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Abstract

Study was carried out to check the impact of training & development, employee empowerment, job performance, rewards & benefits, age, education and experience on job satisfaction. For this purpose questionnaire was developed and circulated in private and public organizations. Around 120 filled questionnaires were returned and researchers found 100 out of 120 genuinely responded. On the data, researchers checked for heteroscedasticity, multicollinearity issues etc. Results showed that in Pakistani organizations rewards, age, education and experience play a vital role in determination of job satisfaction, whereas, training & development, employee empowerment and job performance impact on job satisfaction is quiet insignificant. Researcher found results closer to reality.

Keywords: Job Satisfaction, Training & Development, Job/Employee Performance, Empowerment, Rewards & Benefits

1. Introduction

Despite the wide use in scientific research, as well as in everyday life, there is still no general agreement about what is job satisfaction. In fact there is no definitive definition of what to do. Before defining job satisfaction, the nature and importance of universal human activity, should be considered. Different researchers have developed different methods to define job satisfaction. Hoppock (1935) defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological,
physiological and environmental circumstances that cause a person truthfully to say I am satisfied with my job (Hoppock, 1935). According to this approach although job satisfaction is under the influence of many external factors, it remains something internal that has to do with the way how the employee feels. That is job satisfaction presents a set of factors that cause a feeling of satisfaction. Job satisfaction represents a combination of positive or negative feelings that workers have towards their work. Meanwhile, when a worker employed in a business organization, brings with it the needs, desires and experiences which determinates expectations that he has dismissed. Job satisfaction represents the extent to which expectations are and match the real awards. Job satisfaction is closely linked to that individual’s behavior in the work place (Davis et al., 1985).

Training is the process of enhancing the skills, capabilities and knowledge of people which moulds their thinking and leads to the increase in quality of their performance. It is a continuous process and is a matter of deep concern for most of the researchers. Training is crucial and fruitful for both employee and organizational improvement. Liberman, Block and Koch (2011) discussed training in terms of trainer and its effect on training effectiveness leading to the betterment of organizational performance. Participants identified a number of ways in which training approaches could be adapted to enhance motivation to engage with research, and enable integration of research and clinical practice (Moran, 2011).

Job performance is a commonly used but a poorly defined concept in industrial and organizational psychology (the branch of psychology that deals with the workplace). It is also a part of Human Resource Management. Goris, Vaught and Pettit (2003) were among those who performed research on this subject and took it into the limelight to solve the problem of many. It most commonly refers to whether a person performs their job well or not. Job performance is the way employees perform their work. An employee’s performance is determined during job performance reviews.

With the growing competition in the market place as well as the customers becoming better informed and more choosy, it is important that the employees perform to their full extent so as not to satisfy the customers but to delight them. One of the goals of every manager is to improve the performance of their department. Sales should increase, the number of turnovers should decline, the competitive edge should be attained and the reputation should be the best. Some would prefer training programs to increase performance but a good training consultant would do the opposite. They would look at the factors that affect performance first and competencies later because it is more likely that the company may be lagging behind in fulfilling these factors. Tessema & Soeters (2006) analyzed the HR practices that could affect performance at the employee level. Similarly, Reio & Callahan (2004) performed extensive research on the factors that could affect job performance. It is believed that the performance of employees is affected by some factors which when not employed can cause serious damage to an organization’s reputation and sales volume.
The basic objective of this research is to check the impact of Training & Development, Job/Employee Performance, empowerment and Rewards & Benefits on employee Job Satisfaction.

1.2 Research Question

“What impact training & development, employee empowerment, job performance & rewards have on job satisfaction?”

1.3 Research Objectives

- To study impact of training & development on job satisfaction among the employee in Pakistani organizations.
- To study relationship between employee empowerment & job satisfaction among employee in Pakistani organizations.
- To check the impact of job performance on job satisfaction among the employee in Pakistani organizations.
- To check the rewards as motivation for job satisfaction level in Pakistani Organizations.

1.4 Significance of Study

Study will be fruitful because nobody has ever checked the impact of these variables together on Job Satisfaction.

1.5 Scope of Research

Public & Private companies of Pakistan.

1.6 Limitation of Study

The limitations which we faced during our research are:
- Non-Corporative response of organizations.
- Non-availability of correct & complete information.

