

DBA AFRICA MANAGEMENT REVIEW

VOLUME 12 NO 1

2022

**JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN A
RETAIL SUPERMARKET CHAIN IN FRANCISTOWN,
BOTSWANA**

PROF USHE MAKAMBE
LETSWELETSE MATLHAPÉ

A Quarterly publication of the Department of Business Administration,
Faculty of Business and Management Sciences
University of Nairobi

ISSN NO: 2224-2023

DBA Africa Management Review

Received Date

28/02/2022

Accepted Date

11/04/2022

**JOB SATISFACTION AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE IN A
RETAIL SUPERMARKET CHAIN IN FRANCISTOWN,
BOTSWANA**

Prof Ushe Makambe¹, Letsweletse Matlhape²

Abstract

Getting the best out of an organisation's employees is possible when the employees are satisfied with their work situation since satisfied employees are likely to intensify organisational commitment and performance. This study sought to explicate the impact of job satisfaction on employee performance in a selected supermarket chain in Northern Botswana and come up with recommendations that stimulate job satisfaction among employees. The study adopted a positivist research philosophy, a survey design, and a quantitative research approach whence data was collected using a self-administered questionnaire. Data was analysed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) producing statistical techniques such as correlation analysis, regression analysis, and Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) among others. The research findings revealed a positive correlation between job satisfaction (reward/pay, promotion, job safety/ security, working conditions) and employee performance. It was concluded that employees were generally not satisfied with the working conditions in the organisation. A positive work environment did not exist in the selected organisation to boost employee morale hence performance. The study identified gaps in job satisfaction and employee performance in the selected organisation and suggested appropriate mechanisms for the enhancement of job satisfaction which can add value to human resource practices in the retail sector in Botswana. The discoveries of the study are essential as they empower the management of the organisation to establish competencies that enhance employee satisfaction thereby stimulating organisational productivity.

Key words: Job satisfaction; employee performance; employee motivation; retail supermarket chain; Botswana

¹ Department of Graduate Studies and Research, Faculty of Business and Accounting, Botho University, Gaborone, Botswana - makambe2006@gmail.com

² Botswana Open University, Department of Business Management, Gaborone, Botswana

Introduction and Background To The Study

An organisation's human resource is the greatest asset for its development (Babu and Eimani, 2014). On the other hand, obtaining the best out of an organisation's human capital requires substantial managerial commitment and effort (Babu and Eimani, 2014). These authors further postulate that if employees are contented and successfully put up with the conduct and attitude of the establishment, they thrive to do their best for the employer. On the other hand, if the workers are dissatisfied with their work environment, they might not put significant effort in their work leading the organisation to incur substantial decline in productivity hence the relationship between job satisfaction and employee performance. As such, supervising human beings has become a skill that an employer has to effectively master and constantly practise to make his/her staff contented with the work environment (Khan, *et al.*, 2012).

Many studies have exposed the nexus between employee gratification at the workplace and his/her performance (Khan, *et al.*, 2012; Inuwa, 2016; Karunarathna, 2019). There is significant empirical evidence that indicates that job fulfilment and worker performance are undeniably critical factors in a complex cause and effect relationship (Inuwa, 2016; Karunarathna, 2019). Managers and other stakeholders regard job satisfaction as vital since it has the potential to influence an extensive variety of behaviours in organisations which improve workers' levels of wellbeing (Ghazzawi, 2008) hence productivity. Therefore, this study sought to establish the extent of job satisfaction in the selected supermarket chain and how it influenced employee performance hence organisational productivity.

It is universally believed that work fulfillment is positively associated with job performance since workers who are pleased with their occupation tend to accomplish organisational goals better than those who are less satisfied (Ghazzawi, 2008). Job satisfaction solidly

influences the level of work attendance, employee obligation to perform, and efficiency (Khan, *et al.*, 2012). This study therefore sought to determine whether there was a positive interaction between work fulfilment and employee performance in the organisation that was covered in this study.

The retail supermarket chain that was covered in this study has established a work environment where significant employee satisfaction is unlikely at face value – a scenario that has a significant potential to negatively influence employee performance hence organisational productivity. All the retail supermarket's senior managers (including Branch Managers) originate from India and no Motswana (indigenous Botswana citizen) has been elevated to such positions ever since the establishment of the supermarket chain in Botswana. Ironically, all the lower-level employees are Botswana who not only get paid low salaries but work under unsatisfactory working conditions (Selathwa, 2018). Despite numerous calls by employees to have their salaries and working conditions reviewed over the years, nothing has materialised to date. As a result, there have been numerous protests by employees against poor salaries, lack of promotion opportunities, late hours/night knock outs that have been compounded by not providing transport to employees after knocking off late, unpaid overtime, and absence of employment contracts among other numerous employee grievances (Selathwa, 2018). As a result, a devastating industrial action took place in 2018 whereby employees stayed away from work demanding improved wages and working conditions resulting in the instantaneous dismissal of 40 workers (Selathwa, 2018). The generic objective of this study, therefore, was to investigate the impact of job satisfaction on employee performance at the selected retail supermarket chain in Francistown, northern Botswana. The study is further disintegrated into the subsequent specific research objectives as follows:

- i. To examine the effect of reward/pay on employee performance at the selected supermarket chain.
- ii. To determine the effect of promotion on employee performance at the selected supermarket chain.
- iii. To elucidate the effect of job safety/security on employee performance at the selected supermarket chain.
- iv. To explicate the effect of working conditions on employee performance at the selected supermarket chain.

A study like this one is crucial as it will provide large supermarkets in Botswana and elsewhere with an in-depth understanding of the factors that influence job satisfaction and employee performance. Such knowledge will help to shape the future policy development of the organisations thus facilitating the achievement of their business objectives through effective delivery of products and services to customers. The study can help managers articulate employee expectations from their jobs which the firm can use to advance job satisfaction. This kind of a study necessary as it contributes to the development of the body of knowledge by providing additional literature on job satisfaction and worker performance.

Literature Review

This section reviews the literature that enlightens the study. The section, therefore, reviews extant literary works on the effects of various job satisfaction factors on employee performance focusing on reward, promotion, employee safety/security, and working conditions. These elements, and their effects on employee performance, are discussed in the subsequent subsections below.

The effects of reward/pay on job satisfaction and employee performance

Reward/pay entails the objective evaluation of efforts or achievement or some measure of worker performance before deciding on an appropriate reward (Edirisooriya, 2018).

Reward structures could be used to remunerate workers on their individual performance, or it might exist as a team incentive plan which is tied to group performance that establishes the overall team reward which could be fairly divided around the individual team members irrespective of the individual's performance (Moses, 2016). Furthermore, Edirisooriya (2018) asserts that a compensation package is concerned with creating, executing, and maintaining an effective reward scheme. The scheme involves enhancing the organisation, members of its teams, and the individual employee performance. An organisation that uses a reward scheme to upgrade employee performance could include job design, leadership, and training as components of the scheme (Moses, 2016; Edirisooriya, 2018). Such rewards, if operational, are capable of influencing the conduct and performance of workers (Moses, 2016) hence this study sought to establish the effectiveness of the selected organisation's reward system, with its components that include job design, leadership, and training, in modelling the behaviour of employees towards enhanced performance and productivity.

