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ABSTRACT

The journal objective was to assess the factors affecting organisational performance at the Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MLSS) in Zambia. The journal was carried out because there was evidence that performance at the Ministry has not been as expected due to public opinion. In addition, there is an existence of a contextual gap indicating that there are less studies that have been conducted on the topic.

The journal applied a correlation research design and used a structured questionnaire to collect data from the participants. The journal used a population of 208 and a sample of 164 was collected. The journal findings indicated that job satisfaction and commitment were the major influencers of organisational performance while training and development had no influence on organisational performance.

The journal recommends that the management of the Ministry needs to take the performance of the Ministry seriously and the factors that affect it because of the important role that the Ministry plays in the country. As such, the management of the Ministry should ensure they account for the performance of the Ministry in form of time and sourcing for funds. In order to increase job satisfaction, the Ministry should improve the levels of employee happiness with their salaries; salary increments should be based on performance; workers should feel appreciated about their work; Staff should be promoted in a fair and transparent way; the organization should provide career advancement; employees should receive their performance feedback on time and there should be a friendly environment to improve the friendship among workers.

Furthermore, to improve job commitment, the Ministry should ensure that workers values are aligned with the objectives of the organization, workers feel proud about their work; Staff should be promoted in a fair and transparent way; the organization should provide career advancement; employees should receive their performance feedback on time and there should be a friendly environment to improve the friendship among workers.

The Ministry should encourage wellness through support for exercise, workplace hygiene and healthy. Use rewards and initiatives to encourage engagement and improvement in the workplace.
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1. Introduction

1.1. Background to the Journal

An increase in productivity and efficiency uses of human resource depend on different factors which can be personal factors and organisational policies. Mboi (2014), describes performance as an objective achieving concept while Venkatraman and Ramanujam (1986), explains that, organisational performance is a sign of an organisation capability to efficiently achieve its objectives.

In addition, performance involves the measurement of how efficiently inputs such as land and labour are used to produce an output. Coelli (2005) indicates that trends of monitoring performance are significant to analysts in gauging the position of a business and determining the capacity utilization. Performance is also different from one organisation to other, depending on whether the organisation is public or private, the type of services or goods manufactured (Barodal, 2008). For example, businesses involved in service provision are likely to measure performance using the number of employees served while a company manufacturing actual products is likely to measure performance using the number units produced daily. The importance of organisational performance is to achieve higher performance of wealth for the shareholders (Paul and Anantharaman, 2003). Katou (2008) explains...
that, organisational performance involves proper strategic planning, operations, legal and development of the organisation. The performance and ability of government workers to deliver has been highly criticised by citizens, economists and other reports published by civil or international organisation (Mohammadi, 2018). This has led to most governments using contracted workers due to the poor performance of civil servant in most countries which has led to poor organisational performance. According to the World Bank Report (2017), the performance in most governments has been attributed to job satisfaction, commitment and training and development in most government organisations. It is in line with this claim that this journal will focus on the factors; satisfaction, commitment and training and development.

Muhammad and Wajidi (2013), claim that job satisfaction is among the most important factors that affect organisational performance. There have been a lot of studies that been conducted on job satisfaction and most of them claim that there is a strong correlation between job satisfaction and organisational performance. For example, a journal conducted by Khan and Nawaz (2011), concludes that, the factors that lead to job satisfaction such as pay, job security, working conditions and job autonomy had a strong correlation with performance of organisations. Dambisya (2007) explains that, non-financial and financial incentives that increase job satisfaction have been positively associated with performance of organisations. Haile (2013) concluded that, factors such as training and employee development are significant in improving the performance of employees which in turn leads to organisational performance. This is because training gives employees the confidence to do their job and boost their job satisfaction. Nickols (2003), identified that, factors such as sufficient motivation, training, job satisfaction and commitment are important in improving job performance. There is significant evidence that has shown that, performance in the public sector has been slacking compared to the private sector (Nightingale and Holzer, 2007). It is because of such claims that motivated the need to conduct this journal.

