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ABSTRACT

The Covid-19 pandemic suffocated operations of organizations globally. Individually, employees were affected in the way they executed their daily duties. This paper attempted to assess the effect of occupational health and safety, work environment, organizational culture, transformational leadership and motivation on employee performance in the post Covid-19 pandemic among civil servants in Malawi. It’s a quantitative research method that has used saturation sampling technique to have a sample size of 170 respondents. Data was collected through an on-line structured questionnaire. The analysis technique used was multiple linear regression analysis through Statistical Program for Social Science (SPSS) program version 26. On the one hand, the research results show that occupational health and safety has a positive and significant effect on employee performance; similarly, work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance. On the other hand, organizational culture has no effect on employee performance among civil servants in Malawi. In the same vein, transformational leadership has no effect on employee performance and motivation has no effect on civil servants’ performance in the post Covid-19 pandemic Malawi. Most importantly, this study gives treasured insights into the features prompting employee performance in the aftermath of the Covid-19 pandemic Malawi. The outcomes of this study guide organizations to understand the aspects of occupational health and safety, work environment, organizational culture, leadership style and motivation that contribute to improved employee performance during and after the pandemic in the public sector.
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Introduction

Following its impact on global economies, Covid-19 was qualified as pandemic by the World Health Organization (WHO) in 2020. In Malawi, the government established a national Covid-19 preparedness and reaction plan as well as Covid-19 workplace regulations, which addressed health and safety measures for safeguarding employees in the workplaces as well as employment, earnings, the economy, and labor demand (Thula et al., 2020).

Prior to the Covid-19 pandemic, explain that Malawi's economy was on a high-growth trajectory and anticipated to perform well in 2020; however, the pandemic resulted in job losses and labor income by 2021 (Thula et al., 2020). This status quo had the potential of derailing the attainment of Malawi Vision 2063. Malawi’s public sector faces challenges like unsatisfactory service delivery, institutional and individual inefficiencies (NPC, 2020). In light of this, it is essential to look at how some factors affect employee performance in the post-Covid-19 epidemic era in order to realign employee performance to the country’s vision. The results from this study are a checkpoint in the area of performance management in the post Covid-19 period for the sake of resilience and improvement.
Most importantly, this study gives treasured insights into the features prompting employee performance in the aftermath of the covid-19 pandemic particularly in Malawian. The outcome of this study results guide both public and private public sector organizations in grasping the dynamics of occupational health and safety, work environment, leadership style, organizational culture and motivation practices that contribute to improved employee performance during and after the pandemic.

Firstly, on factors that affect employee performance, it is revealed there is strong influence of occupational health and safety on job performance (Perera, 2019). On the contrary, occupational health and safety had no effect on employee performance (Ekowati & Amin, 2018). Question that comes is “what impact does occupational health and safety have on employee performance?” Despite finding no evidence of a substantial beneficial impact of work environment on employee performance (Ermita, 2022), it was shown that both non-physical work environment and job characteristics had a positive and significant impact on employee performance (Izzah et al., 2019). Now, the research question, “what is the effect of work environment on employee performance?” emerges.

While one research suggested that organisational culture had a favourable and significant impact on employee performance (Fitria, 2018), another research demonstrated that organisational culture had no such favourable or direct effect on employee performance (Sapta et al., 2021). In a similar vein, a particular study demonstrated that organizational culture had little impact on worker performance (Paramita et al., 2020). So, “what impact does organizational culture have on employee performance?” On the one hand, research found the impact of transformational leadership on employee performance (Prabowo et al., 2018). Another research demonstrated that transformational leadership had little to no effect on worker performance during the Covid-19 pandemic (Kamar et al., 2019). This contradiction springs up a question, “what is the effect of transformational leadership on employee performance?”

Lastly, it was portrayed that extrinsic motivation affects employee performance (Nilasari et al., 2021). Another research demonstrated that motivation had little to no positive effect on employee performance (Rahmi, 2020). The question for further study is “What is the impact of motivation on employee performance?”

In the post covid-19 period, this paper aims to investigate how: 1) employee performance is impacted by occupational health and safety; 2) work environment affects workers’ performance; 3) organizational culture affects worker performance; 4) transformational leadership impacts worker performance and 5) employee performance is impacted by motivation. Ultimately, this study tries to respond to the question: what are the factors that affect employee performance in the public sector in the post covid-19 Malawi.

The paper has been structured in this way: just after this introductory section, follows the literature. The third section carries the methodological information which unleashes how data were collected and analyzed. Thereafter, an analysis is followed by findings, discussions and implications. In the ultimate end, the paper provides key points, recommendations, future research directions and limitations of the study.

**Literature Review**

This part sets foundation of the study by highlighting a theoretical and conceptual background and comprehensively discussing some empirical studies. This is done to grasp and synthesize the existing knowledge on the topic under study before ushering in this research.

