



RESEARCH PAPER

An Investigation into the Association between Employee Performance and Protection Motivation in the Context of Hiring, Training, Evaluating, Promoting, and Employee Behavior: The Case of Punjab, Pakistan's Public Sector

¹Ehsan Bhutta* and ²Dr. Kashif Mahmood

1. PhD Scholar, Department of Business Administration, Superior University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan
2. Assistant Professor, Department of Business Administration, Superior University Lahore, Punjab, Pakistan

*Corresponding Author: ehsanbhutta69@gmail.com

ABSTRACT

The study aims to explore the intricate relationship between Protection Motivation Theory (PMT) and employee performance within the dynamic context of the public sector in Pakistan. The primary concern is to present an insight that can help public sector policymakers design an effective reward system, including an incentive mechanism, which will thereby positively motivate public sector employees for better outcomes. A quantitative research design consisting of 412 employees from various departments of the Punjab government across diverse functions was selected through stratified random sampling. A structured questionnaire was distributed to all available employees on the Lickert scale. After continuous follow-up, 265 respondents responded to share their opinion. The collected data was analyzed through Statistical Package for Social Sciences version 21 (SPSS) to find the co-relation among the variables of the study. The findings of the study showed a pivotal role of human resource management elements, including training, evaluation, promotion, and employee behavior (EB), in shaping their performance in the context of the protection motivation approach. The results indicated a significant impact between Protection Motivation Theory (PMT) and employee performance in the presence of hiring, training, evaluation, and promotion. By elucidating the tangled interplay between PMT and key human resource practices, this study contributes valuable insights in the field of public policy.

KEYWORDS Employee Behavior, Employee Performance, Protection Motivation Theory

Introduction

Recent decades have observed a major challenge in public sector employee management, especially in developing nations like Pakistan (Shi, 2023; Chen, Ahn, & Wang, 2023; Ali & Elias, 2023). Human resources experts, following the experiences of developed countries, are re-designing their human resource practices (Alkhalailah & Mjlae, 2023; Schnell & Gerard, 2022). Employee motivation, a catalyst for heightened productivity and performance, stands as a critical factor influencing engagement, productivity, and overall department outcome (Nguyen, Chau, & Huynh, 2023). Recognizing its pivotal role, organizations deploy incentive programs to inspire optimal performance and attract top-tier talent (Akinyele, Demek, & Tian, 2023; Smiley, 2023).

Pakistan has tried many civil servant reforms to transform, restructure, and recognize the role of government employees; however, all these improvements could not produce the required output. The third era attempt (2001-21) to boost the motivational level of government employees through training and development by reducing the

divide between generalists and technocrats by NCGR came up with a far-reaching plan of total reforms for public sector employment by benchmarking it with private sector. Little could be achieved in terms of enhancing the performance of government employees due to political culture and patronage.

Employee motivation has always been at the core of organizational strategy because productivity is directly linked to the morale of employees (Weiwei, 2023; Alanizan, 2023; Sherli, J., & Mayakannan, 2023; Leman & Gustomo, 2023). It has also been figured out in many theories related to employee motivation that motivated employees behave in a specific manner that leads to high productivity. These theories include Maslow's hierarchy of needs, expectancy theory, goal-setting theory, Herzberg's two-factor theory, equity theory, Skinner's reinforcement theory, Theory X and Theory Y, ERG theory, acquired needs theory, goal-setting theory, etc.

Literature Review

The previous literature pointed out that the motivation of employees in the public sector of Pakistan will serve as a catalyst to raise the bar of performance and productivity (Bashir, Wright, & Hassan, 2023; Anwar & Humayun, 2023; Kalwar, Shah, & Hussain, 2023; Hassan, Ansari, & Rehman, 2023). The studies conducted by Pakistani authors explicitly ruled out the factors that hinder the performance of public sector employees, mentioning the root cause of motivation. The study by Mehmood & Lee (2023) found that political patronage, the absence of an internal accountability mechanism, and demotivation are vigor causes of PMSCS performance. Similarly, a study on public sector library professionals revealed that various types of motivation affect the service attitude of employees (Shahzad, Khan, Iqbal, & Shabbir, 2023). The study on the banking sector showed that effective commitment is affected by motivation and job satisfaction, and that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards have a positive relationship with productivity (Nizam & Hameed, 2023; Haq, Qazi, Kamran, & Yosaf, 2023). The predictors of job satisfaction and motivation have a high impact on the productivity of female public sector university teachers in Pakistan (Kazmi, Nasir, & Cheema, 2023). The study conducted by Hassan, Ansari, and Rehman (2022) found that personal attributes also influence public service motivation (PMS).

The above literature is significant evidence to highlight a reasonable gap based on variables of study and to launch an inquiry that suggests a reason and logical solution to the problem. Because public-sector organizations are driven by public money and the expectations of the masses from personnel serving in the public sector are very high, the rationale is also convincing: the annual cost of wages to public sector employees is more than 3 trillion PKRS, while 1.5 trillion are being paid as pensions. Instead of these heavy expenditures, public sentiment is not in favor, but the graph is decreasing with the passage of time.