1.2. Performance of the Public Sector

The public sector is mostly involved in the creation of services and goods that are needed by the majority citizens rather than what is preferred by a group of individuals (Carrera and Dunleavy, 2013). The most commonly asked questions when it comes to evaluating the performance of the sector are: Are the needed services and goods reaching the citizens? And are the goods and services produced in an efficient way? Mboi (2014), explained that, public sector performance has been criticised by most citizens all over the world but especially in African countries. In spite of the sector having access to huge funding and infrastructure, the call for performance improvement has been the song of the day (Mboi, 2014). Furthermore, reforms and restructuring in the sector have been passed which are aimed at enhancing performance. However, the reforms bore no fruit as the experience of most citizens has not changed, they still complain of the services not meeting their expectations. Bolye (2006) added that, this is due to high levels of work stress, low job satisfaction and commitment and lack of training and development of employees.

1.3. Statement of the Problem

The growing population places a huge burden on the government to increase the number of goods and services. On the other hand, governments are challenged to provide quality goods and services (Mboi, 2014). The Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MLSS) in Zambia is tasked to provide policy and legal framework on labour issues.
This includes social protection, enforcement of labour laws, promotion of productivity and safe working environments. In addition, the Ministry is tasked with the responsibility to ensure full protection of workers and employers rights and that Zambians have decent jobs. The Ministry also mitigates in promotion and maintenance of industrial peace and harmony in the Country (Ministry of Labour and Social Security, 2020). However, reports of the Ministry’s failure to perform its duties have been the song of the day in the country due to the following incident: the loss of a life at Column mine in Sinazongwe which proved that labour inspectors failed to do their job (Lusaka Times, 2018). Furthermore, the human rights watch (2011) explained that, Ministry of Labour and Social Security (MLSS) has failed to provide the expected services and protect its citizens from exploitations through the enforcement of laws and inspections. This evidence calls for the need to investigate the factors affecting the performance of the Ministry of Labour and Social Security in Zambia.

2. Research Methodology

2.1. Introduction

Journal four of the research presents the methods that were applied in conducting the journal so as to answer the research objectives. The journal covered the following in the methodology; the research design, research approach, journal population, sampling procedures, data collection instrument, data analysis, reliability and validity.

2.2. Research Design

According to Kothari (2004), a research design is a blueprint of a research used to obtain relevant data for the purpose of answering the research questions. The journal applied a correlational research design as suggested by Creswell (2012). Creswell (2012) suggested that, studies whose aim is to find the association between variables should apply a correlational research design. On the other hand, the journal used a quantitative research approach. This is because, Creswell (2012) recommended that, quantitative approach is suitable for studies that investigate cause and effect relationship of variables.

2.3. Journal Population

The target population for the journal is all employees working at Ministry of Labour and Social Services (MLSS) Headquarters in different positions. The total number of employees at the headquarters is 208 (Human Resource MLSS, 2020). Non-clerical workers such as cleaners and security personnel who are outsourced will be excluded. The population makeup of the journal is presented in Table 1 below.

Table 1. Population make-up

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Department</th>
<th>Number of people</th>
<th>Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Finance</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>9.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Human resource</td>
<td>107</td>
<td>51.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Labour</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Social security</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
2.4. Sample determination and sampling procedures

The journal sample was determined using Yamane (1967, p.886) sample formula which is presented below as follows; N= 208 and e= 0.03 (3%).

\[
n = \frac{N}{1 + N * e^2}
\]

n – the sample size
N – the population size
e – the acceptable sampling error

*95% confidence level and p=0.5 are assumed.

N= 208/ (1 + (208) *0.03^2) =175.2 = 176 respondents.

To choose a sample, a combination of stratified sampling and systematic sampling were employed. Each department was treated as strata from which a sample is to be selected. For the department’s audit and procurement, all the respondents were targeted because the numbers were very small. For the remaining departments, the targeted sample was determined by the percentage contribution.

For example, to choose a sample for department, 176 was multiplied by 0.096 (9.6/100) = 17. After, finding the targeted sample, systematic sampling was employed where each third person entering the building was given a questionnaire.

2.5. Data Collection

The journal used both primary and secondary data. Secondary data was collected from already published articles, books, journals and magazines. Meanwhile, primary data was collected using a structured questionnaire. The measures from the questionnaire were adopted in journal three.