Various other researchers argue that rewards could be detached into two key categories namely basic and extrinsic payments (Egbunike, *et al.*, 2015; Edirisooriya, 2018; Ranjan and Mishra, 2018). These researchers posit that extrinsic rewards consist of monetary remunerations such as financial benefits like pay, bonuses, health insurance, and a pension plan, while intrinsic rewards involve benefits with a psychological motivating influence such as attractive working conditions, employee recognition, job enrichment, and career progression opportunities. These are intangible rewards that are premised to be external to the employee's job. This study attempted to explicate the prevalence, or otherwise, of these forms of employee rewards and establish their effect on the performance of the selected employees of the organisation that was covered in this study.

Highlighting further the influence of diverse reward elements on employee performance, which is the subject of this study, Gohari, *et al* (2013) assert that a positive association exists between equity based remuneration and employee performance. The authors further aver that pay is a strong factor in attracting human capital to firms and it plays a vital role in retaining skilled workforce. An attractive remuneration enhances job satisfaction among an organisations' employees hence there is a need for management of organisations to come up with a strategic reward system that increases employee performance with the goal of achieving competitive advantage for an organisation which is what this study sought to establish.

To enhance employee performance, the supermarket that was covered in this study could revamp its reward structures to ensure the remuneration of workers based on their individual performance, or come up with a reward system that recognises and promotes team work. To further enhance employee performance, the organisation could revisit its job design, leadership, and training as components of the reward scheme to positively influence the attitude and behaviour of employees towards the achievement of organisational goals. Based on this analysis from the literature review, the following hypothesis is tested in this study:

H1: Pay/reward has a positive effect on employee performance.

The effects of promotion on employee performance

Godwin (2014) views promotion as advancement of an employee to a higher post that carries greater responsibilities, higher status, and a better salary. The author further suggests that promotion serves to move people up the ladder of the establishment to more advanced levels of responsibility, authority, and status and improved working conditions. Razak, *et al* (2018) concur that promotion

serves to reward employees for their best performance and to further motivate them to exert more effort in their job tasks thus contributing towards the achievement of the organisation's productivity goal. Naveed, *et al* (2011) assert that when employees acquire merited promotion, they become motivated culminating in them contributing optimum effort towards attaining the objectives of the organisation. The above authors further postulate that an organisation that sets a high level of impartial promotion, an attractive remuneration system, and a decent work environment results in elevated levels of employee satisfaction and performance.

Promotion serves to certify that an employee is performing his/her duties well and that he/she deserves elevation to a higher position with better remuneration which motivates the employee to perform even better. An effective promotion policy which is fair and transparent is critical in organisations as it leads to the stability of the organisation with enhanced employee confidence and heightened performance (Abdul, *et al.*, 2018). Promotion is believed to inspire worker happiness. Sahuruddin and Saluiman (2016) concur that employees who hope to be promoted to serve in more powerful roles work harder and perform better thus enhancing organisational performance. These researchers believe that to the contrary, employees who are aware that they will never be promoted will reduce their effort hence performance until they believe that opportunities exist for them to be promoted in the future. This study sought to elucidate whether employees of the selected organisation believed that promotion prospects existed in the organisation for all employees and that they were executed impartially.

The management of the selected supermarket chain should promote employees who are the best performers to motivate them further and to encourage the rest of the workforce to exert more effort in their job tasks to gain promotion thereby contributing towards the achievement of the organisation's goal of enhanced

productivity and profitability. The organisation should ensure that all promotions are based on merit as this serves to motivate employees who will exert maximum optimum effort in their work knowing fully well that hard work and superior performance are the only bases upon which they will be promoted. Based on this analysis, the following hypothesis was tested in the study:

H2: Promotion has a positive effect on employee performance.

The effects of job safety/security on employee performance

Employees in organisations need to be certain that they will continue having their contracts and will not lose them. This can only be achieved if an organisation has a job safety policy in place that heightens employees' interest to continue working for the organisation in a more productive manner (Ahmed, *et al.*, 2017). Job security constitutes freedom from fear of losing a job. It builds confidence in an employee that he/she will preserve his current job for a long time to come (Sanyal, *et al.*, 2018). Job security constitutes one of the most critical constituents of job satisfaction hence its presence has the capacity to escalate employee performance.

Research illustrates that the significance of job security rests in ensuring employees a stable career path. Its presence in an organisation appears to enhance employees' trust in the establishment resulting in them staying longer thus contributing towards improving their curriculum vitae (Khan, *et al.*, 2012). The authors further argue that employees who are conscious that their employment contracts are safe and secure resolve to work harder to attain the goals of the organisation. The empirical component of this research sought to determine whether the employees of the selected organisation believed that their careers were stable with safe and secure employment contracts and the extent to which this influenced their performance.

It is vitally important that the selected supermarket chain enhances the job security of its employees by making them aware that if they continue to perform well, they will remain in the employ of the organisation for a long time to come. The organisation thus needs to put in place a job safety policy that amplifies the workers' desire to remain in the organisation and to increase their productivity. The management must ensure that the employees do not leave in fear of loss of their jobs thereby increasing job satisfaction. As part of enhancing employee job satisfaction hence employee performance through job security, the organisation must facilitate an environment of a stable career path that stimulates employees' trust in the organisation which will facilitate their staying longer in the organisation continuing to be productive. In view of the aforementioned views, the following hypothesis was tested in this study:

H3: Job safety and security have a positive effect on employee performance.

The effects of working conditions on employee performance

Anitha and Pragadeeswaran (2016) aver that working conditions comprise the work environment and all existing circumstances that affect workers in their place of work which encompass working hours, physical infrastructure, workers' rights, job responsibilities, organisational culture, workload, and training. Managers of organisations must therefore establish a work structure that ensures that every employee's job situation is as safe and healthy as possible. Operational circumstances add to the comfort of personnel and the performance of organisations (Anitha and Pragadeeswaran, 2016).

A study by Munir and Rahman (2016) proposes seven dimensions of job excellence that encompass working conditions namely the physical atmosphere, labour concentration, working period, the public atmosphere, employee abilities and growth, chances for

promotion, and earnings. This study revealed that most of the employees in blue collar careers are unprotected and work in substantially challenging operational circumstances which negatively impact their work fulfilment and performance. Many researchers therefore concur that working conditions are the main factors that stimulate employee performance because working environments have an influence on the level of job gratification in an organisation's employees leading to advanced levels of employee involvement and commitment hence performance (Muindi, 2011; Raziq and Maulabakhsh, 2015; Sengul, 2017; Hsiao and Lin, 2018). The empirical research accompanying this study sought to confirm the findings of the reviewed literature by establishing whether the working conditions experienced by the employees of the selected organisation such as working hours, physical infrastructure, job responsibilities, organisational culture, workload, and training enhanced employee performance or did not.