The study is a valuable addition because it suggests solutions to enhance the performance of public sector employees given the huge investment and minimum return on investment (ROI), which will ultimately improve the image of state-owned institutions. With the convalescence of government departments, public trust will be enhanced, and the lethargy of government departments will perk up. The study recommends a feasible course of action and strategies for policymakers that not only bridge the gap between the masses and government but also pull the public towards public institutions. The study would be a good addition to the body of knowledge, which may be beneficial for other developing and underdeveloped countries. The study also highlights the importance of motivational strategies in light of existing theories and how these can be seen from the perspective of the public sector.

An organization's people must be known; they are good people who require training. Every employee has his or her own unique motivating factors that drive him or her to execute a good job. Some employees are driven by praise, while others are motivated by financial incentives. Organizations must be aware of their employees' requirements. Employees who are highly driven are more productive, joyful, engaged, and satisfied with their jobs. One of the most critical responsibilities for any organization that wants to achieve success is to have a motivating function. Every manager must motivate his or her subordinates in order to increase their willingness to work. Employees in any organization require something to drive them to work for the organization; without motivation, the quality of work, or all work, would be warped (Mbogo, 2013).

Employees who aren't motivated tend to put less effort into their work, produce subpar work, don't go to work, and may even quit when the chance arises. Employees who are motivated are more likely to take on new tasks, produce quality work, and be creative, tenacious, and productive. There are two kinds of employee motivation: intrinsic and extrinsic.

Motivation (intrinsic) emerges from a wish for a result outside of the job (e.g., as a reward), whereas extrinsic motivation stems from a desire for a result outside the job (e.g., as a promotion) (Amabile, 1993). Every employee within a company is driven differently. Many factors influence employee motivation, including attractive work, appreciation at work, job satisfaction, stress, job security, promotion and growth, compensation, the work environment, punishment, and recognition. (Palaniammal, 2013). The main goal of these motivators is to create an environment in which people work with enthusiasm, initiative, interest, and enthusiasm and to achieve high levels of individual and group satisfaction, responsibility, loyalty, and self-confidence. (Palaniammal, 2013). Employee satisfaction and contribution to organizational success are at the center of all definitions. Employee motivation, according to the results of several studies, may be utilized to involve employees in an organization's tasks. In addition to motivation, many companies recognize the importance of engaging employees to survive in today's highly competitive economy.

One of the various ways to encourage and reward employees who do well is to recognize and reward them for their efforts (Memmott & Growers, 2012). Everyone in the organization must recognize and accept that they are significant assets to the organization and that they require training. Every individual has a set of specific motivators that push them to do their activities as effectively and efficiently as possible.

Employees who are well-motivated produce higher levels of productivity, joy, dedication, and satisfaction in their employment. If a company wishes to achieve better levels of performance, one of the most significant obligations it has is to carry out the incentive function. The quality of one's job, or the total quality of one's labor, will suffer if one is not driven to work hard (Mbogo, 2013). Pay and incentives in the public sector are meant to reward completed work, inspire employees, and retain people in order to save time and money spent on the costly recruitment and training of three replacement employees. In this situation, every country's government is continuing to put in significant effort to stimulate its employees. The area of development management garnered a great deal of attention throughout the 1950s. This was due to the legitimate requirements of managers and academics who, when confronted with particular phenomena and operational requirements, felt obligated to act and explain these phenomena and operational requirements (Hess, 1995).

Concentrating on the mission might boost some areas of performance development at the expense of others, a situation similar to the multitasking issue when monetary incentives are tied to specific performance measures (Holmstrom & Milgrom 1991). Furthermore, if the goal is largely to encourage employees, increasing financial incentives may result in a lack of motivation as a result of the increased financial incentives (Gneezy et al., 2011; Cassar, 2018; Deci et al., 1999). When examining the possibility of a conflict of interest, it is vital to determine whether and how these two incentives influence employee performance.

The success of a country is dependent on the effectiveness of its public sector. Across the world, public sector changes have been labeled as such in many ways: restructuring, reengineering, and the incorporation of new employment technology (Christensen, Laegreid, Roness, and Rvik, 2007). A comprehensive set of regulations for recruitment, training, promotion, and assessment were promulgated by the Punjab Provincial Government in 1974, which became known as the Punjab Civil Service Law (Punjab Civil Service Rules (appointment and conditions of service), 1974).

The most recent emphasis of the Security Inspiration Hypothesis (PMT) show was created by Ronald Rogers in 1983 to better understand how and why individuals react to potential dangers to their wellbeing and security. PMT proposes that both individual and natural variables can energize or debilitate interest in defensive behaviors, and the impacts of these variables are interceded by person cognitive forms. These cognitive forms are planned to recognize them from the so-called coordinate relationship between enthusiastic fear and defensive reactions. The Theory of Protection Motivation is a theory that was developed to explain individual human responses to fear appeals. It proposes that our motivation to protect ourselves depends on two factors: our threat appraisal and our coping appraisal. Hence, protecting ourselves from the risks we face requires us to act in a certain way. This theory is based on a variety of studies and research findings.

Most employees are "motivated by various causes," while some "may not be driven or have high levels of motivation" (Shanks, 2007). Managers must have a thorough grasp of people in this setting. D'Ausilio (2008) asserts that in order to effectively encourage employees, most managers are either overly busy or have not taken the time to comprehend the concept of motivation.

Employee motivation is crucial to the success of both individuals and organizations. Employee and organizational performance can be harmed by a lack of motivation. Employees who are proactive are genuine, engaged, productive, and loyal to the company. Employees must be motivated by a variety of incentives for good work and improved organizational performance (Sevanson, 2011).