2. Literature Review

Training relates to employees present job and assignments. Development entails employee’s future career growth in a firm. Former HR practice helps individuals learn specific skills and knowledge to do the current working assignments efficiently. To judge the effectiveness of the training both the trainer and trainees responses be recorded to check which job areas still require improvements. The feedback on trainer’s profile is also must to know that whether the trainer is competent in his knowledge and field and has delivered the right training material to the workers. The negative judgment about the trainer would help him realized his mistakes and
deficiencies so the next time he is more productive and proficient in his work or may be the new trainer is hired to conduct the training. Trainings that focus only on present job requirements are more successful than those which don’t cover the domains of current jobs. The researches reveal that employees’ job satisfaction and motivation feelings are closely correlated with training opportunities within the organization. Consumers enjoying particular service or product be also asked to give opinion on the improvement of the service or if employee delivering the service has improved his skills, knowledge or behavior to provide problem free and timely service. Training providers and trainees should be engaged in the training evaluation phase to further improve the training methods, courses and components. Those trainees be selected which actually need training to benefit the company. Training should be tested on following areas:

1. Relevancy of the training. Is the desired training relevant to the firm or not?
2. Practicality of the training does the training feasible and practical to the jobs of the trainees or not?
3. How much time the training would consume?
4. What is the objectivity of the training?
5. Reliability of the training. Either the training reliable and valid enough to impart the knowledge or skills it is supposed to deliver?

There are numerous kinds of training available which an organization can adopt. These are lectures, seminars, conferences, videos, simulations, role play and demonstrations etc. The trainers of the firm must try new and innovative approaches to train the employees (Huque & Vyas, 2008).

The research conducted in Taiwan is another vital support for training in the company. The findings reveal that top ten companies of Taiwan almost invested 3.3% of their pay roll on training and development. The major area to be improved and invested is training and development practices of any enterprise. The respondents in the research shared that training and development along with other HR practices should be used and adopted on regular basis for the businesses to earn profit and market share (Lin, 1997).

Learner’s pre and post assessment on behavior, skills and knowledge would also enable managers to check the utility of the training (Todaro, 2002).

Internet based trainings also save company’s time and spatial differences are overcome in seconds as finance department workers working in China can easily learn new finance software tests and programs via internet training being conducted in America (Grotzky & Turner, 1997).

The employees are the main source of company’s profitability and development. In ever changing and complex business environment only those businesses would yield success who believes in the powers and capacities of their HR force. The eminent researchers have given the concept Employee Engagement. The process involves the interest, commitment and connection
of the workers in their jobs. Highly involved and engaged employees would be performing 2½ times more than the disinterested and less involved workers (Robbins, Mary and Vohra, 2010).

To meet customer satisfaction the managers are continually striving for quality in business. The quality services or products are only possible if the employees are taken on board to express the views and suggestion on modifying the services and products. Futuristic management and visionary supervisors who understand that without educating, training and development, employee empowerment they cannot beat the rivals would harvest the fruit of high profits and revenues (Green, 2006).

Employee empowerment also holds the employee commitment response to the company. This greatly depends on whether the job employee is hired for is a match to his/her skills and qualification, if answer is yes then the employee would work compassionately and would have greater sense of belongingness to the firm. The wrong hiring or employee who is misfit for the job would quickly leave the organization (Silva, HUTCHESON and WAHL, 2010).

The candid organization structure, open and fearless communication with supervisors, employees friendliness towards each other all aid in engaging and involving employees in organization’s daily business matters to achieve viable results (Chow and Liu, 2009).

The researchers have defined Job Satisfaction as the employee’s attitude and general behavior towards his job (Robbins et al., 2010). Working environment, relationship between colleagues, manager’s support and work itself all affect person’s satisfaction for the job. The study on job satisfaction and working environment or organization culture revealed that rewards, degree of self-authority and power on job, performance evaluation all are key drivers to boost employees satisfaction correlation among all these factors is 5-7 levels of satisfaction which is high level of correlation as per the quantitative analysis conducted by Zavyalova & Kucherov (2010). Other studies indicate that current work demands also play a role in satisfying employees. Employee – employer relations is another important measure for job satisfaction (Schyns & Croon, 2006).

Employees who are satisfied and contended with their work show more customers focus attitude. Another main factor for satisfaction is the fairness of judgment shown by the supervisors and managers regarding employee’s ability and performance. The job satisfaction does influence employees’ customer orientation or focus but no relationship has been found between these human responses (Wagenheim and Anderson, 2008).