2.5.1. Questionnaire

The questionnaire used closed questions to collect data and applied a Likert scale of 1 to 5. The questionnaire was first be taken to the supervisor for approval and then piloted. This was done for the purpose of increasing the
reliability and validity of the data collection instrument. The questionnaire was administered by the researcher to
the employees within a space of four weeks.

2.6. Data Analysis

A statistical package SPSS was handy at this stage. The data collected using the questionnaire was fed into SPSS
software to generate results that were key in presenting the findings. Data was checked for any missing values
before analysis progressed. Descriptive statistics were used to describe the distribution of the data collected, this
included the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. Meanwhile, inferential statistics were applied to
draw conclusions. In addition, data was tested for normality too. The inferential test conducted was multiple
regressions for hypotheses testing.

2.7. Reliability and validity of data collection instrument

Reliability is the measure of the consistency of the results obtained. This is common in data collected using
measures of variable constructs (Kothari, 2010). For testing reliability, Cronbach alpha was used. Zikmund et al
(2010) explained that, Cronbach alpha values between 0.8 and 0.95 are considered and excellent quality; between
0.7 and 0.8 are considered good; between 0.6 and 0.7 are considered fair and those below 0.6 are considered very
poor reliability values. Meanwhile, content validity indicates that, the measures were measuring the variables as
required (John et al, 2007). This was censured by adopting and adapting the measures of the variable constructs.

3. Data Presentation, Analysis and Discussion

3.1. Introduction

The previous journal outlined the methodologies that were used to collect the data analyzed in this chapter. This
journal discussed the presentation, analysis and discussion of the results obtained. The analysis first began by
analyzing the demographics which included gender and experience. Furthermore, the descriptive statistics were
analyzed. Thereafter, preliminary analyses were performed before multiple regression was conducted.

3.2. Response Rate

According to Finchman (2008), a response rate of more than 60% should be the goal of every researcher. This
journal targeted a sample size of 176. A total of 176 questionnaires were distributed at the Ministry and only 164
questionnaires were returned. The remaining 12 questionnaires were not returned because the respondents had
traveled for workshops outside town and some were not in their offices due to the COVID-19 pandemic. Overall,
the journal had a response rate of 93% which is acceptable.

3.3. Demographic

The sample characteristics were analyzed using cross-tabulation. A cross-tabulation was done between gender and
work experience. Table 2 shows the results obtained. The results revealed that there were 55 participants with
experience between 0 to 5 years of which 27 were male and 28 were female. There were 55 participants with
experience between 6 to 10 years of which 26 were male and 29 were female. Furthermore, there were 35
participants of which 17 were male and 18 were female. Besides, there were 16 participants with experience
between 16 to 20 years of which 10 were male and 6 were female. Lastly, there were 3 male participants who had
experience above 20 years. From Table 2, it can be concluded that, most participants have experiences between 0 to 5 years and 6 to 10 years. Furthermore, there were more male participants compared to female participants.

**Table 2. Age and Experience Cross-Tabulation**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>How long have you been working with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security</th>
<th>male</th>
<th>female</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>between 0 to 5</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>28</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>16.5%</td>
<td>17.1%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 6 to 10</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>29</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>15.9%</td>
<td>17.7%</td>
<td>33.5%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 11 to 15</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>10.4%</td>
<td>11.0%</td>
<td>21.3%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>between 16 to 20</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>6.1%</td>
<td>3.7%</td>
<td>9.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>above 20</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
<td>0.0%</td>
<td>1.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>Count</td>
<td>83</td>
<td>81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>50.6%</td>
<td>49.4%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Gondwe (2020).

### 3.4. Descriptive Statistics

The descriptive statistics were used to summarize the data collected using the mean, standard deviation, skewness and kurtosis. The skewness indicated side to which the data is leaning. Negative skewness values indicated that the data is concentrated to the right and the median is greater than the mean. Meanwhile, positive skewness values indicate that the data is concentrated to the left and the mean is greater than the median. The standard deviation was included to show the variation of the data while the skewness and kurtosis were included to test for the normality of the data. According to George and Mallery (2019), skewness values within the range $+2$ and $-2$ indicate that the data was normally distributed. On the other hand, Bryne (2010) recommended that kurtosis values between $+7$ and $-7$ indicate that the data is normally distributed.