Despite the Pakistani government's efforts to raise public sector compensation, the pay levels in the public sector have not increased as compared to other comparators in the labor market. There is still a noteworthy chasm. Discrimination that pays rewards regardless of "who did what" undercuts the entire architecture of incentive theory in public service. Those in charge are shortsighted, display partiality, and sabotage other people's motivation. Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation are inextricably linked. Rewarding job hoppers drives willing employees to rethink their objectives. A study by Gisela (2014), "Influence of Motivation on Employee Job Performance," explored the mismatch between employers' incentives affecting employee performance and employee demands.

For employees to carry out their duties in an efficient manner, they need to be sufficiently motivated both internally and externally. As a result, the completion of this study will improve motivational techniques in the public sector, resulting in better individual and organizational performance.

The goal of this study is to help government policymakers create effective public-sector incentive and compensation schemes that improve worker performance. The Civil Service (Employment) Act and Regulations were published in 1974, and no research has been done on this topic to solve performance-related concerns in the Punjab public sector, which lacks current employment strategies (Najabat Ali, 2015).

Hypotheses Development

Based on the above discussion and the research questions, this research has developed the following hypothesis for empirical testing, and thus the research questions can be well justified for conclusions and policymaking in the public sector.

- H1: The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of hiring.
- H2: The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of training.
- H3: The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of evaluation.
- H4: The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of promotion.
- H5: The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of employee behavior.

In terms of mediating hypotheses, Han et al. (2019) described that encouraging leadership increases employee psychological motivation and cooperative attitude, resulting in the creation of innovative and creative behaviors. Accordingly, this study hypothesized the following mediation effects between employee performances: hiring, training, evolution, promotion, and employee behavior. According to Stokemer (2019), the majority of empirical studies rely on the methods and plans utilized to collect the sample, the measurements that help the study's components establish relationships, and the analysis to determine and interpret the scores pertaining to the relationships between variables.

According to this study's objectives, hypothesis testing is incorporated to explore the variable variation associated with variables (one or more) based on factors like correlation. The data collection for this research was conducted in a non-contrived setting in which workers' work was minimally interfered with at a single point in time (cross-sectional).

For the above-mentioned mediation analysis, the following hypotheses have been drawn:

- H1a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by hiring.
- H2a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by training.

H3a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by evaluation.

H4a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by promotion.

H5a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by employee behavior.

Material and Methods

Hiring, training, evaluation, and promotion do have a significant impact on employee behavior and performance. Economic and administrative changes in Pakistan have gone through several stages, but for a variety of reasons, political reforms are mostly being ignored. Thus, the original purpose of the protection motive theory (PMT) was to better understand how different people react to fear appeals.

The data type governs the appropriateness of a model. The primary data were examined using a deductive technique in this study. This study will use regression analysis to conjecture the impact of hiring, promotion, training, evaluation, and employee behavior on employee performance. Furthermore, protective motivation impact will also evaluate how it changes the direction and impact of the above-mentioned variables. For this study, regression was developed in light of Kripfganz (2019) to address potential measurement issues in the data. The data used in this study was obtained by filling in the best linear biased estimations. Though linearity, heterogeneity, and serial correlation will be addressed in this data, additionally, the bulk of explanatory factors in the management studies are not linear or heteroscedastic. As a result, the concept of (BLUE) becomes relevant. Thus, in order to address the issue, PLS must be used with a suitable instrument rank (Anwar & Akhtar, 2018).

Besides, descriptive statistics, correlation analysis, and regression with moderated regression analysis will be carried out. In other words, to determine how an independent variable—hiring, training, evaluation, promotion, and employee behavior—will affect employee performance in the presence of protective motivation. In other words, factors that alter the link between independent and dependent variables are found using moderated models.

$$\text{Employee Performance} = \alpha + \beta_1 \text{Hiring} + \beta_2 \text{Training} + \beta_3 \text{Evaluation} + \beta_4 \text{Promotion} + \beta_5 \text{Employee Behaviour} + \beta_6 \text{PMT} + \epsilon$$

Besides, each item represents different constructs like hiring, training, appraisal, promotion, employee behavior, and protection motivation. However, the main key constructs, like employee behavior, employee motivation, and employee performance, are measured through four items as follows:

- Performance of the Employee: Productivity Levels as Per Organization's Standards (Thompson, (2005) and Armstrong, (2006)), Assessment of the Employees (Breu et al., (2002), and Employee Training (Hale, (2002)).
- Employee Behavior: employees perceptions of their supervisor's behavior (Fawcett et al., 2008), the idea of execution (Fawcett et al., 2008), social connections with peers (Fawcett et al., 2008) and belief in the skills (Fawcett et al., 2008).

- Employee other factors: training and its impact on skills (Hale, (2002), active attempts to improve career (Parker and Collins, (2010), and role relationships with supervisors and colleagues in promotion (Armstrong, (2012))
- A detailed questionnaire is responded to from different departments, with 265 respondents with a gender mix.