The managers of the supermarket chain that was covered in this study need to make sure that the working hours, physical infrastructure, workers' rights, job responsibilities, organisational culture, workload, and employee training are conducive to stimulate employee performance in their organisation given the strong association between the work environment and employee performance. Based on this view that is confirmed by the extant literature, this study tested the following hypothesis:

H4: Working conditions have a positive effect on employee performance.

Theoretical foundation

This study is hinged on Herzberg's Two-factor theory of motivation. The position of this theory is that there is a set of job elements in an organisation that trigger employee satisfaction while another distinct set of factors exists that trigger employee dissatisfaction and these two

categories of factors act independently from one another (Ezeanyim, *et al.*, 2019).

The Herzberg's Two-factor theory of motivation is a valuable strategic management tool. It enables managers who aspire to increase job satisfaction amongst employees to focus on motivating factors (satisfiers) (Busaclic and Mujabasic, 2018). The addition of motivators and hygiene factors will usually enable organisations to motivate workers and deliver job satisfaction and facilitate active performance (Zobisch and Swanson, 2017; Ezeanyim, *et al.*, 2019). The theory explicates that employee satisfaction and dissatisfaction are the outcome of diverse factors that are related to the job, that is, job content and job context (Jegede and Ola-Olorun, 2017).

Job content is the internal motivators which result in employee personal growth such as accomplishment, acknowledgement, and the personal emotion of individuals in the organisation. This can be achieved through factors such as salary, working conditions, promotion, and a safe work environment. Job context, on the other hand, is the external motivators which result in employee satisfaction such as specific activities taking place in the work place. It identifies the actual duties and responsibilities that are related with the job which encompass company policy, supervision and relationship with supervisors, working conditions, relationship with peers, salary, personal life, relationship with subordinates, employee status, and work safety (Nini, 2019). Based on this theory, this study sought to establish the presence of satisfiers and dissatisfiers in the selected organisation and the extent to which these elements contributed to employee performance.

Research Methodology

This study adopted a positivist research philosophy, a quantitative research methodology, and the survey design whence a structured questionnaire was used to collect data on the nexus between job satisfaction and employee performance in a selected

supermarket chain. This design was adopted because it explicitly describes the organisation of a study indicating the various interconnected conclusions (Creswell, 2014; Saunders, *et al.*, 2016).

Data was collected from three retail stores that were part of the supermarket chain that was covered in this study using a sample of 150 respondents who were chosen from a population of 200 employees. The simple random sampling strategy was used to select the respondents as it guarantees each unit of the

population an equal probability of being picked to participate in the study. The sample size was determined using Krejcie and Morgan (1970) sample size table whereby for a population of 200, the sample size is 132 which was inflated to 150 to cater for non-responses and to enhance the generalisability of the research findings. The formula that was used to come up with the sample size is indicated below (Krejcie and Morgan, 1970).

Formula for determining sample size

$$s = \frac{X^2 NP(1 - P)}{d^2(N - 1) + X^2 P(1 - P)}$$

s = required sample size.

X^2 = the table value of chi-square for 1 degree of freedom at the desired confidence level (3.841).

N = the population size.

P = the population proportion (assumed to be .50 since this would provide the maximum sample size).

d = the degree of accuracy expressed as a proportion (.05).

Source: Krejcie & Morgan, 1970

Before data was collected, the questionnaire was pilot tested to enhance its validity and reliability (Junyong, 2017). The pilot study involved 21 respondents (seven from each store) who were randomly selected. Pilot testing enabled the researcher to determine how appropriate, comprehensive, and realistic the instrument was and to tackle possible problems before the instrument was substantively used.

To further establish the validity of the study, the appropriateness of factor analysis was tested and established before exploratory factor analysis was adopted utilising the Kaiser Meyer Olkin (KMO) test of sampling adequacy. The strength of the variables under study was tested using the Bartlett's test of sphericity (BTS) and the Average Variance

Extracted (AVE). The KMO is a statistical technique that is utilised to reduce many observed variables to a small number of constituents (Hadi and Ilham, 2016). The AVE measures the level of variance that is captured by a construct against the level due to measurement error (Pallant, 2013). Hadi and Ilham (2016) elucidate that the sample is adequate if the value of the KMO is above 0.5, while Pallant (2013) puts the figure at a minimum of 0.6. The strength of the correlation determined by the BTS should be less than 0.5 as the acceptable value for the AVE is 0.5 with those above 0.7 being very good (Pallant, 2013).

The reliability of the research instrument was determined using the Cronbach's Alpha

reliability test. A Cronbach reliability analysis was conducted on all the items to check on the internal consistency of the scales and establish whether these scales could be trusted for data gathering purposes. Adeniran (2019) and Taber

(2017) suggest that Cronbach alpha values range between 0 and 1 with varying degrees of acceptability as shown in Table 1 below.

Table 1: Cronbach’s Alpha internal consistency reliability (Source: Taber, 2016; Adeniran, 2019).

Cronbach’s alpha	Internal consistency reliability
$\alpha \geq 0.9$	Excellent (high stakes testing)
$0.7 \leq \alpha < 0.9$	Good (low stake testing)
$0.6 \leq \alpha < 0.7$	Acceptable
$0.5 \leq \alpha < 0.6$	Poor
$\alpha < 0.5$	Unacceptable

Table 1 above shows that the acceptable Cronbach’s Alpha value is 0.6 while 0.9 and above are excellent.

research instrument that was used to collect data produced the results that are displayed in Table 2 below.

Research Results and Discussion

The Cronbach’s Alpha coefficient test that was conducted to establish the reliability of the

Table 2: Cronbach’s Alpha reliability test results

Research objective	Variable	Cronbach's alpha
1	Effects of rewards/pay on employee performance	0.838
2	Effects of promotion on employee performance	0.811
3	Effects of job safety/security on employee performance	0.931
4	Effects of working conditions on employee performance	0.918

The Cronbach’s Alpha test results that are indicated in Table 2 above show high reliability and good internal consistency of the instrument that was used to collect data as the alpha values ranged from 0.811 to 0.931, which is way above the preferred cut-off threshold of 0.60 (Taber, 2016; Adeniran, 2019). This means that the findings can statistically be relied upon. Out of the 150 questionnaires that were distributed, 115 were completed and returned culminating in a 77% response rate which is

relatively high considering the Covid-19 regulations that restricted human movement during the time the study was conducted.

The research findings for each of the research objectives that are epitomised in Table 2 are presented in the subsequent subsections.

