6	<i>Fair</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	8	7	7.5	<i>Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	11	8	9.5	<i>Very Good</i>
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	4	6	5	<i>Fair</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	11	9	10	<i>Very Good</i>
	average	8.38	8	7.94	Good

Respondents are not satisfied to the values and attitudes of Janitor No. 7 as the following indicators: Always offers help or assistance./ Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant were rated FAIR. Janitor No. 7 needs to reflect and do his action to correct and prevent same rating in the next evaluation.

Table 9: Summary of Responses for Janitor 8

Janitor 8					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, students good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	10	18	14	<i>Excellent</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	11	15	13	<i>Excellent</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	9	13	11	<i>Very Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	8	13	10.5	<i>Very Good</i>

Janitor 8					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
5	Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.	10	12	11	Very Good
6	Looks presentable, neat and tidy.	8	13	10.5	Very Good
7	Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.	9	12	10.5	Very Good
8	Shows care to the university properties.	10	14	12	Very Good
	average	9.38	14	11.57	Very Good

Generally respondents are very satisfied with the values and attitudes manifested by the work performance of Janitor No. 8 as expressed in all indicators and by the total of VERY GOOD rating.

Table 10: Summary of Responses for Janitor 9

Janitor 9					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
1	Greets teachers, parents, students good morning or good afternoon with a smile	11	18	14.5	Excellent
2	Always visible cleaning the assigned area.	10	14	12	Very good
3	Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.	9	10	9.5	
4	Always offers help or assistance.	9	13	11	Very good
5	Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.	10	15	12.5	Excellent
6	Looks presentable, neat and tidy.	10	10	10	Very good
7	Shows good example of being Augustinian and	10	11	10.5	Very good

Janitor 9					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
<i>Marian servant.</i>					
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	11	12	11.5	<i>Very good</i>
	average	10	13	11.44	Very good

Respondents are very satisfied with the values and attitudes manifested by the work performance of Janitor No .9 as expressed in all indicators garnered the ratings of two EXCELLENT and VERY GOOD on the rest of the indicators.

Table 11: Summary of Responses for Janitor 10

Janitor 10					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, students good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	4	13	8.5	<i>Good</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	4	10	7	<i>Good</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	1	6	3.5	<i>Fair</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	7	5	6	<i>Fair</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	5	5	5	<i>Fair</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	2	5	3.5	<i>Fair</i>
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	1	7	4	<i>Fair</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	3	8	5.5	<i>Fair</i>
	average	3.38	7	5.38	Fair

Respondents are not satisfied with the values and attitudes that reflect on the performance of Janitor No. 10 as the most of the indicators were rated FAIR. Janitor No. 10 must undergo into the seminars that will help him develop positive attitudes.

Table 12: Summary of Responses for Janitor 11

Janitor 11					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, students good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	9	12	10.5	<i>Very good</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	8	11	9.5	<i>Good</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	7	10	8.5	<i>Good</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	4	9	6.5	<i>Good</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	7	8	7.5	<i>Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	3	7	5	Fair
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	4	9	6.5	Fair
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	8	10	9	<i>Good</i>
average		6.25	10	7.88	Good

Janitor No. 11 needs further self-evaluation to correct his values and attitudes as the respondents rated the following indicators: Looks presentable, neat and tidy/ Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant./ Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work were all rated FAIR.

Table 13: Summary of Responses for Janitor 12

Janitor 12					
Item	Values/ Attitudes	Peer (N=12)	Employees (N=19)	Average	Interpretation
1	<i>Greets teachers, parents, students good morning or good afternoon with a smile</i>	9	12	10.5	<i>Very good</i>
2	<i>Always visible cleaning the assigned area.</i>	4	8	6	<i>Fair</i>
3	<i>Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work.</i>	2	9	5.5	<i>Fair</i>
4	<i>Always offers help or assistance.</i>	3	8	5.5	<i>Fair</i>
5	<i>Approachable and always pleasant to talk with.</i>	6	10	8	<i>Good</i>
6	<i>Looks presentable, neat and tidy.</i>	7	9	8	<i>Good</i>
7	<i>Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant.</i>	1	7	4	<i>Fair</i>
8	<i>Shows care to the university properties.</i>	4	7	5.5	<i>Fair</i>
	average	4.5	9	6.63	Fair

Most of the Respondents are not satisfied with the values and attitudes that reflect on the performance of Janitor No. 12 as the most of the indicators were rated FAIR. Janitor No. 12 must undergo into the seminars that will help him develop positive attitudes. General average of FAIR rating is alarming and corrective actions must be done by Janitor No. 12.