Normally, the explorative nature of causes and effects can be effectively explored, like training, hiring, evaluating, and performance effects on employee performance and employee behavior, in the existence of protective motivation theory. To conjecture the hypothesis, the inductive technique is used in qualitative research. Besides, the data collection source is verbal, so assign a scale to measure certain constructs like employee behavior, employee performance, and protective motivation. Additionally, employee training, employee hiring, employee evaluation, and employee promotion are measured through an adapted scale of measurement. For this purpose, primary data was collected through a questionnaire and targeted populations. Any Administrative Department of the Government of the Punjab is headed by the Secretary, possessing a pay scale of 20. Under the headship of the Secretary is the administration section, which deals with the processes of hiring, training, appraisal, and promotion. The posts are those of Additional Secretary (pay scale 19), Deputy Secretary (pay scale 18), and Section Officers (pay scale 17). In some departments, there is a post of Special Secretary (pay scale: 19/20), who also deals with the administrative matters of the department.

The data was collected via questioners given the above-mentioned administrative posts in all departments of the Government of Punjab, and the demographic profile of the targeted population is as follows:

Table 01
Demographic Profile - Basic Pay Scale

Sr. No.	Designation	Basic Pay Scale	% in the data set
1	Secretary	20	07 %
2	Special Secretary	19/20	03 %
3	Additional Secretary	19	15 %
4	Deputy Secretary	18	25 %
5	Section Officer	17	50 %

Table 02
Demographic Profile - Education

Sr. No.	Designation	Education Level
1	Secretary	Masters
2	Special Secretary	Masters
3	Additional Secretary	Masters
4	Deputy Secretary	Graduation/Masters
5	Section Officer	Graduation/Masters

Table 03
Demographic Profile - Gender

Sr. No.	Designation	Male/ Female
1	Secretary	97/3 %
2	Special Secretary	98/2 %
3	Additional Secretary	70/30 %
4	Deputy Secretary	68/32 %
5	Section Officer	70/30 %

All administrative secretaries of the government of Punjab, including the whole administration section of the department that deals with the process of hiring, training, appraisal, and promotion, i.e., an additional secretary (admin), deputy secretary (admin), and section officer (admin) of the same department, conduct the research. In some departments, there is a post of Special Secretary who also deals with the administrative matters of the department. Furthermore, data processing will involve different empirical techniques, like correlation, regression, and moderated regression analysis.

There are forty-four (44) total administrative departments; therefore, in this research, cluster sampling technique is used to select all administrative secretaries, including an additional and deputy secretary of administration, who shall be taken part in the research. In some departments, there is a post of special secretary. It also deals with administrative issues like hiring, training, appraisal, and promotion that will be added to the sample size. The Likert scale measuring technique shall be used to conduct the research.

Results and Discussion

Table 04
Descriptive Analysis of Data

	N	Min	Max	Mean	Std. Dev
Hiring	265	2.00	4.50	3.4687	.59010
Training	265	2.00	3.00	2.7187	.43530
Evaluation	265	1.50	5.00	3.7031	.95833
Promotion	265	1.00	4.67	3.4219	.82347
EmplayBehav	265	1.67	3.67	2.6979	.49945
EmplayPerform	265	2.00	4.67	3.7396	.79564
PROTECT MOTIVATION	265	2.11	4.44	3.4692	.64570
Valid N (listwise)	265				

Table 05
Correlation Analysis

		Hiring	Training	Evaluation	Promotion	Employ Behave	Employ Perform	Protect motivation
Hiring	P. Correlation	1	.305*	.264*	.251*	.183	.490**	.321**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.014	.035	.046	.148	.000	.010
Training	P. Correlation	.305*	1	-.165	.012	-.251*	.213	.013
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.014		.192	.928	.045	.091	.921
Evaluation	P. Correlation	.264*	-.165	1	.319*	.484**	-.020	.739**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.035	.192		.010	.000	.877	.000
Promotion	P. Correlation	.251*	.012	.319*	1	.238	-.349**	.434**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.046	.928	.010		.059	.005	.000
EmplayBehav	P. Correlation	.183	-.251*	.484**	.238	1	.136	.433**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.148	.045	.000	.059		.283	.000
EmplayPerform	P. Correlation	.490**	.213	-.020	-.349**	.136	1	-.114
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.091	.877	.005	.283		.371
PROTECTMO TIVATION	P. Correlation	.321**	.013	.739**	.434**	.433**	-.114	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.010	.921	.000	.000	.000	.371	

*. Significant Correlation at the level of 0.05 (2-tailed).

** Significant Correlation at the level of 0.01 (2-tailed).

Table 06
Model Summary

Model	R	R Sqr	R Sqr (Adjusted)	Std. Error
1	.734 ^a	.539	.490	.56818

a. Predictors: (Constant), PROTECTMOTIVATION, Training, Promotion, Hiring, EmplayBehav, Evaluation

Table 07
ANOVA

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1					
Regression	21.480	6	3.580	11.090	.000 ^a
Residual	18.401	57	.323		
Total	39.882	63			

a. Predictors: (Constant), PROTECTMOTIVATION, Training, Promotion, Hiring, EmplayBehav, Evaluation: b. Dependent Variable: Emplay Perform