Clear performance criteria and standards make performance evaluation easy. The proper usage of employee’s competencies and knowledge also enhances his job performance. Management creativity and innovation in managing workers performance is another driver for improving employees’ capacities to deliver the best (Kwon & Jang, 2011).

The link and interaction between HR and business strategy also generates greater level of employees’ performance. Cordial working atmosphere, opportunities of training and development aid in better performance of the workers. Appreciating and acknowledging
employees' effort also motivate them to perform well. Organization working conditions also affect workers' performance (Haines III & Onge, 2011).

There are many organizations which have a foreign or an expatriate hiring along with local workers this situation also triggers employees' performance levels. The research conducted for such type of firms covered organization structure, position of an expatriate within the company, international linkages, and local offices location and size. The findings disclosed that expatriates and supervisors participate in goal settings. Expatriates' performance evaluation carried out formally. Varying and different performance management techniques have different results (Suutari & Tahvanainen, 2002).

The human being's basic nature is that he needs recognition of whatever good he does. The rewards are encouragement for him to become more productive. The best example of rewards is the corporate sector. Big and huge companies are considered to reward their employees better than small business concerns. There is certain work mechanisms defined for every firm to follow. Rules and regulations help maintain order and discipline in the business. Managing employees especially globally demand that management must know the norms and procedures of those countries where it has the business interests. Government regulations, taxation department, law and legislation, labor unions and trade unions all influence reward and compensation structure of the company. Income tax rate directly target the employees with handsome salary to be charged and paid such a situation demands fairness and equity in terms of giving salary and other benefits. Country to country the compensation system varies and firms have to adjust accordingly. The reward programs should be formal and consistent. To align HR component with firms' strategic goals is a challenge because mostly the financial rewards are given more weightage than non-financial (Yanadori, 2011).

The research in USA gives the idea of compensation and rewards system in media. The kinds of compensation system prevailing in corporate sector are fixed compensation and incentive based compensation. Base salary is fixed compensation and incentives consist of payment in cash or as per the company's decision regarding incentives. The two standards financial condition of the firm and its survival have been the hallmark of the research under discussion. The executives who have high fixed compensation the business experience positive impact on Return on assets and return on equity. Similarly the directors who have high fixed income the companies performed well. CEO and directors who have given handsome fix compensation improved media company performance. In order to satisfy share holder and stake holder the firm's overall performance need to be catered and this depends on the executives holding high position (Shao, 2010).

Education is the essence of any society's survival and development. The distance learning institutions also contribute in this regard. Salary, benefits, promotion etc. the faculty members are motivated to perform well. In the modern and developed country like America the distance learning is still not acknowledged and has little rewards for the workers (Wolcott, 1997).
The organizations should not focus on monetary rewards but intrinsic rewards also add value to employees’ performance (Reilly, 2003). The new approach to motivate employees’ performance is pay after performance and giving employees’ ownership in the company has geared more support of the workers. The managers in this situation should carefully devise employee ownership programs, employees’ right of investment be safe guarded and firms must have proper procedures, compliance and code of conduct in order to have fairness and justice in employee compensation and reward structure (Blasi, Kruse, Sesil and Kroumova, 2003).

3. Methodology

3.1 Research Sample

Researchers adopted questionnaire for the research. (Attached at annexure I)
Sample of 100 employees from different organization of Rawalpindi & Islamabad were selected.
SPSS software was used to reach the resulting figure and to check whether they play a significant role or not.

3.2 Model

Theoretical framework/Model consists of independent and dependent variables. Independent variable is that variable which is not influenced by any other variable. Dependent variable is that variable which is influenced by independent variables. The theoretical framework of this research is drawn below.
3.3 Research Hypothesis

Researcher is trying to measure not only the validity & reliability of data but also applied different test to check the relationship between dependent & independent variables.

H1: Training & Development has positive impact on Job Satisfaction in Pakistani organizations.
H2: Employee Empowerment has positive impact on Job Satisfaction in Pakistan organizations.
H3: Job Performance is directly related to Job Satisfaction in Pakistani organizations.
H4: Rewards systems influence the Job Satisfaction in Pakistani organizations.
H5: Contributive factors of Job Satisfaction vary in different Pakistani organizations.