The effects of rewards on employee performance

This section presents the study findings on the effects of rewards on employee performance at the three stores that were covered in this study. To determine the validity of the scale items that were used in the questionnaire, the BTS, KMO

and AVE were used. The mean and the SD values were used to summarise the ratings of the respondents on the individual scale items. Table 3 indicates the results of the effects of rewards on employee performance.

Table 3: Effects of rewards/remuneration on employee performance

	KMO	Bartlett's test	Mean	SD	AVE	Factor Metrics
Statements	0.830	400.329			67.191	
In my organisation, rewards positively influence performance of employees.			2.39	1.27		0.651
I am rewarded fairly			2.30	1.28		0.719
My organisation rewards employees fairly for their performance.			2.00	1.14		0.697
Individual rewards are preferred to team rewards to motivate employees to work harder			2.09	1.20		0.659
There is labour turnover in my organisation due to poor rewards			3.23	1.50		0.720
Poor rewards reduce employee performance			3.49	1.53		0.682
My organisation cares about the financial stability of employees			1.90	1.17		0.595
My organisation's rewards meet employee needs and expectations			1.94	1.22		0.652

The findings in Table 3 above indicate that the effects of rewards/remuneration account for 67.1% on average in explaining employee performance at the selected superstores. The KMO of the reward construct is 0.83 which is well above the cut-off value of 0.5, and all the eight factor loadings that were included in Table III for this construct are statistically significant at the 0.01 level. They all have factor loading metrics of more than the minimum threshold of 0.5. The lowest factor metric is 0.595 and the highest is 0.720. Therefore, the reward questions exhibit valid and reliable constructs that are suitable for factor analysis.

The results in Table III reveal that the rewards that were being offered by the chain stores that were covered in this study did not positively influence employee performance (mean = 2.39, n = 115). This could be because the respondents believed that they were not being fairly rewarded for their performance (mean = 2.00). The respondents also indicated that the reward system of the organisation that was covered in this study did not motivate employees to work harder (mean = 2.09). Furthermore, the respondents strongly disagreed that the selected organisation cared about the financial stability of its employees (mean = 1.90), and that it offered rewards that met their needs and expectations (mean = 1.94).

On the other hand, the respondents agreed with the view that there was labour turnover that was linked to poor remuneration (mean = 3.23), and that poor rewards reduced employee performance (mean = 3.49). These findings confirm the views of Ibra and Khan (2015) who argue that unsatisfactory employee rewards create unpleasant conditions that are likely to diminish employee performance. The findings are also consistent with Herzberg's Two Factor Theory of Motivation, the

theoretical framework which was used in this study, that avers that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are a result of different factors that are associated with the work itself (Jegede and Ola-Olorun, 2017; Ezeanyim, *et al.*, 2019).

To establish the direction of the association between rewards and employee performance, a correlation analysis was conducted. The results are indicated in Table 4 below.

Table 4: Correlation matrix between reward characteristics and employee performance

		Correlations				
		Employee performance	I'm rewarded fairly	Organization rewards employees fairly for their performance	Individualistic rewards preferred to team rewards to motivate employees	Organization cares about financial stability of employees
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.651**	.631**	.604**	.541**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
I'm rewarded fairly	Pearson Correlation	.651**	1	.620**	.644**	.519**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
Organization rewards employees fairly for their performance	Pearson Correlation	.631**	.620**	1	.659**	.519**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
Individualistic rewards preferred to team rewards to motivate employees	Pearson Correlation	.604**	.644**	.659**	1	.460**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
Organization cares about financial stability of employees	Pearson Correlation	.541**	.519**	.519**	.460**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	115	115	115	115	115

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The correlation of the findings in Table 4 above shows that there is a statistically significant relationship at the 0.01 level between rewards and employee performance. The correlation is positive and moderately strong across the spectrum. This is shown by the correlation coefficient of 0.651 for the statement on whether the individual employee was fairly rewarded, and 0.631 for the statement on whether employees were fairly rewarded for their performance. It is 0.604 and

0.504 on individual rewards and on whether the organisation cared about the financial stability of employees, respectively.

Furthermore, a regression analysis was also carried out to examine the causal relationship between the dependent variable 'employee performance' and the independent variable 'reward'. Table 5 shows the regression analysis results.

Table 5: Regression analysis results - effects of rewards on employee performance

		Coefficients ^a												
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	.427	.189		2.258	.026	.052	.802						
	I'm rewarded fairly	.295	.091	.297	3.232	.002	.114	.476	.651	.294	.207	.487	2.055	
	Organization rewards employees fairly for their performance	.266	.104	.239	2.562	.012	.060	.472	.631	.237	.164	.472	2.118	
	Individualistic rewards preferred to team rewards to motivate employees	.179	.098	.170	1.821	.071	-.016	.374	.604	.171	.117	.473	2.114	
	Organization cares about financial stability of employees	.199	.085	.184	2.339	.021	.030	.368	.541	.218	.150	.664	1.506	

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

The results in Table 5 above show that the variable ‘employees are fairly rewarded’ has a positive and significant effect on employee performance ($\beta = 0.297$, $P < 0.01$). This indicates that an increase in reward by 1 unit is likely to raise employee performance by 0.297 units. Moreover, the multicollinearity diagnostics is less than 1 (0.487) and the VIF is greater than 1 (2.065). This implies that there are no violations of the multicollinearity assumptions in the model. Therefore, the finding depicts the direct effect of rewards on employee performance. As a result, the

hypothesis H1: Pay/reward has a positive effect on employee performance is accepted.

The effects of promotion on employee performance

This section is meant to present the respondents’ views on the effect of promotion on employee performance at the selected supermarket chain stores. As a precursor, the validity of the factor loadings of this construct was conducted using KMO, BTS and the AVE. The effects of promotion on employee performance at the selected organisation are presented in Table 6.

Table 6: The effects of promotion on employee performance

	KMO	Bartlett's test	Mean	Standard Deviation	AVE	Factor Metrics
Statements	0.80	236.773			63.69	
My organisation uses performance appraisals to determine promotion.			2.53	1.30		0.622
I get feedback on my performance standards.			2.04	1.22		0.664
Training policies in my organisation offer best opportunities for promotion.			2.81	1.33		0.560

Employees who are bypassed during promotions end up leaving the organisation.			3.01	1.43		0.740
Employees prefer to work for organisations with clear promotional pathways.			3.33	1.41		0.623
My organisation offers the best promotional opportunities			2.31	1.27		0.702
Good work leads to promotion in my organisation.			2.67	1.41		0.547

The findings in Table 6 above indicate some factor metrics ranging from 0.547 to 0.740. This implies that the results are valid for factor analysis. The KMO value is 0.8. All the factor loadings are more than 0.5 and significant at the 0.01 thus signifying their validity and reliability. The effects of promotion contribute 63.96% on average (AVE) to employee performance.