Table 08
Regression Coefficients

Model		Unstd. Coefficients		Std. Coefficients	t	Sig.	95% Confidence Interval for B	
		B	Std. Error	Beta			Lower Bound	Upper Bound
1	(Constant)	1.788	.724		2.470	.017	.338	3.237
	Hiring	.799	.139	.593	5.762	.000	.522	1.077
	Training	.206	.188	.113	1.096	.278	-.170	.581
	Evaluation	.048	.118	.058	.407	.686	-.188	.285
	Promotion	-.451	.098	-.467	-4.623	.000	-.646	-.256
	EmplayBehav	.396	.171	.248	2.309	.025	.052	.739
	PROTECTMOTIVATION	-.312	.179	-.253	-1.747	.086	-.670	.046

a. Dependent Variable: EmplayPerform

Table 09
Mediation Results

Hypotheses	Relationship	B	SE	T-value	95 % CI		Decision
					LL	UL	
H1a	Hiring - Protection motivation theory - employee performance.	0.359	0.054	6.65	0.257	0.472	Supported
H2a	Training - Protection motivation theory - employee performance.	0.152	0.032	4.687	0.091	0.217	Supported
H3a	Evaluation - Protection motivation theory - employee performance.	0.018	0.03	6.587	0.045	0.076	Supported
H4a	Promotion - Protection motivation theory - employee performance.	0.228	0.04	5.23	0.115	0.118	Supported
H5a	Employee behavior - Protection motivation theory - employee performance.	0.245	0.05	5.684	0.129	0.054	Supported

Interpretations and Discussions

Firstly, the descriptive analysis was carried out and presented in the above-mentioned table 04. In this research, descriptive analysis results expounded the standard deviation and mean of different constructs. The mean results of hiring (3.4687) indicate hiring is closely linked with employee performance. Similarly, the mean results of training (2.7187) indicate, on average, that training is closely linked with employee performance. Moreover, it shows a low interest among employees in adopting any training program since joining the Punjab government. The coefficient of variation (2.7187/0.43530) indicates only a 6% trend for the employees to undergo any training program. Besides, employees considered that training has a slight positive impact on job performance. Contrary to this, another indicator, "job evaluation" mean results (3.7031), considered evaluation closely linked with employee performance. In a similar way, promotions mean results (3.4219), indicating an average response, which is considered to be closely linked with employee performance. Another construct is "Employee Behavior," and the mean value (2.6979) indicates employee behavior is affected by the extent of social connections of the employee with his peers. Moreover, employee performance on average (3.7396) is influenced by the values of the people being hired. Furthermore, protection motivations, on average (3.7396), prevail for employee behavior.

Secondly, the correlation among the variables has been calculated and summarized in the above-mentioned table 05. The correlation among variables shows that hiring and training have a positive and significant correlation (0.305), which indicates that the more the hiring of employees, the more the organization will conduct towards more training. Likewise, hiring and evaluation have a positive and significant correlation (0.264), which indicates that the hiring of employees will increase organization conduct towards more evaluation appraisals. In a similar way, hiring and promotion have a positive and significant correlation (0.251), which shows that the hiring of employees will increase the organization's ability to execute their succession plan in terms of promotion. However, hiring and employee behavior have a positive but insignificant correlation (0.183), which indicates that the hiring of employees and employee behavior issues will increase. Moreover, hiring and employee performance have a positive but significant correlation (0.490), which states that as the hiring of employees increases, employee performance will increase.

Whereas, training and evaluation and training and promotion are insignificantly correlated. However, training and employee behavior are significantly correlated with each other (-0.25), which indicates an inverse relationship between them. It means training improves employee behavior. Similarly, training and employee performance and protection motivation have insignificant correlations because performance is based upon motivation, ability, and working environment.

Employee evaluation and promotion have a significant and positive correlation at level (0.319), which indicates as job evaluation is conducted realistically, it will explore more chances of promotion. Whereas, job evaluation and employee performance are insignificantly correlated. (0.484), indicates that job evaluation realistic criteria will improve employee performance. Because job evaluation does not associate with employee performance. Contrary to popular belief, job evaluation and protective motivation have a significant and positive correlation at level 0.739, indicating that, as job evaluation is conducted realistically, it will provide a higher level of motivation to the staff.

Promotion does not significantly correlate with employee behavior, but employee behavior is significantly and negatively correlated with promotion at level -0.349.

Sometimes promotions without monetary rewards will have a negative impact on employee behavior. Unlike this, promotion and protective motivation have a positive and significant correlation at level 0.434.

While employee behavior and employee performance have an insignificant correlation, with protective motivation, it has a significant and positive correlation at level (0.433). It indicates that employee behavior improves with protective motivation. Lastly, employee performance and protection motivation are insignificantly correlated.

The third and most noticeable fact is the model summary (mentioned in Table 06), explaining that independent variables (hiring, promotion, evaluation, training, employee behavior, and protection motivation theory) have an impact on employee performance. The value of R-square indicating the dependent variable explained variation (performance of employee) described by independent variables (hiring, promotion, evaluation, training, employee behavior, and protection motivation). Furthermore, the ANOVA (mentioned in Table 06) explains the fitness of the model. While using ANOVA, a continuous outcome is predicted using one or more categorical predictor factors. Moreover, F statistics explain the overall fitness of the model. Now, we can conjecture that this model is overall significant at level 5%.

Fourth and most important is the regression analysis, which is presented in the above-mentioned table 08, which describes that hiring has a significant impact on employee performance. One unit change in hiring will bring a 0.799% change in employee performance. Unlikely, training and evaluation have an insignificant impact on employee performance. However, promotion has a significant impact on employee performance. One unit change in promotion will bring a (-0.451%) change in employee performance, meaning it has a negative impact as the promotion factor will decrease employee performance. Likewise, protection motivation has a negative impact on employee performance. One unit change in protection motivation will bring a (-0.312%) change in employee performance, thus having a negative impact, as the protection motivation factor will decrease employee performance. Whereas, employee behavior has a significant effect on an employee's performance. One unit change in employee behavior will bring a 0.396% change in employee performance.