5. Discussion

Research demonstrates that interrelationships and complexities underlie what would seem to be the simply defined term job attitudes. (Judge and Muller 2012). “Attitudes are evaluative statements—either favorable or unfavorable—concerning objects, people, or events. They reflect how one feels about something” (Robbins and Judge 2013). Typically researches have assumed that attitudes have three components: cognition, affect and behavior (Robbins and Judge 2007).

In the totality, respondents rated majority of the janitors with an approval rating of VERY GOOD to the four janitors and GOOD to the Five Janitors while three of the Janitors got an average rating of FAIR.

Majority of the respondents are satisfied with the values and attitudes towards work performance as expressed by the GOOD rating. On the other hand, Janitor No. 1 must develop to offers help or assistance and to show good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant as these two get FAIR ratings.

Janitor No. 2 was rated by the respondents VERY GOOD by his visibility in the assigned area, being pleasing and approachable, and by showing good example of Augustinian and Marian Servant.

Respondents rated Janitor No. 3 with GOOD, being a new employee of having less than a year as janitor, Janitor No. 3 get VER GOOD by being visible in the assigned area, and by being presentable. To show good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant needs further improvement.

Respondents were very satisfied with the values and attitudes manifested by the work performance of Janitor No. 4, Janitor No. 5 and Janitor No. 6 were rated EXCELLENT in some of the indicators and with a gerenal average rating of VERY GOOD.

Janitor No. 7 needs further self-evaluation to correct his values and attitudes as the respondents rated the following indicators: Looks presentable, neat and tidy/ Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant/ Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work were all rated FAIR. and by the general average of FAIR rating.

Respondents are not satisfied to the values and attitudes of Janitor No. 8 as the following indicators: Always offers help or assistance/ Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant were rated FAIR. Janitor No. 8 needs to reflect and do his action to correct and prevent same rating in the next evaluation.

Respondents are not satisfied with the values and attitudes that reflect on the performance of Janitor No. 9 as well as Janitor No. 10 as the most of the indicators were rated FAIR. The three janitors must undergo into the seminars that will help him develop positive attitudes.

Janitor No. 11 needs further self-evaluation to correct his values and attitudes as the respondents rated the following indicators: Looks presentable, neat and tidy/ Shows good example of being Augustinian and Marian servant/ Enthusiastic and full of energy doing his/ her work were all rated FAIR.

6. Conclusions

When an employee reports to work, his attitude affects his work performance and can have an impact on the employee morale around him. Generally, workers with good

attitudes have stronger performance, and workers with poor attitudes exhibit less-than-superior performance. "The values and attitudes of some employees have to change." This is supported by the facts that respondents were giving POOR and FAIR ratings in some indicators.

Majority of the janitors have good attitudes the attitudinal values are the ones that need to be addressed. If these attitudes are having negative effect on the performance, then management is going to have to address a solution.

Janitors, administrators, faculty and non-teaching force of the University must realize that the attitude that they exhibit is just a reflection on how they treat one another, and it will also influence the new employees as the new employees may mirror the prevailing conditions in terms of values and attitudes in the work place. It is everybody's effort to exhibit positive attitude that will enhance the work place.

A bad attitude typically begins with an expectation of yourself or others. You want to please yourself or others, so you establish unrealistic expectations. When you fail to meet an unrealistic expectation, it will create a bad attitude and a negative environment. You need to accept that there's no perfect condition.

Janitors have to change their poor attitudes and must exhibit more dedication towards their job. Other employees have to make effort to correct these attitudes that is affecting the work. The following are recommendations to improve values and attitudes and to increase the individual performance:

1. Let the janitors feel the sense of total belongingness and importance not to let them feel that they are categories into the lower level of the organizations, let them be involved and participate in all institutional activities to establish camaraderie.
2. Identifying the negative of bad attitudes of the janitors and provide corresponding trainings and seminars to correct their attitudes resulting to poor performance at work.
3. Motivating employees to achieve the high level of satisfaction and performance by giving appropriate awards and incentives.
4. Ensure feedback is specific – Don't just tell the employee their poor attitude needs to improve. Point out exactly what negative traits they have and the impact each has on their performance and monitor their action periodically for expected change to positive attitude towards work performance.