Table VI shows that the respondents disagreed with the view that the organisation that was covered in this study used performance appraisals to determine employee promotion (mean = 2.53, n = 115). They also disagreed with the view that they got feedback on their performance standards (mean = 2.04). In addition, the respondents disagreed with the notion that training policies were offering the best opportunities for employee promotion (mean = 2.81), and neither with the idea that good work was recognised for promotion (mean = 2.67).

On the other hand, the respondents agreed with the views that employees preferred to work for organisations with a clear promotional pathway (mean = 3.33), and that employees who were bypassed during promotion ended up leaving the organisation (3.01). The findings of this study resonate with the views of Sahuruddin and Saluilman (2016) and Abdul, *et al* (2014) who postulate that employee performance is driven by fair promotional practices and availability of opportunities for promotion and that employees who are by-passed during promotion when they think they deserve it are likely to have low morale and low productivity and are liable to leave the organisation.

To establish the strength of the correlation between promotion and employee performance, a Pearson Correlation analysis was carried out. The results are shown in Table 7 below.

Table 7: Correlation matrix for promotional factors and employee performance

Correlations					
		Organization uses performance appraisal to determine promotion	I get feedback on my performance standards	Employees prefer organizations with clear promotional pathway	Employee performance
Organization uses performance appraisal to determine promotion	Pearson Correlation	1	.490**	.166	.567**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.075	.000
	N	115	115	115	115
I get feedback on my performance standards	Pearson Correlation	.490**	1	.155	.648**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.098	.000
	N	115	115	115	115
Employees prefer organizations with clear promotional pathway	Pearson Correlation	.166	.155	1	.210*
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.075	.098		.024
	N	115	115	115	115
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	.567**	.648**	.210*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.024	
	N	115	115	115	115

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

Table 7 indicates that ‘performance appraisals to determine employee promotion’ is statistically significant and positively associated with employee performance ($r = 0.567$, $P < 0.01$). This moderate level of correlation shows that performance appraisals are necessary in determining the promotion of employees and influencing employee performance. In addition, the effect of issuing feedback to employees on performance

standards is more strongly and positively associated with their performance ($r = 0.648$, $P < 0.01$).

A regression analysis was conducted to determine the causal relationship between promotional factors and employee performance. The results are displayed in Table 8.

Table 8: Regression analysis results on the effect of promotion on employee performance

Coefficients ^a													
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF
1	(Constant)	.218	.233		.934	.353	-.244	.680					
	Organization uses performance appraisal to determine promotion	.282	.076	.288	3.697	.000	.131	.433	.567	.332	.244	.716	1.396
	I get feedback on my performance standards	.423	.089	.404	4.772	.000	.247	.598	.648	.414	.314	.605	1.652
	Employees with the skills are getting promoted on merit	.058	.068	.061	.848	.398	-.077	.192	.328	.081	.056	.842	1.187
	Good work is recognized for promotion	.149	.073	.153	1.963	.050	-.006	.283	.509	.179	.125	.671	1.491

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

The results in Table 8 indicate that ‘performance appraisals to determine employee promotion’ has a positive and statistically significant effect on employee performance ($\beta=0.288, P<0.01$). This means that a unit increase in usage of performance appraisals to determine employee promotion would raise employee performance by 0.288 units. Similarly, feedback given to employees concerning their performance standards bears a significant and positive effect on employee performance ($\beta=0.404, P<0.01$). Finally, when the good work of an employee is recognised for promotion, that becomes statistically significant at the 0.05 level and positively impacts on employee performance ($\beta=0.153, P=0.05$). All the VIF values for these independent variables are greater than 1, and tolerance values are less than 1, implying that the multicollinearity assumptions of the model are not violated. The results lead to the acceptance of the hypothesis H2: Promotion has a positive effect on employee performance.

The study findings resonate with the views of Ahmad, *et al* (2014) who affirm that there is a relationship between promotion and employee performance, and that issuing performance appraisal feedback motivates employees thus enhancing their performance so do the availability of opportunities for employee promotion. Mullins (2016) confirms the findings of this study noting that employees prefer to work for an organisation that has a clear and strong employee promotion policy.

The effects of job safety/security on employee performance

This section presents the results on the effects of job security/safety on employee performance in the organisation that was covered in this study. The KMO, BTS and AVE were used to test the validity of the research constructs. The individual scale items were rated using the mean and the SD. Table 9 indicates the effects of job security/safety on employee performance.

Table 9: Effects of job safety/security on employee performance

	KMO	Bartlett's test	Mean	Standard Deviation	AVE	Factor Metrics
Statements	0.93	604.321			66.746	
I have a sense of job security and safety in my organisation.			2.51	1.385		0.759
My organisation offers good working conditions.			2.45	1.293		0.750
The future of my job is guaranteed.			2.34	1.263		0.702
My organisation continuously improves the safety of the work environment.			2.56	1.319		0.689
There is effective communication between management and employees.			2.60	1.262		0.629
My organisation offers health insurance to employees.			2.21	1.328		0.596
I am up to date with work-related health hazards in my organisation.			2.79	1.281		0.640
Office space and furniture are good enough for employee safety.			2.68	1.295		0.575

Table 9 above shows the factor loading results of the effects of job safety and security on employee performance at the three superstores that were covered in this study. The KMO is 0.93 which confirms the high validity of the instrument that was used to collect data. The job safety/security aspects contribute 66.75% AVE in explaining employee performance. The factor loadings range from 0.575 to 0.759 which proves the validity of all the factor loadings as they exceed the 0.5 threshold.

The findings in Table 9 indicate that the employees at the selected superstores did not have a sense of job security (mean=2.51, n=115) and they did not believe that there were good working conditions in the organisation (mean = 2.45). The respondents disagreed with the view that the future of their jobs was guaranteed (mean = 2.34) and that the safety of the work environment was continuously improved (mean = 2.56). Also, the respondents disagreed with the notion that there was effective communication between management and employees (mean = 2.60) and that their organisation offered health insurance to employees (mean = 2.21). Finally, the

respondents refuted the view that they were up to date with the work-related health hazards in the organisation (mean= 2.79) and that the office space and furniture were good enough for employee safety (mean= 2.68).

The empirical evidence provided by this study were found to be inconsistent with the views of Sanyal, *et al* (2018) who argue that job security assures employees that they will keep their current jobs. The findings of this study conform with Herzberg Two-Factor Theory of Motivation which posits that factors like poor job security, poor working conditions, low pay, and lack of promotional opportunities have adverse effects on the level of job satisfaction and employee performance (Cortes, et al., 2019).

In addition to the above, a correlation analysis was conducted to determine the association between job security and employee performance at the selected superstores. The results are presented in Table 10 below.