In this research, there are five hypotheses that are constructed to answer the research questions, and their status is as follows:

Table 10
Hypothesis Results

Hypotheses	Status
The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of hiring (HR)	Accepted
The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of training (TR)	Rejected
The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of evaluation (EV)	Rejected
The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of promotion (PR)	Accepted
The protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of employee behavior (EB)	Accepted

1. Protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the presence of hiring, as the correlation coefficient between protection motivation and employee performance is 0.433**, which describes the significant impact of protection

motivation on employee performance. The value of the correlation coefficient between hiring and employee performance is 0.490**, indicating that as the hiring of employees increases, employee performance will increase.

2. Protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of Training is rejected as the correlation coefficient between protection motivation and employee performance is 0.433**, which describes the significant impact of protection motivation on employee performance. The value of the correlation coefficient between training and employee performance is 0.213, indicating an insignificant correlation because performance is based upon motivation, ability, and working environment.
3. The fact that protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of evaluation is **rejected** as the correlation coefficient between protection motivation and employee performance is 0.433**, which describes the significant impact of protection motivation on employee performance. The value of the correlation coefficient between evaluation and employee performance is 0.020, indicating an insignificant correlation because job evaluation does not associate with employee performance. Contrary to popular belief, job evaluation and protection motivation have a significant and positive correlation at level (0.739), indicating that, as job evaluation is conducted realistically, it will provide a higher level of motivation to the staff.
4. Protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the presence of promotion, as the correlation coefficient between protection motivation and employee performance is 0.433**, which describes the significant impact of protection motivation on employee performance. The value of the correlation coefficient between promotion and employee performance is (-.349**), which is also significant, indicating that sometimes promotion without monetary reward will have a negative impact on employee behavior. Contrary to this, promotion and protective motivation have a positive and significant correlation at level 0.434.
5. Protection motivation significantly affects employees' performance in the existence of Employee behavior is accepted as the correlation coefficient between protection motivation and employee performance is 0.433**, which describes the significant impact of protection motivation on employee performance. While employee behavior and employee performance have an insignificant correlation, with protective motivation, it has a significant and positive correlation at level (0.433). It indicates that employee behavior improves with protective motivation. Lastly, employee performance and protection motivation are insignificantly correlated.

Moreover, this study examined the mediation effects of hiring, training, evaluation, promotion, and employee behavior on the association between employee performance and protection motivation. The mediation results revealed the following:

H1a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by hiring.

The analysis showed a significant effect ($\beta = 0.359$, $t = 6.65$, $p < 0.05$). The effect of the 95% Boot CI [LL = 0.257, UL = 0.472] did not straddle a zero in-between. These results revealed the mediation effect of hiring on the relationship between protection motivation theory and employee performance. In other words, H1a was supported.

H2a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by training.

The analysis showed a significant effect ($\beta = 0.152$, $t = 4.687$, $p < 0.05$). The effect of 95% Boot CI [LL = 0.091, UL = 0.217] did not straddle a zero in-between. These results revealed the mediation effect of training on the relationship between protection motivation theory and employee performance. In other words, H2a was supported.

H3a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by evaluation.

The analysis showed a significant effect ($\beta = 0.018$, $t = 6.587$, $p < 0.05$). The effect of the 95% Boot CI [LL = 0.045, UL = 0.076] did not straddle a zero in-between. These results revealed the mediation effect of evaluation on the relationship between protection motivation theory and employee performance. In other words, H3a was supported.

H4a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by promotion.

The analysis showed a significant effect ($\beta = 0.228$, $t = 5.23$, $p < 0.05$). The effect of 95% Boot CI [LL = 0.115, UL = 0.118] did not straddle a zero in-between. These results revealed the mediation effect of promotion on the relationship between protection motivation theory and employee performance. In other words, H4a was supported.

H5a: The relationship between employee performance and protection motivation is mediated by employee behavior.

The analysis showed a significant effect ($\beta = 0.245$, $t = 5.684$, $p < 0.05$). The effect of the 95% Boot CI [LL = 0.129, UL = 0.054] did not straddle a zero in-between. These results revealed the mediation effect of employee behavior on the relationship between protection motivation theory and employee performance. In other words, H4a was supported.

Conclusion

The core goal of this research is to empirically determine the basic features of human resource management—hiring, training, evaluation, promotion, and employee behavior—that will impact employee performance in the presence of protective motivation. The results suggested that hiring has a significant effect on the performance of the employee. Although using cognitive tests to select employees has grown in popularity, it has a positive impact on the performance of the employee.

Promotion has a significant but negative impact on the performance of the employee; sometimes it happens when an employee is promoted in terms of job enlargement. Both groups of components for the expansion of jobs are supported by the empirical analysis. That is why results suggest that the effect of such promotions has a negative impact on employee performance, especially in Pakistan's public and private sectors. Moreover, in a government department, there are predefined succession criteria, so promotion has no impact on employee performance. Similarly, employee behavior and protection motivation have a significant impact on employee performance.

Unlike the above, evaluation and training have no impact on the performance of the employee. Training employees is an important function of HRM, but employees' performance is not based on it. However, performance is based on the following factors: motivation, ability, and working conditions. So, training can only improve the ability, but not all factors of performance. Similarly, evaluation has no effect on employee performance because it is a tool to learn about employee performance.