4. Results

Researcher conducted following tests on the data collected.

4.1 Reliability Test

Researcher applied reliability test on the variables i.e. Cronbach’s Alpha test which results in 0.69.
Reliability Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cronbach's Alpha</th>
<th>N of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>.069</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.2 Frequencies

Details of frequencies of variables are as follow:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistics</th>
<th>Age, Education, Experience</th>
<th>Training Development</th>
<th>Job Satisfaction</th>
<th>Employee Empowerment</th>
<th>Rewards</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N Valid</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Missing</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mean</td>
<td>18.7596</td>
<td>3.7404</td>
<td>3.3942</td>
<td>3.5661</td>
<td>3.5064</td>
<td>3.7871</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Error of Mean</td>
<td>.45777</td>
<td>.04176</td>
<td>.05253</td>
<td>.06452</td>
<td>.05132</td>
<td>.04737</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Minimum</td>
<td>12.67</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>1.80</td>
<td>1.38</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>2.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Maximum</td>
<td>35.00</td>
<td>4.43</td>
<td>4.40</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>4.89</td>
<td>4.71</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.3 Normality Test

Researcher conducted Normality test by using Histogram

Results showed that majority of data lies within normal distribution.

4.4 Regression Test

Researcher applied regression function on the variables, based on the following model.

\[ JS = \beta_0 + \beta_1 TD + \beta_2 EE + \beta_3 R + \beta_4 JP + \beta_5 AEE \]
Results showed

**Model Summary**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.631&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.42598</td>
<td>1.907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience, Training Development, Rewards, Employee Empowerment, Job Performance
b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

**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>Regression</td>
<td>11.774</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2.355</td>
<td>12.977</td>
<td>.000&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>17.783</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>.181</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29.557</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience, Training Development, Rewards, Employee Empowerment, Job Performance
b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
Coefficients

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model 1 (Constant)</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>1.595</td>
<td>.475</td>
<td>3.357</td>
<td>.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Development</td>
<td>-.181</td>
<td>.115</td>
<td>-1.568</td>
<td>.120</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Empowerment</td>
<td>.484</td>
<td>.083</td>
<td>5.833</td>
<td>.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>.133</td>
<td>.105</td>
<td>1.257</td>
<td>.212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Performance</td>
<td>.047</td>
<td>.119</td>
<td>.396</td>
<td>.693</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Age, Education, Experience</td>
<td>.006</td>
<td>.009</td>
<td>.617</td>
<td>.538</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Residuals Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>N</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Predicted Value</td>
<td>2.4565</td>
<td>4.1899</td>
<td>3.3942</td>
<td>.33810</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>-.112368</td>
<td>1.07944</td>
<td>.00000</td>
<td>.41551</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Predicted Value</td>
<td>-.2774</td>
<td>2.353</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.000</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Std. Residual</td>
<td>-.2638</td>
<td>2.534</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.975</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

Results are

\[
JS = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{TD} + \beta_2 \text{EE} + \beta_3 \text{R} + \beta_4 \text{JP} + \beta_5 \text{AE} + e
\]

\[
JS = 1.595 - 0.181 + 0.484 + 0.133 + 0.47 + 0.006 + e
\]

\[
(0.477) (0.115) (0.083) (0.105) (0.119) (0.009) \text{ Standard Error}
\]

\[
(3.357) (-1.568) (5.833) (1.257) (0.396) (0.538) \text{ t-statistics}
\]

\[
(0.001) (0.120) (0.000) (0.212) (0.693) (0.538) \text{ p-value}
\]

R = 0.631   R² = 0.398   R² adjusted = 0.368   F = 12.977   p-value = 0.000   N = 104
4.5 Interpretation

Results showed that training & development has no impact on the Job Satisfaction, whereas employee empowerment rewards & job performance has positive impact on job satisfaction. Results of rewards are significant and all rest independent variables showed insignificant results.

4.6 Autocorrelation Test

For checking autocorrelation researcher used Durbin Watson test which yield D.W = 1.907 showing that there is almost no autocorrelation in the data.