The data was collected using a Likert scale of 1 to 5 where 1 = strongly disagree, 2 = disagree, 3 = neutral, 4 = agree and 5 = strongly agree. Therefore, mean values between 1 to 1.5 represent respondents strongly disagreed to the statement, mean values between 1.6 to 2.4 means respondents disagreed to the statement, mean values between 2.5 to 3.5 means respondents were neutral to the statement, mean values between 3.6 to 4.4 mean respondents agreed to the statement and mean values above 4.5 mean respondents strongly agreed to the statement.

#### 3.4.1. Job Satisfaction

Table 3 shows the descriptive statistics for the items under the variable “job satisfaction”. The Table shows that the highest mean value was 4.0244 for the statement “I enjoy working with my colleagues” while the lowest mean value was 2.073 for the statement “Salary increments are based on performance”. In addition, the skewness values were within the range $+2$ and $-2$ while kurtosis values were thin $+7$ and $-7$ indicating that there was no serious deviation from normality by the data collected.
Table 3. Descriptive Statistics for Job Satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Gondwe (2020).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

**Interpretation of the means in relation to the items**

**I am happy with my salary**

The mean value for the item was 2.286 indicating that on average, respondents disagreed with the statement I am happy with my salary.

**Salary increments are based on performance.**

The mean value for the item was 2.073 indicating that on average, respondents disagreed with the statement salary increments are based on performance.

**The work I do is appreciated**

The mean value for the item was 3.146 indicating that on average, respondents were neutral with the statement the work I do is appreciated.

**Personnel are promoted in a fair and transparent way**

The mean value for the item was 2.591 indicating that respondents on average were neutral with the statement staff is promoted in a fair and transparent way.

**There are great opportunities for career advancement in my organization**

The mean value for the item was 3.042 indicating that on average, respondents were neutral with the statement there are great opportunities for career advancement in my organization.

**Employees, who receive frequent feedback concerning their performance, are usually more highly motivated than those who do not.**
The mean value for the item was 3.6037 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement employees, who receive frequent feedback concerning their performance, are usually more highly motivated than those who do not.

I enjoy working with my colleagues

The mean value for the item was 4.0224 indicating that on average, respondents were neutral with the statement I enjoy working with my colleagues.

3.4.2. Job Commitment

Table 4 shows the descriptive statistics for the items under the variable “job commitment”. The Table shows that the highest mean value was 4.372 for the statement “My job contributes to the objectives and goals of the Ministry” while the lowest mean value was 3.140 for the statement “I would be happy to work for another organization if the work was similar”. In addition, the skewness values were within the range +2 and -2 while kurtosis values were thin +7 and -7 indicating that there was no serious deviation from normality by the data collected.

Table 4. Descriptive Statistics for Job Commitment

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Source: Gondwe (2020).</th>
</tr>
</thead>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>I feel loyal to the Ministry</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.9512</td>
<td>.95208</td>
<td>-1.283</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My values are aligned with the values of the Ministry</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.0244</td>
<td>.56601</td>
<td>-.007</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>My job contributes to the objectives and goals of the Ministry</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.3720</td>
<td>.58776</td>
<td>-.498</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I am proud to tell everyone that I work for the Ministry</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>4.1098</td>
<td>.71797</td>
<td>-.367</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>It would be hard for me to leave the organization</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.2988</td>
<td>1.00787</td>
<td>.031</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I find it difficult to agree with the Ministries Policies</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.9634</td>
<td>.06360</td>
<td>-.087</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I would be happy to work for another organization if the work was similar</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.1402</td>
<td>1.24283</td>
<td>-1.53</td>
<td>.190</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Interpretation of the means in relation to the items

I feel loyal to the Ministry

The mean value for the item was 3.951 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement I feel loyal to the ministry.

My values are aligned with the values of the Ministry.