Recommendations

This study finding would help government organisations to improve employee performance. It will guide policymakers and identify factors that impact employee performance, such as the hiring process, fair promotion criteria, and employee behaviour. Additionally, protection motivation also impacts employee performance. Moreover, the results will guide government and policymakers in encouraging employee participation in an effective training programme and improve employee behaviour. Nevertheless, employee evaluation criteria must be improved in government departments since evaluations in the public sector are usually biased in less developed countries such as Pakistan. Thus, the result of the study also showed an insignificant impact of evaluation on employee performance.

References

- Abou Samra, A. (2021). The debates of methodology and methods: reflections on the development of the study of international relations. *Review of Economics and Political Science*, 4(2), 27-44.
- Adams, J. S. (1963). Towards an understanding of inequity. *The journal of abnormal and social psychology*, 67(5), 422.
- Ahmad, M. S., Khan, M. M., Mehmood, A., Ali, U., & Iqbal, M. N. (2021). "Impact of employee perception shaped by despotic leadership on the job performance of employees: investigating the mediating role of work engagement and the moderating role of social climate of friendship groups". *Journal of Management and Research*, 8(2), 62-97.
- Akinyele, K. O., Demek, K. C., & Tian, Y. (2023). Self-Interest or Public Interest: The Role of Incentive Schemes in Public Sector Employees' Decisions. *Accounting & the Public Interest*, 23(1).
- Alanizan, S. (2023). How does employee satisfaction and motivation affect productivity? *International Journal of Business and Management*, 18(2), 55-60.
- Ali, E., & Elias, H. (2023, January). Potential Application of HR Analytics to Talent Management in the Public Sector: a Literature Review. *International Conference on Cyber Management And Engineering (CyMaEn)* (pp. 8-11). IEEE.
- Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational synergy: Toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace. *Human resource management review*, 3(3), 185-201.
- Andrew, O. C., & Sofian, S. (2012). Individual factors and work outcomes of employee engagement. *Procedia-Social and behavioral sciences*, 40, 498-508.
- Anwar, F., & Humayun, A. A. (2023). How Empowered Leadership in Pakistan's Public Sectors Enhances Employee Creativity a Mediating Role of Creative Self-Efficacy. *Journal of Tourism, Hospitality, and Services Industries Research (JTHS)*, 3(01), 19-33.
- Anwar, M. M., & Akhtar, M. R. (2018). Do peer firms impact corporate investment policies? *Pakistan Journal of Commerce and Social Sciences (PJCSS)*, 12(1), 363-378.
- Asseburg, J., Hattke, J., Hensel, D., Homberg, F., & Vogel, R. (2020). The tacit dimension of public sector attraction in multi-incentive settings. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(1), 41-59.
- Bashir, M., & Hassan, S. (2020). The need for ethical leadership in combating corruption. *International Review of Administrative Sciences*, 86(4), 673-690.
- Bashir, M., Wright, B. E., & Hassan, S. (2023). The interactive influence of public service motivation, perceived reward equity, and prosocial impact on employee engagement: a panel study in Pakistan. *Public Management Review*, 25(7), 1213-1237.
- Bell, E., Bryman, A., & Harley, B. (2022). *Business research methods*. Oxford university press.
- Bhutta, E., Mahmood, K., & Khan, M. I (2023). Challenges and Effects of Organizational Politics on the Performance of Employees at Public Institutions in Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Social Issues, Volume XIV*, 114-122.

- Bogna, F., Raineri, A., & Dell, G. (2020). Critical realism and constructivism: merging research paradigms for a deeper qualitative study. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 15(4), 461-484.
- Borst, R. T. (2018). Comparing work engagement in people-changing and people-processing service providers: A mediation model with red tape, autonomy, dimensions of PSM, and performance. *Public Personnel Management*, 47(3), 287-313.
- Chen, Y. C., Ahn, M. J., & Wang, Y. F. (2023). Artificial intelligence and public values: value impacts and governance in the public sector. *Sustainability*, 15(6), 4796.
- Cho, W., Choi, S., & Choi, H. (2023). Human resources analytics for public personnel management: Concepts, cases, and caveats. *Administrative Sciences*, 13(2), 41.
- Engidaw, A. E. (2021). The effect of motivation on employee engagement in public sectors: in the case of North Wollo zone. *Journal of Innovation and Entrepreneurship*, 10(1), 43.
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- Gisela, J. O. (2014). Effect of Motivation factors on employee's Job Performance in Public Primary healthcare facilities, a case of Ilemela District, Mwanza City. Unpublished MHRM Dissertation, Open University of Tanzania. Dar es Salaam, Tanzania.
- Hameduddin, T., & Fernandez, S. (2019). Employee engagement as administrative reform: Testing the efficacy of the OPM's employee engagement initiative. *Public administration review*, 79(3), 355-369.
- Han, S., Harold, C. M., & Cheong, M. (2019). Examining why employee proactive personality influences empowering leadership: The roles of cognition-and affect-based trust. *Journal of occupational and organizational psychology*, 92(2), 352-383.
- Haq, M. U., Qazi, M. W., Kamran, M., & Yosaf, M. (2023). Impacts of Extrinsic and Intrinsic reward on Employee's performance: A study of banking sector in Pakistan. *Journal of Management Practices, Humanities and Social Sciences*, 7(5), 1-12.
- Hassan, S., Ansari, N., & Rehman, A. (2023). Public service motivation, workplace spirituality and employee well-being: a holistic approach. *Journal of Economic and Administrative Sciences*, 39(4), 1027-1043.
- Hess, M. (1995). Development administration, human resources and public sector reform. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 386-407.
- Kalwar, M. S., Shah, S. M. A., & Hussain, N. (2023). Role of Employee-related Factors for Employee Performance in Private Sector Banks of Sindh, Pakistan. *Pakistan Journal of Humanities and Social Sciences*, 11(2), 1575-1584.
- Kothe, E. J., Ling, M., North, M., Klas, A., Mullan, B. A., & Novoradovskaya, L. (2019). Protection motivation theory and pro-environmental behaviour: A systematic mapping review. *Australian Journal of Psychology*, 71(4), 411-432.
- Kripfganz, S. (2019, September). Generalized method of moments estimation of linear dynamic panel data models. *In London Stata Conference (Vol. 17)*.
- Kumar, R. (2018). Research methodology: A step-by-step guide for beginners. *Research methodology*, 1-528.