7. Acknowledgements

The following institutions and individuals have significantly contributed to the success of the conduct of the study of which the researcher is grateful:

1. La Consolacion University Philippines
2. Department of Education, Region 3
3. Dr. Enrico Rosales, Dean of Graduate School, La Consolacion University Philippines

References:

- Abdalla, Emad. (2015). The Impact of Job Satisfaction and Motivation At Workplace, Board Member at Re3aya Medical Services, Egypt Procurement& Contract Manager at Star Line, UAE Dubai, 30 November 2015
- Al Jasmi, Samira (2012). A Study on Employees Work Motivation and its Effect on their Performance and Business Productivity, The British University in Dubai, March, 2012.
- Barbaro, William J. (1996). The Janitor: The Forgotten Man in the School System. *Plan B Papers*. 558. https://thekeep.eiu.edu/plan_b/558
- Bruce, W. M. & Blackburn, J. W. (1992). *Balancing job satisfaction and performance*. Westport, CT: Quorum Books
- Buchanan, D. and Huczynski A. (2013). *Organisational Behaviour*. 8th ed. Pearson Education Limited
- Craig, R. (1996). *The ASTD training and development handbook: A guide to Human resource development*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Dean, P. (1994). *Performance engineering at work: International board of standards for training, performance and instruction*. Illinois: Barrington.
- Garber, John Absalom. (1992). The School Janitor: A Study of the Functions and Administration of School Janitor Service. *Bureau of Education, Department of the Interior*. 24.
- Graham, G.H. (1982). *Understanding human relations. The individual, organisations, and management*. Science Research Associates, Chicago Inc.
- Feldman, F. (1998). *Housekeeping handbook for institution, business, & industry*. Canada: Thomas Nelson & Son, Limited Don mills.
- Hettiararchchi, H.A.H, Jayarathna, S.M.D.Y., (2014). The effect of Employee Work Related Attitudes on Employee Job Performance: A Study of Tertiary and Vocational Education Sector in Sri Lanka, *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM)*16(4): 74-83
- Huddard, L. (1996-2000). Applied scholastics: opening the doors to learning using L. Ron Hubbard's study techniques, Retrieved June 11, 2003, from://<http://www.appliedscholastics.org/eng/training/business/page01/htm>
- Ian Brooks (2006). *Organisational behaviour, Individuals, Groups and Organisations*. 3rd ed. Pearson Education Limited.
- Jacobs, R., & Jones, M. (1995). *Structured on-the-job training*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Judge T. and Muller J. (2012). *Job Attitude. Annual Review of Psychology*. Timothy- judge.com [online]. Available from: <http://www.timothy-judge.com/documents/Jobattitudes.pdf>
- Kirkpatrick. D. (1998). *Evaluating training programs: The four levels*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Krech.D, Crutchfield.S.R, and Ballachey. Z .E (1962).*Individual in society*. McGraw –Hill, NewYork.

- Lawler E.E.(1992). *The Ultimate Advantage :Creating the High Involvement Organization*, San Francisco; Jossey Basis
- Leonard, Kimberlee. (2018). *Behavior Vs. Attitude in Employees*, Chron.
- Laurie J. Mullins (2010). *Management & Organisational Behaviour*. 9th ed. Pearson Education Limited.
- Luthans, F. (2006). *Organizational Behavior*. 11th ed. Irwin: McGraw-Hill.
- Martin, I., & Jones, R. (1991). *Dictionary of occupation titles* (Vol.I) U.S.: Department of Labor.
- Petty, M. M., McGee, G. W., & Cavender, J. W. (1984). A meta-analysis Of the relationships between individual job satisfaction and individual performance. *Academy of management Review*, 9(4),712-721.
- Rahman Habeeb Ur, and Kodikal Rashmi, Impact of Employee Work Related Attitudes on Job Performance, *British Journal of Economics, Finance and Management Sciences* 93 March 2017, Vol. 13 (2) © 2017 British Journals ISSN 2048-125X
- Robbins, JM. (2004). *How Workers Attitude and Job Satisfaction Affect Their Work*.
- Robbins, Judge and Campbell (2010). *Organisational Behaviour*. 9th ed. Pearson Education Limited.
- Robbins, S. and Judge, T. (2007). *Essentials of Organizational Behavior*. 9th ed. Prentice Hall PTR.
- Robbins, S. and Judge, T. (2013). *Organizational Behavior*. 15th ed. Pearson Education Limited.
- Robinson-Gaines, D., & Robinson, J. (1998). *Moving from training to performance*. San Francisco: Berrett-Koehler.
- Rothwell, W., Hohne, C., & king, S. (2000). *Human performance improvement: building practitioner competence*. Texas: Gulf Publishing Company.
- Rothwell, W., & Kazanas, H. (1994). *Improving on-the-job training*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.
- Saari, Lise M. and Judge, Timothy A. (2004). *Employee Attitudes and Job Satisfaction*, Wiley Periodicals, Inc.
- Stolovitch, H. & Keeps, E (1999). *Handbook of human performance technology*. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass/
- Teran, Suzanne and van Dommelen-Gonzalez, Evan. (2017). *Excessive Workload in the Janitorial Industry – An Emerging Health and Safety Concern –Labor Occupational Health Program – University of California, Berkeley*
- Tessman, C. (2002). *Comprehensive annual financial report*. Pewaukee, Wisconsin: Waukesha County Technical College, Financial Services