The mean value for the item was 4.024 indicating that respondents on average agreed with the statement my values are aligned with the values of the ministry.
My job contributes to the objectives and goals of the Ministry

The mean value for the item was 4.372 indicating that, respondents on average agreed with the statement my job contributes to the objectives and goals of the Ministry.

I am proud to tell everyone that I work for the Ministry.

The mean value for the item was 4.109 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement I am proud to tell everyone that I work for the Ministry.

It would be hard for me to leave the organization.

The mean value for the item was 3.298 indicating that, respondents on average agreed with the statement it would be hard for me to leave the organization.

I find it difficult to agree with the Ministries Policies

The mean value for the item was 3.963 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement I find it difficult to agree with the ministries policies.

I would be happy to work for another organization if the work was similar

The mean for the item was 3.140 indicating that on average, respondents were neutral with the statement I would be happy to work for another organization if the work was similar.

3.4.3. Training and Development

Table 5 mentioned below shows the descriptive statistics for the items under the variable “Training and Development”. The Table shows that the highest mean value was 4.182 for the statement “Training leads an employee to reduce their work mistakes” while the lowest mean value was 3.457 for the statement “The ministry follows employee performance after training”. In addition, the skewness values were within the range +2 and -2 while kurtosis values were thin +7 and -7 indicating that there was no serious deviation from normality by the data collected.

Interpretation of the means in relation to the items

Training leads an employee to improve performance

The mean value for the item was 4.158 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement training leads an employee to improve performance.

Employees feel a strong desire to apply what they have learned during the training

The mean value for the item was 4.146 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement employees feel a strong desire to apply what they have learned during the training.

Training leads an employee to reduce their work mistakes

The mean value for the item was 4.182 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement training leads an employee to reduce their work mistakes.
Table 5. Descriptive Statistics for Training and Development

| SOURCE: Gondwe (2020). |

| Training leads an employee to improve performance |
| Employees feel a strong desire to apply what they have learned during the training |
| Training leads an employee to reduce their work mistakes |
| The Ministry follows employee's performance after training |
| The training need assessment is done only by asking the trainee for their opinions |
| The required training is given to ensure job effectiveness |
| Professional employees participate in identifying their training needs |
| Valid N (listwise) |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Statistic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Ministry follows employee's performance after training

The mean value for the item was 3.457 indicating that on average, respondents were neutral with the statement the Ministry follows employee's performance after training.

The training need assessment is done only by asking the trainee for their opinions

The mean value for the item was 3.567 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement the training need assessment is done only by asking the trainee for their opinions.

The required training is given to ensure job effectiveness

The mean value for the item was 4.097 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement the required training is given to ensure job effectiveness.

Professional employees participate in identifying their training needs

The mean value for the item was 4.000 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement professional employees participate in identifying their training needs.

3.4.4. Organizational Performance

Table 6 shows the descriptive statistics for the items under the variable “Organizational Performance”. The Table shows that the highest mean value was 3.695 for the statement, “Few people leave the Ministry every year,” while
the lowest mean value was 3.317 for the statement “All tasks are completed on time and with quality assurance”. In addition, the skewness values were within the range +2 and -2 while kurtosis values were thin +7 and -7 indicating that there was no serious deviation from normality by the data collected.

Table 6. Descriptive Statistics for Organizational Performance

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Description</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std Deviation</th>
<th>Skewness</th>
<th>Kurtosis</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>In the Ministry absenteeism is very low.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.5305</td>
<td>1.25039</td>
<td>-.951</td>
<td>-.700</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Few people leave the Ministry every year.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.6951</td>
<td>1.19497</td>
<td>-.744</td>
<td>-.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>The Ministry serves more Clients every year.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.5183</td>
<td>1.19545</td>
<td>-.654</td>
<td>-.441</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases to do with investigation are followed up on a regular basis.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.6463</td>
<td>1.19685</td>
<td>-.699</td>
<td>-.503</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Our Department meets its set targets every year.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.4573</td>
<td>1.28393</td>
<td>-.556</td>
<td>-.824</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>All tasks are completed on time and with quality assurance</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.3171</td>
<td>1.40007</td>
<td>-.405</td>
<td>-.163</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases to do with investigation are followed up on a regular basis.</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>3.5244</td>
<td>1.21064</td>
<td>-.572</td>
<td>-.661</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Gondwe (2020).