Model Summary\(^b\)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adjusted Square</th>
<th>Std. Error of the Estimate</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.631(^a)</td>
<td>.398</td>
<td>.368</td>
<td>.42598</td>
<td>1.907</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Age, Education, Experience, Training Development, Rewards, Employee Empowerment, Job Performance

b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction
4.7 Runs Test

To reconfirm the results of D.W researcher used Runs Test which showed very nominal autocorrelation.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Runs Test</th>
<th>Unstandardized Residual</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Value(^a)</td>
<td>.0000000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases &lt; Test Value</td>
<td>44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Cases &gt;= Test Value</td>
<td>60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total Cases</td>
<td>104</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Number of Runs</td>
<td>53</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>.248</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

\(^{a}\text{Mean}\)

4.8 Multicollinearity Test

- Employee Empowerment showed weak positive collinearity with Training & Development, Rewards, & Job Performance. Whereas, very weak negative collinearity with Age, Education & Experience.
- Rewards showed weak positive collinearity with Training & Development, Employee Empowerment, & Job Performance. Whereas, very weak negative collinearity with Age, Education & Experience.
- Training & Development showed weak positive collinearity with Rewards, Employee Empowerment, & Job Performance. Whereas, very weak negative collinearity with Age, Education & Experience.
- Job Performance showed weak positive collinearity with Training & Development, Employee Empowerment, & Rewards. Whereas, very strong negative collinearity with Age, Education & Experience.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Correlations</th>
<th>Training Development</th>
<th>Employee Empowerment</th>
<th>Reward</th>
<th>Job Performance</th>
<th>Age, Education, Experience</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Pearson Correlation</td>
<td>Sig. (2-tailed) N</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training Development</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>.496**</td>
<td>.334**</td>
<td>.398**</td>
<td>-.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>104</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.001</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>.929</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

### 4.9 Heteroscedasticity
To check heteroscedasticity researcher applied Park test on the data. Results showed

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary&lt;sup&gt;b&lt;/sup&gt;</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1&lt;sup&gt;a&lt;/sup&gt;</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<sup>a</sup> Predictors: (Constant), LnAEE, LnTD, LnR, LnEE, LnJP

<sup>b</sup> Dependent Variable: RES_2
Results showed that Employee Empowerment & Job Performance is statistically insignificant whereas, Training & Development, Rewards & Contributive factor are statistically significant. It means there exists heteroscedasticity in the data to some extent.

4.10 Goldfeld-Quant Test

Researcher also applied Gold-Quant Test to check heteroscedasticity, results showed

$$F = \frac{RSS_2/df}{RSS_1/df}$$
If the F is found significant (F-calculated > F-tabulated, the problem of heteroscedasticity is likely to exist. Researcher dividend data into two equal parts & applied regression on them

4.11 Results of part 1

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA^b</th>
<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></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>4.692</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.938</td>
<td>3.575</td>
<td>.008^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>11.551</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.263</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>16.243</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Performance, Age, Education, Experience, Training Development, Rewards, Employee Empowerment
b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

4.12 Results of Part 2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA^b</th>
<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></td>
<td>Regression</td>
<td>2.551</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>.510</td>
<td>5.749</td>
<td>.000^a</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3.904</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>.089</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.455</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td>5.749</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Job Performance, Age, Education, Experience, Training Development, Employee Empowerment, Rewards
b. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction

The residual sums of squares (RSS) of the two groups are:

RSS₁ = 11.551 with DF = 44
RSSᵢᵢ = 3.904 with DF = 44

Calculating F

\[ F = \frac{(RSSᵢᵢ/DF)}{(RSS₁/DF)} \]
\[ = \frac{(3.904/44)}{(11.551/44)} \]
\[ = 0.0887/0.2625 \]
\[ F = 3.379 \]

F-calculated = 3.370 < 3.76, so suggesting there exists no heteroscedasticity.
5 Conclusion

Results showed that Training & Development, Employee Empowerment, Job Performance has negligible impact on job satisfaction whereas Rewards and Contributive factors significantly impact Job satisfaction. Thus researchers can conclude that in Pakistani environment if organizations give more importance to rewards & benefits and age, education and experience than they will be able to generate more job satisfaction in the organization. As Pakistani human resource is still fighting for basic necessities thus the results seem more realistic and close to reality. Since, researchers collected data from 100 respondents; therefore, increase in sample size can generate more generalizable results.

6 Recommendation

Based on the study researchers recommend that reward system must formal based on equitable & compatible to employee performance. Researcher also recommends that future researchers must be conducted based on the same assumptions, as there are few other variables like organizational culture which need to be discussed.
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