Table 10: Correlation matrix for employee performance and job security/safety factors

		Correlations							
		Employee performance	Organization offers good terms and working conditions	The future of my job and career is guaranteed	Organization updates work environment safety	There's effective communication between mgt & employees	Organization offers health safety & medical insurance to employees	I'm up-to-date with my work related health hazard risks	Office space & furniture good enough for employee safety
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.761**	.737**	.663**	.615**	.661**	.679**	.543**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
Organization offers good terms and working conditions	Pearson Correlation	.761**	1	.679**	.695**	.623**	.614**	.651**	.607**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
The future of my job and career is guaranteed	Pearson Correlation	.737**	.679**	1	.644**	.603**	.653**	.554**	.588**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
Organization updates work environment safety	Pearson Correlation	.663**	.695**	.644**	1	.609**	.579**	.609**	.614**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
There's effective communication between mgt & employees	Pearson Correlation	.615**	.623**	.603**	.609**	1	.558**	.599**	.586**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
Organization offers health safety & medical insurance to employees	Pearson Correlation	.661**	.614**	.653**	.579**	.558**	1	.542**	.448**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
I'm up-to-date with my work related health hazard risks	Pearson Correlation	.679**	.651**	.554**	.609**	.599**	.542**	1	.599**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115
Office space & furniture good enough for employee safety	Pearson Correlation	.543**	.607**	.588**	.614**	.586**	.448**	.599**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	115	115	115	115	115	115	115	115

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 10 above shows that there is a positive and statistically significant correlation between employee performance and the job safety/security factors at the 0.01 level of significance. Strong correlations with the dependent variable rest on the construct ‘My organisation offers good working conditions’ ($r = 0.761$) and ‘the future of my job is guaranteed’ ($r = 0.737$). All the remaining job safety factors have a moderate correlation with the dependent variable ‘employee performance’. These include ‘My organisation updates work environment safety’ ($r = 0.663$); ‘there is effective communication between management and employees’ ($r = 0.615$); ‘organisation offers health, safety, and medical insurance to employees’ ($r = 0.661$); ‘I am up to date with my work-related health hazards’ (r

$= 0.679$), and ‘office space and furniture are good enough for employee safety’.

The findings in Table 10 are supported by Khan, *et al* (2012) who aver those employees who are confident that their jobs are safe tend to work harder. Furthermore, the findings of this study resonate with Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory of Motivation which suggests that a safe work environment constitutes a critical factor that triggers job satisfaction and performance (Mitchell, *et al.*, 2017).

A regression analysis to establish the association between job safety factors and employee performance was also conducted. The results are presented in Table 11 below.

Table 11: Regression analysis results for job safety/security and employee performance

		Coefficients ^a												
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	.010	.183		.057	.955	-.352	.373						
	Organization offers good terms and working conditions	.384	.091	.359	4.235	.000	.204	.564	.761	.376	.224	.389	2.570	
	The future of my job and career is guaranteed	.312	.091	.284	3.442	.001	.132	.491	.737	.313	.182	.409	2.444	
	Organization updates work environment safety	.098	.085	.093	1.155	.251	-.070	.265	.663	.110	.061	.430	2.323	
	There's effective communication between mgt & employees	.082	.081	.074	1.005	.317	-.079	.243	.615	.096	.053	.510	1.962	
	Organization offers health safety & medical insurance to employees	.167	.078	.160	2.134	.035	.012	.322	.661	.200	.113	.495	2.019	

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

Table 11 above shows that the two job safety factors that were found to have a strong positive correlation with employee performance in the preceding analysis have a statistically significant causal effect at the 0.01 level. A unitary improvement in working conditions would raise employee performance by 0.359 units at the three selected superstores as shown by the standardised coefficient. Similarly, a unitary improvement in job security and career continuation would increase employee performance by 0.284 units. The

offering of health safety and medical insurance to the employees by the organisation would raise their performance ($\beta = 0.160$) at the 0.05 level of statistical significance. The VIF values for each of the independent variables are more than 1 and tolerance values are less than 1 which implies that the multicollinearity assumptions were not violated. These results lead to the acceptance of the hypothesis H3: Job safety and security have a positive effect on employee performance.

5.4 The effects of working conditions on employee performance

This section presents the findings of the study on the effects of working conditions on employee performance. The validity of the constructs was established using the factor loading tests - BTS, KMO and AVE. The

rating of each scale item by the respondents is reflected in the individual mean and SD. Table 12 below indicates the properties of the effects of working conditions on employee performance.

Table 12: Effects of working conditions on employee performance

	KMO	Bartlett's test	Mean	Standard Deviation	AVE	Factor Metrics
Statements	0.882	533.936			62.08	
There is a culture of teamwork and cooperation in my organisation.			2.77	1.30		0.577
There is a high level of trust between superiors and subordinates in my organisation.			2.44	1.22		0.640
My organisation provides a clear path for career advancement for employees.			2.37	1.195		0.699
There is a friendly work atmosphere that promotes informal relations among staff.			2.67	1.27		0.573
My workload is reasonable.			2.12	1.29		0.597
Work tasks are not complex.			2.77	1.16		0.615
A good work environment and conditions motivate employees.			2.80	1.31		0.588
I am satisfied and productive in my organisation.			2.57	1.41		0.598

Table 12 above indicates that working conditions have a bearing on employee performance at the three superstores that were covered in this study. The KMO is 0.88 which entails high validity of the instrument that was used to collect data. The effects of the working conditions make up 62.08 percent on average (AVE) in explaining employee performance. The factor loadings range from 0.573 to 0.699 which is higher than the 0.5 threshold.

The findings in Table 12 demonstrate that the respondents did not agree that there was a culture of teamwork and cooperation (mean = 2.77, n = 115); they did also not agree that

there was a high level of trust between superiors and subordinates (mean = 2.44). The respondents further disagreed that the organisation they worked for provided a clear pathway for career advancement (mean = 2.37) and that there was a friendly work atmosphere that promoted informal relations among staff (mean = 2.67). In addition, the respondents disagreed that the workload was reasonable (mean = 2.12), that work tasks were not complex (mean = 2.77), and that there was a good work environment and conditions which motivated employees (mean = 2.80). Lastly, the respondents disagreed that they were satisfied and productive in the organisation.

The above findings resonate with the views of Nini (2019) who postulates that there is an interplay between job satisfaction and working conditions such as company policies, relationship with supervisors and peers, employee personal life, and job status which ultimately enhances employee performance. The findings of this study are also in conformance with Herzberg’s Two-factor Theory of Motivation which postulates that the work environment is a powerful determinant of

job satisfaction and when job satisfaction goes down, individual employee performance also declines (Komboi, 2016; Abudukhaliq and Mohammadali, 2019).

Furthermore, a correlation analysis was undertaken to determine the association between working conditions and employee performance. The findings are indicated in Table 13.