Interpretation of the means in relation to the items

In the Ministry absenteeism is very low.

The mean for the item was 3.530 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement in the ministry, absenteeism is very low.

Few people leave the Ministry every year.

The mean for the item was 3.695 indicating that respondents agreed on average with the statement few people leave the ministry every year.

The Ministry serves more Clients every year.

The mean value for the item was 3.518 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement the ministry serves more clients every year.

Cases to do with investigation are followed up on a regular basis.

The mean value for the item was 3.646 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement cases to do with investigations are followed up on regular basis.

Our Department meets its set targets every year

The mean value for the item was 3.457 indicating that respondents on average were neutral with the statement our department meets its set targets every year.
All tasks are completed on time and with quality assurance

The mean for the item was 3.317 indicating that on average, respondents were neutral with the statement all tasks are completed on time and with quality assurance.

All resources allocated to the Ministry are used efficiently to provide public service

The mean value for the item was 3.524 indicating that on average, respondents agreed with the statement all resources allocated to the ministry are used efficiently to provide public service.

3.5. Factor and Reliability Analysis

This section of the analysis included the factor and reliability analysis. Indicators that had a factor loading of less than 0.6 were removed as suggested by George and Mallery (2019). Eleven (11) indicators (JC5, JC6, JC7, JS5, JS6, JS7, TD4, TD5, TD6, TD7 and OP7) were removed because their factor loadings were less than 0.6. The remaining indicators are shown in the Table 7 below with their reliability values.

Table 7. Factor analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable Construct</th>
<th>Indicator</th>
<th>Factor Loading</th>
<th>Cronbach alpha</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>JS1</td>
<td>0.861</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS2</td>
<td>0.750</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS3</td>
<td>0.727</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JS4</td>
<td>0.643</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Commitment</td>
<td>JC1</td>
<td>0.687</td>
<td>0.725</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JC2</td>
<td>0.679</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JC3</td>
<td>0.649</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JC4</td>
<td>0.631</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>JC5</td>
<td>0.619</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training and Development</td>
<td>TD1</td>
<td>0.873</td>
<td>0.798</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TD2</td>
<td>0.845</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>TD3</td>
<td>0.820</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Performance</td>
<td>OP1</td>
<td>0.796</td>
<td>0.741</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OP2</td>
<td>0.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OP3</td>
<td>0.681</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OP4</td>
<td>0.633</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>OP5</td>
<td>0.615</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Gondwe (2020).
3.5.1. Reliability

Reliability was measured using Cronbach alpha as shown in table 7 mentioned above. According to George and Mallery (2019), Cronbach values alpha values of less than 0.5 indicate poor reliability, values of 0.6 are questionable, values of 0.7 are acceptable and values of 0.8 and greater are good. The table above shows that the Cronbach alpha values for job satisfaction, job commitment, training and development and organizational performance are 0.699, 0.725, 0.798 and 0.741 respectively. The Cronbach alpha value for job satisfaction (0.699) was below 0.7 but very close to it hence it was kept. Overall, the reliability of the data collected was satisfactory.

3.5.2. Correlation Analysis

Before multi-regression analysis was conducted, correlation analysis was done. This was done to assess the problem of multi-collinearity. According to Pallant (2016), multi-correlation or singularity is a huge problem in multi-regression analysis. Both Pallant (2016) and Cohen (1988) suggest that correlation values of 0.8 and greater indicate the existence of multi-correlation. The results obtained shown below indicate that there was no existence of such a problem.

Table 8. Correlation

| SOURCE: Gondwe (2020). |

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Job_satisfaction</th>
<th>Training_Development</th>
<th>Organisation_Performance</th>
<th>Job_Commitment</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job_satisfaction</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>.323*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Training_Development</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.101</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Organisation_Performance</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.323*</td>
<td>.032</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job_Commitment</strong></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>.131</td>
<td>-.098</td>
<td>.159</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>164</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

The results obtained indicate that organizational performance is positively and significantly correlated with job satisfaction ($r= 0.323$, $p < 0.01$) and Job commitment ($r = 0.159$, $p < 0.05$). On the other hand, organizational performance is not significantly correlated with training and performance ($r= -0.098$, $p > 0.05$).