- Leman, N. P., & Gustomo, A. (2023). Transforming Employee Motivation to Enhance Employee Performance at PT Bio Farma (Persero). *Journal of World Science*, 2(2), 255-268.
- Mbogo, A. (2013). Impacts of Motivation on Employee's Performance in the Public service: A case Study of Ilala Municipality in Dar-es-salaam (*Doctoral dissertation, The Open University of Tanzania*).
- Mehmood, T., & Lee, J. An Investigation of the Performance Management System of Civil Servants in the Provincial Government of Khyber Pakhtunkhwa.
- Menard, P., Bott, G. J., & Crossler, R. E. (2017). User motivations in protecting information security: Protection motivation theory versus self-determination theory. *Journal of Management Information Systems*, 34(4), 1203-1230.
- Nguyen, H. D., Chau, T. N., & Huynh, Q. V. T. (2023). The impact of team support, financial incentives and public sector motivation on employee motivation: an empirical study of the public sector in Vietnam. *Asia-Pacific Journal of Business Administration*.
- Nizam, K., & Hameed, S. (2023). The Impact of Knowledge Sharing on Job Performance in Banking Sector of Pakistan—Mediating Role of Affective Commitment. *Pakistan Journal of Social Sciences*, 43(1), 25-38.
- Muthuswamy, V. V., & Sharma, A. (2022). MOTIVATION FACTORS AND THEIR IMPACT ON THE PERFORMANCE OF EMPLOYEES IN SMALL BUSINES. *The Journal of Modern Project Management*, 10(2), 436-443.
- Palaniammal, G. (2013). Motivating factors of employees are instigated to improve organization productivity. *Indian Stream Research Journal*, 3(7), 1-4.
- Pope, C., & Mays, N. (2020). The role of theory in qualitative research. *Qualitative research in health care*, 15-26.
- Schnell, S., & Gerard, C. (2023). From bureaucrats to entrepreneurs to networkers, advocates, and empaths: Reappraising human resources management ideals and practices in public administration. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 43(4), 652-676.
- Schott, C., & Ritz, A. (2018). The dark sides of public service motivation: A multi-level theoretical framework. *Perspectives on Public Management and Governance*, 1(1), 29-42.
- Serhan, C., Achy, E. A., & Nicolas, E. (2018). Public sector employees' motivation: causes and effects. *People: International Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(2), 49-55.
- Shahzad, K., Khan, S. A., Iqbal, A., & Shabbir, O. (2023). Effects of motivational and behavioral factors on job productivity: An empirical investigation from academic librarians in Pakistan. *Behavioral Sciences*, 13(1), 41.
- Shanks, N. H., & Dore, A. (2007). Management and motivation. Introduction to healthcare management, 312-320.
- Sherli, J., & Mayakannan, T. (2023). A Study on An Investigation into Employee Motivation in Organizations. *Journal of Survey in Fisheries Sciences*, 10(2S), 1328-1333.
- Shi, S. (2023). The Reform of Human Resource System in the Public Sector under the New Public Management System. In *SHS Web of Conferences* (Vol. 154, p. 01007).

- Smiley, R. T. (2023). Human Resource Professionals' Perceptions of Employee Recruitment and Retention Using Linking Total Compensation to Performance Theory (*Doctoral dissertation, Walden University*).
- Stockemer, D., & Stockemer, D. (2019). The nuts and bolts of empirical social science. Quantitative methods for the social sciences: A practical introduction with examples in SPSS and Stata, 5-22.
- Ugaddan, R. G., & Park, S. M. (2017). Quality of leadership and public service motivation: A social exchange perspective on employee engagement. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 30(3), 270-285.
- Vogel, D., & Willems, J. (2020). The effects of making public service employees aware of their prosocial and societal impact: A microintervention. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 30(3), 485-503.
- Weiwei, H. E. (2023). The effect of employee motivation on employee performance: A case of a technological small and medium enterprise. *Procedia of Multidisciplinary Research*, 1(4), 4-4.
- Wright, B. E., Hassan, S., & Christensen, R. K. (2017). Job choice and performance: Revisiting core assumptions about public service motivation. *International Public Management Journal*, 20(1), 108-131.