Table 13: Correlation matrix between working conditions and employee performance

		Correlations				
		Organization provides clear path for career advancement	Workload is reasonable in my organization	Work tasks are not complex	Good work environment & conditions motivates employees	Employee performance
Organization provides clear path for career advancement	Pearson Correlation	1	.592**	.513**	.607**	.554**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
Workload is reasonable in my organization	Pearson Correlation	.592**	1	.592**	.561**	.664**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
Work tasks are not complex	Pearson Correlation	.513**	.592**	1	.514**	.544**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000	.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
Good work environment & conditions motivates employees	Pearson Correlation	.607**	.561**	.514**	1	.675**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000		.000
	N	115	115	115	115	115
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	.554**	.664**	.544**	.675**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	.000	
	N	115	115	115	115	115

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Table 13 above reveals that there are four statistically significant working conditions at the 0.01 level that are correlated with employee performance. The strength of the association for all the four elements are moderate and the relationship is positive. The construct ‘organisation provides a clear path for career advancement’ has a correlation coefficient of 0.554, while ‘workload is reasonable’ is 0.664.

The correlation coefficient of ‘work tasks are not complex’ is 0.544 and ‘work environment and conditions motivate employees’ is 0.675.

A regression analysis was conducted to evaluate the causal relationship between working conditions and employee performance. The results are displayed in Table 14 below.

Table 14: Regression analysis re

		Coefficients ^a												
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	95.0% Confidence Interval for B		Correlations			Collinearity Statistics		
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound	Zero-order	Partial	Part	Tolerance	VIF	
1	(Constant)	.069	.247		.278	.782	- .420	.557						
	Organization provides clear path for career advancement	.065	.100	.055	.646	.520	- .133	.263	.554	.061	.040	.526	1.903	
	Workload is reasonable in my organization	.381	.094	.348	4.039	.000	.194	.568	.664	.359	.248	.511	1.958	
	Work tasks are not complex	.134	.098	.110	1.369	.174	- .060	.328	.544	.129	.084	.587	1.704	
	Good work environment & conditions motivates employees	.419	.089	.390	4.699	.000	.242	.595	.675	.409	.289	.548	1.824	

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance.

sults for

working conditions elements and employee performance

Table 14 shows that there are two working conditions elements that are statistically significant at the 0.01 level and thus have a causal effect on employee performance. Firstly, ‘a reasonable workload’ has a positive effect on employee performance ($\beta = 0.348$). A unitary enhancement of workload towards reasonable levels would raise employee performance by 0.348 units. Secondly, a unitary improvement in ‘the work environment and conditions to motivate employees’ would raise their performance by 0.39 units. The multicollinearity assumptions were not violated in this study as shown by the VIF values that

are all above 1 and the tolerance values that are less than 1. These findings result in the acceptance of the hypothesis H4: Working conditions have a positive effect on employee performance.

An Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) was also conducted to establish if the survey output was significant. This was executed by taking into consideration the variations of the ‘within and between’ groups. The results of the ANOVA are shown in Table 15 below.

Table 15: Analysis of Variance

ANOVA ^a						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	132.088	4	33.022	38.629	.000 ^b
	Residual	94.033	110	.855		
	Total	226.122	114			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance.

b. Predictors: (Constant), Good work environment & conditions motivates employees, Work tasks are not complex, Organization provides clear path for career advancement, Workload is reasonable in my organization

The results in Table 15 indicate that the survey results are statistically significant at the 0.01 level and therefore can be relied on.

Conclusion

The study looked at the specific effects of job satisfaction on worker performance at the selected retail supermarket chain stores in Francistown, Botswana. The study outcomes were informative and clearly verified an important and constructive relationship between job satisfaction (with its diverse components) and employee performance which addressed the research problem thus leading to the achievement of the identified research objectives. The job satisfaction components namely the organisation's reward system, promotion, job safety/security, and the work environment were revealed to explicate much of the difference in worker performance in the organisation that was covered in this study.

The findings of the study could assist the management of the supermarket chain to identify employee expectations which the firm may use to stimulate job satisfaction hence employee performance. The main inference for practice is that policy makers from other institutions like the private and public sector could use the findings of this study to design policies and procedures that may facilitate employee job satisfaction which could facilitate performance enhancement and productivity in their organisations.

This study will also contribute to the development of the body of knowledge on job satisfaction and employee performance by providing additional literature on the subject and new empirical findings. No known study has been conducted to establish the quality and quantity of job dissatisfaction in the biggest retail supermarket chain in Botswana despite the media being inundated with reports of endless labour unrests in the organisation for some years. This study therefore filled that gap by revealing the extent to which aspects that influence job satisfaction such as remuneration, promotion, employee safety/security, and

working conditions were being handled in the organisation and the extent to which they affected employee satisfaction and performance.

Furthermore, the study will be instrumental in serving as a springboard for further study on the topic. Future researchers may want to expand the scope of this study by including other big retailers in the whole country in the form of an embedded case study given the homogenous circumstances engulfing the retail sector in Botswana. It would be fascinating for forthcoming researchers to conduct a further study on the topic focusing on a broader contextual setting using a more sophisticated and comprehensive methodological approach such as mixed methods which would stimulate the triangulation of study findings thereby enhancing the validity of the study.

References

- Abdul, R, *et al* (2018), "Influence of Promotion on Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance", *Journal of Accounting, Business and Financial Research*, Vol. 3 No. 1, pp.18-27.
- Abdulkhalig, S. S. and Mohammadali, Z.M. (2019), "The Impact of Job Satisfaction On Employee Performance: A Case Study of Al Hayat Company- Pepsi Employee in Erbil Kurdistan Region Iraq", *Management and Economic Review*, Vol. 4 No. 2, pp.163-176.
- Adeniran A.O. (2019), "Application of Likert Scale's Type and Cronbach's Alpha Analysis in an Airport Perception Study", *Sch J Appl Sci Res*, Vol. 2 No. 4, pp.1-5.
- Ahmed, S. *et al* (2017), "Employee Job Insecurity and Performance Relationship in Developing Economy Through Employee Engagement: Critical Analysis with PLS-SEM", *International Journal of Economics Research*, Vol. 14 No. 19, pp.133-147.
- Anitha, S. and Pragadeeswaran, S. (2016), "A Study on The Impact of Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance", *International Journal of management and development studies*, Vol. 5 No.5, pp.27-31.
- Babu, R. M. and Eimani, A. (2014), "Human Resource Management: A Challenging Scenarion in the Indian Context", *Afro Asian Journal of Anthropology and Social Policy*, Vol.5 No.45, pp.45-50.