3.6. Regression Analysis

The results from the analysis shows that the coefficient of determination ($R^2$) was 0.202 indicating that the three independent variables (job commitment, job satisfaction and training performance) jointly explain 20.2% of the changes in the dependent variable (organizational performance).
Table 9. Model summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted R Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.229a</td>
<td>.052</td>
<td>.040</td>
<td>.88225</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.449b</td>
<td>.202</td>
<td>.176</td>
<td>.81722</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), How long have you been working with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, What is your (sex) gender

b. Predictors: (Constant), How long have you been working with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, What is your (sex) gender, Job_Commitment, Job_satisfaction, Training_Development

c. Dependent Variable: Organisation_Performance

Anova

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>6.886</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3.433</td>
<td>4.411</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>125.317</td>
<td>161</td>
<td>.778</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132.193</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>26.652</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.332</td>
<td>7.965</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>105.520</td>
<td>158</td>
<td>.668</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>132.193</td>
<td>163</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Organisation_Performance

b. Predictors: (Constant), How long have you been working with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, What is your (sex) gender

c. Predictors: (Constant), How long have you been working with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security, What is your (sex) gender, Job_Commitment, Job_satisfaction, Training_Development

Source: Gondwe (2020).

Pallant (2016) proposes that the Variance Inflation Factor (VIF) be used to check for multi-correlation of the regressed variables. Table 10 shows that all values of the VIF are below 5 indicating no multi-collinearity problems (Pallant, 2016).

Table 10. Regression analysis

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td>T</td>
<td>B</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>3.264</td>
<td>27.34</td>
<td></td>
<td>12.422</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your (sex) gender</td>
<td>.197</td>
<td>.138</td>
<td>.164</td>
<td>1.365</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long have you been working with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security</td>
<td>-.166</td>
<td>.066</td>
<td>-.163</td>
<td>-.489</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.356</td>
<td>62.76</td>
<td></td>
<td>2.163</td>
<td>.032</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>What is your (sex) gender</td>
<td>.301</td>
<td>.134</td>
<td>.168</td>
<td>2.243</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>How long have you been working with the Ministry of Labour and Social Security</td>
<td>-.198</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>-.230</td>
<td>-.257</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job_satisfaction</td>
<td>.300</td>
<td>.082</td>
<td>.335</td>
<td>4.623</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Training_Development</td>
<td>.099</td>
<td>.095</td>
<td>.070</td>
<td>.936</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Job_Commitment</td>
<td>.153</td>
<td>0.84</td>
<td>.150</td>
<td>2.561</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Organisation_Performance

Source: Gondwe (2020).
Table 10 above shows that job satisfaction and job commitment were significantly related with organizational performance while training and development was not related with organizational performance.

3.7. Summary of hypotheses testing

Table 11. Hypotheses testing

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypotheses</th>
<th>B-value</th>
<th>P-value</th>
<th>Conclusion</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>$H_1$: Job satisfaction has a positive influence on organisational performance.</td>
<td>0.335</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_2$: Job commitment has a positive influence on organizational performance</td>
<td>0.070</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>Supported</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>$H_3$: Training and development has a positive influence on organisational performance.</td>
<td>0.150</td>
<td>0.351</td>
<td>Not Supported</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

SOURCE: Gondwe (2020).

The results above indicate that:

$H_1$: Job satisfaction has a positive influence on organisational performance was supported indicating that, an increase in job satisfaction level is likely to result into an increase in organisational performance levels.

$H_2$: Job commitment has a positive influence on organizational performance was supported indicating that, an increase in job commitment level is likely to result into an increase in organisational performance levels.

$H_3$: Training and development has a positive influence on organizational performance was supported indicating that, an increase in training and development level is likely to result into no change in organisational performance levels.