- Busaclic, S. and Mujabasic, A. (2018), "Herzberg Two-factor Theory of Job satisfaction Comparative Study Between Private and Public High School Teachers in Canton Sarejebo", *International Journal of Business Management and Research*, Vol. 8 No.6, pp.27-48.
- Creswell, J. W. (2014), *Research Design: Qualitative, Quantitative and Mixed Methods Approaches*, Sage, New York. NY.
- Edirisooriya, W. A. (2018), "The Impact of Reward on Employee performance With Special reference To Electro Co. Sri lanka: Kandy", available at: <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/323747331> (accessed 21 October 2020)
- Egbunike, C. et al (2015), "Effect of Reward on Employee Performance in Organizations: A Study of Selected Commercial Banks in Awka Metropolis", available at: <https://www.researchgate.net> (accessed 23 November 2020)
- Ezeanyim, E. et al (2019), "The Impact of Job satisfaction on Employee Performance in Selected Public Enterprises in Awka Anambra State", *Global Journal of Management and Business Research*, Vol.19 No.7, pp.2249-4588.
- Farooq, A. (2019), "Difference Between Inductive and deductive Approach?", available at: <https://www.google.com> (accessed 22 May 2020)
- Ghazzawi, I. (2008), "Antecedents and Consequences of Job Satisfaction: A conceptual framework", *The Business Review*, Vol.11 No.2, pp.1-10.
- Godwin, C. P. (2014), "Impact of Promotion To Employees' Performance at Dar es Salaam City Council", available at: <https://www.google.com> (accessed 19 June 2020)
- Gohari, P. et al (2013), "Relationship Between Reward and Employee Performance: A Mediating Role of Job satisfaction", *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research in Business*, Vol.5 No.3, pp.571-597.
- Haderi, S. et al (2017), "Employee Job Security and Performance Relationships in Developing Economy Through Employee Engagement: Critical analysis with PLS-SEM", *International Journal of Economic Research*, Vol.1 No.19, pp.133-147.
- Hadi, N. U. and Ilham, S. (2016), "An Easy Approach To Exploratory factor analysis: Marketing Perspective", *Journal Of Educational and Social Research*, Vol.6 No.1, pp.215-223.
- Hsiao, J. and Lin, D. (2018), "The Impact of Working Conditions and Employee Competencies of Fresh Graduates of Job Expertise, Salary and Job satisfaction", *Journal of Review on Global Economics*, Vol.7, pp.246-259.
- Ibra, M. and Khan, O. (2015), "The Impact of Reward on Employee Performance: A case Study of Malakand private School", Vol.52, pp.95-103.
- Inuwa, M. (2016), "Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance", *The Millennium University Journal*, 1, Inuwa, M. (2016). Job Satisfaction and Employee Performance. *The Millennium University Journal*, Vol.1 No.1, pp.90-103.
- Jegede, A. and Ola-Olorun, O. (2017), "Effects of Work Content and Work Context on Job Motivation of Hospital Pharmacists", *Global Journal of Pharmacy and Pharmaceutical Research Science*, Vol.1 No.3, pp.1-7.
- Junyong, I. (n.d.), "Introduction To Pilot Study", *Korean Journal of Anesthesiology*, Vol.70 No.6, pp.601-601.
- Karunarathna, R. (2019), "The Effect of Employee Satisfaction and Commitment: A Conceptual Review", *International Journal of Scientific Research Publication*, Vol.9 No.8, pp.480-490.
- Khan, A. H. et al (2012), "The Impact of Job satisfaction on Employee Performance", *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol.6 No.7, pp.2697-2705.
- Khan, M. M. et al (2012), "The Impact of Employee Commitment on Employee Satisfaction: Role of Employee Performance As a Moderating Variable", *Singapore Journal of Business Economics and Management Studies*, Vol.1 No.2, pp.68-80.
- Komboi, P. C. (2016), "Determinants Employee Job Satisfaction in the Public Security Sector in Kenya: A Case of National Police Service", *Strategic Journal of Business and Change Management*, Vol.3 No.2, pp.660-668.
- Moses, C. (2016), "Effects of Rewards on teacher Performance: A Case of Three Secondary Schools in Kasama District, Lusaka, Zambia", *Masters Dissertation*, University of Zambia, available at: <https://www.semanticscholar.org> (accessed 11 June 2020)
- Muindi, F. K. (2011), "The Relationship Between Participation in Decision Making and Job Satisfaction Among Academic Staff in The School of Business, University of Nairobi", *Journal of Human Resource Management Research*, No.2, pp.1-34.

- Mullins, L.J. (2016), *Management & Organisational Behaviour*, Prentice Hall, London.
- Munir, R.I.S. and Rahman, R.A. (2016), "Determining Dimensions of Job Satisfaction Using Factor Analysis", *Procedia Economics and Finance*, Vol.37, pp.488-496.
- Naveed, U. *et al* (2011), "Promotion: A Predictor of Job satisfaction: A Study of Glass Industry of lahore Pakistan", *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, Vol.2 No.16, pp.301-305.
- Nini, M. (2019), "Job Performance: Why Task and Contextual Performance Matter: From an Evidenced-based Management Perspective", *Leadership Guide for Professionals*, available at: <https://www.ckju.net> (accessed 21 May 2020)
- Pallant, J. (2013). *SPSS Survival Manual. A Step by Step Guide to Data Analysis using SPSS*. Allen and Unwin.
- Ranjan, R. and Mishra, U. (2018), "Impact of Rewards on Employee Performance: A Case of Indian Oil Corporation, Patna Region", *Journal of Business and Management*, Vol.19 No.6, 22-30.
- Razak, A. *et al* (2018), "Influence of Promotion and Job Satisfaction on Employee Performance", *Journal of accounting, Business and Finance Research*, Vol.5 No.1, pp.18-27.
- Raziq, A. and Maulabakhsh, R. (2015), "Impact of Working Environment on Job Satisfaction", Paper presented at the 2nd Global Conference on Business, Economics, Management and Tourism, 30-31 October, available at: www.sciencedirect.com (accessed 13 November 2020)
- Sahuruddin, M. and Saluiman, C. (2016), "The Effect of Promotion and Compensation Toward Work Productivity Through Job Satisfaction and Working Motivation of Employees in The Department of Water and Mineral Resources and Energy, North Aceh District", *International Journal of Business and Management Invention*, Vol.5 No.10, pp.33-40.
- Sanyal, S. *et al* (2018), "Loss of Job Security and its Impact on Employee Performance: A Study in the Sultanate of Oman", *International Journal of Innovative Research and Growth*, Vol.7 No.6, pp.202-212.
- Saunders, M. *et al* (2016), *Research Methods For Business Students* (Seventh ed.), Pearson, London.
- Selatlhwa, I. (2018), "Choppies may Fire More", *The Monitor*, 21 May, p.1.
- Sengul, Y. H. (2017), "The Effects of Work Environment Factors on Job satisfaction", *Journal of Human Resource Management*, Vol.5 No.1, pp.12-18.
- Zobisch, P. and Swanson, A. (2017), *The Effects of Herzberg's Motivators and Hygiene Factors on Job Satisfaction in the Military*, Ashford University Publishers, Ashford.