3.8. Discussion of the Research Finding

The results obtained indicated that job satisfaction is positively related to organisational performance. The results obtained reveal that increasing the levels of job satisfaction increases the organisational performance at MLSS. The results showed that if the workers are happy with their salary, salary increments are based on performance, workers feel appreciated, staff workers are promoted in a fair and transparent way, the organisation offers career advancement, employees receive career feedback and enjoy their work, the results are likely to be; low absenteeism, more clients are served, few employees leaving the organisation, achievement of targets, completion of tasks on time with and efficient use of resources at the Ministry.

The journal results were in line with the theory of motivation by Maslow’s. The theory contends that job satisfaction results into individual satisfaction and eventually organisational performance. Furthermore, the theory points out that job satisfaction can be as a result of psychological needs such as salaries, social needs such as enjoying work with colleagues. In addition, the findings were also supported by Herzberg’s theory which pointed out that salaries improve organisational performance.
Furthermore, the findings were in line with the literature reviewed such as Garvea et al., (2011) who concluded that satisfaction is a determinant of organisational performance in Romania. In addition, Mushriha (2013), conducted a journal in Indonesia and concluded that job satisfaction influences performance in an organisation. Furthermore, Javed et al., (2014) conducted a journal in India on determinants of job satisfaction and its impact on employee Performance and Turnover Intentions and concluded that the three variables were related. Shaju and Durai (2017) conducted a journal in Indias automobile industry and concluded that job satisfaction and performance are positively correlated. Almanae (2007) in Libya, Shaikah et al., (2017) in Pakistan and Carmeli and Freund (2004) in Israel all concluded that job satisfaction was related to performance of an organisation. The results obtained also indicated that job commitment is positively related to organisational performance. The results obtained reveal that increasing the levels of job commitment increases the organisational performance at Ministry of Labour and Social Security. The results showed that if the workers feel loyal to the Ministry, the values of the workers are aligned with their values, workers feel that their job contributes to Ministry, workers feel proud to work for the Ministry and workers do not wish to leave the organisation, the results are likely to be; low absenteeism, more clients are served, few employees leaving the organisation, achievement of targets, completion of tasks on time with and efficient use of resources at the Ministry. The journal results were in line with the adopted theory of behavioural commitment which pointed out that, conditions such as loyalty to a supervisor, rewards of being in an organization and positive working environment might influence an individual to remain in an organization and improve performance.

Furthermore, the results obtained were also in the same vein as the studies conducted in different parts of the world such as studies by Carmeli and Freund (2004) in Israel; Mckeever (2018) in United States; Alexander et al (2011) in China and Diab and Musa (2014) in Jordan who all concluded that job commitment influenced organizational performance and service quality.

The hypotheses tested also disclosed that, training and development had no effect on organisational performance. This implied that increasing the levels of training and development resulted into no change in the levels of organisational performance. These inconsistent with the theory of social learning which assumes that training and development results into improved performance. Not only that, the results were also not in line with the literature reviewed from different countries such as that by Kasua (2014) in Kenya; Farooq and Aslam (2011); Anitha and Kumar (2016) in India and Diab and Musa (2014), in Jordan which all pointed out that training results into improved organizational performance. The difference in these findings could be as a result of lack of adequate training funding at the Ministry which has as a result made most the employees at the Ministry to perceive training and development not important in improving organizational performance. Besides, the inconsistence could be as a result of the difference in the working culture between Zambia and the countries where the studies were conducted. Other than that, the difference in the implementation and design of training and development program could be another reason for the difference in the inconsistence of the findings.

4. Conclusion

This journal presented the presentation, interpretation and discussion of the results obtained. The analysis first analyzed the demographic information using cross-tabulation. Thereafter, the descriptive statistics were done which included the mean, standard deviation, kurtosis and skewness. The skewness and kurtosis were used to test for the
normality of the data collected. Furthermore, the factor analysis was done with reliability analysis. Overall, the reliability values were accepted. The correlation results showed that job satisfaction and job commitment were positively and significantly correlated with organizational performance. However, training and development is positively correlated to organizational performance although not significant. Furthermore, the hypotheses developed in journal three were tested and two out of the three hypotheses were supported. Thereafter, the findings were discussed in line with the theories and literature obtained.
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