**Theoretical and Conceptual Background**

**Herzberg Two Factor Theory**

The link between a positive work environment and productive employees is well explained by this Frederick Herzberg. In determining employees’ working attitudes and level of performance, this theory divides components into two groupings namely motivational and hygienic elements. The variables that cause discontent are referred to as the dissatisfiers or the hygiene factors, whereas the factors that increase contentment are referred to as the satisfiers or the motivators.

While satisfiers encourage workers to perform well in their roles and responsibilities, hygiene elements make sure that workers stay contented and satisfied. Herzberg asserts that as motivation factors increase employees’ job satisfaction, hygiene factors prevent any employees’ dissatisfaction. On the one hand, intrinsic motivators include recognition, achievements, self-esteem, level of responsibility, self-actualization, and the need for personal growth. On the other side of the coin, the hygiene factors are extrinsic to the job and they include interpersonal interactions, rewards, remuneration, working environment, status symbols, supervision, and business policy are among the external to the job hygiene aspects under study (Herzberg, 1959).

By contrasting job pleasure and discontent as two opposed extremes of the same continuum, Herzberg deviated from the conventional viewpoint (Herzberg, 1959). Herzberg reasoned that the availability of some factors in the workplace leads job satisfaction however their absence doesn’t result in dissatisfaction but ends in no satisfaction. Although these hygiene factors do not lead to satisfaction, they are important because they prevent dissatisfaction hence encouraging employees to perform better through enhancement of the work environment.
Empirical Review and Hypothesis Development

Employee Performance

Employee performance is the outcome of work that can be completed by an individual or group of individuals within an organization, in accordance with their respective authorities and responsibilities, in order to achieve the goals of the organization in question legally, without breaking the law, and in accordance with morals and ethics (Sinambela, 2019). Employee performance, according to, is measured by eight metrics, including the following, quantity of work, quality of work, job knowledge, creativeness, cooperation, dependability, initiative and personal qualities (Intanghina, 2009).

Occupational Health and Safety’s Effect on Employee Performance

The ILO Convention on Occupational Safety and Health, 1981 (No. 155), defines health in relation to work as including both the physical and mental factors of health that are directly relevant to safety and hygiene at work, in addition to the absence of sickness or infirmitiy Ales (2018). The promotion and maintenance of the highest level of physical, mental, and social well-being for workers in all jobs is specifically what is defined as occupational health (World Health Organisation, 2020). The following are indicators of occupational health and safety: a thorough hand wash with soap or sanitizer is effective in avoiding the spread of covid-19; social distancing, avoid coming into contact with those who have the coronavirus, avoid crowds when they are outside houses and work places; spending more time indoors is necessary to reduce mobility because being outdoors increases one's risk of contracting the coronavirus (Ekasari et al., 2021).

Workplace health and safety affect how well employees perform (Aprianti & Almashur, 2022). A study found that occupational health and safety had no effect on employee performance (Ekowati & Amin, 2018). Workplace health and safety procedures have a significant influence on output (Perera, 2019). Similarly, it was indicated that occupational health and safety laws in the construction sector had a favorable association with worker performance and statistically significant effects (Segbenya & Yeboa, 2022).

On the negative side, it was discovered that workplace safety and employees’ chronic health issues, as well as the physical and emotional demands of the job had an effect on absenteeism and job performance (Jinnett, 2022). In the end, a close examination of these earlier studies shows that there are contradictions in the results of studies on the effect of occupational health and safety on worker performance. According to Herzberg’s theory, both satisfied and unsatisfied features can be found in workplace health and safety. The first hypothesis is established in this study paper: H1: Occupational health and safety has a positive and significant effect on employee performance.

Work Environment’s Effect on Employee Performance

Work environment refers to all of the physical and non-physical surroundings that surround employees while they are at work (Prasetyono et al., 2020). A productive workplace is a good work environment which is very helpful for employees in completing their duties (Imran & Ramli, 2019). The indicators of work environment include: workspace lighting, the air temperature in the workroom, comfortable work environment, work tool condition, workplace cleanliness, complete facilities at work, assigned task responsibilities, attention and support from leaders, cooperation between employees, and evenly distributed workload (Riyanto, et al., 2021).

Work environment positively affects employee performance (Ramli, 2019; Ermita, 2022; Putra et al., 2020). However, work environment does not affect employee performance (Ermita, 2022). In line with variable, the two-factor theory states that there are differences between the elements of the workplace that make people happy and those that make them unhappy. It proposes that making workplace improvements will encourage workers to perform better because it is logical to assume that top performers will be those who are satisfied with both the hygiene and motivational factors, while poor performers will be those who are dissatisfied with both. This leads to the research second hypothesis: H2: Staff performance is positively and significantly impacted by the work environment.

Effect of Organizational Culture on Employee Performance

Organizational culture or corporate culture is frequently described as values and symbols that are understood and displayed by an organization to make its members feel like they are a part of a single family and to distinguish it from other organizations (Bishey et al., 2019). Power distance, aversion to uncertainty, individuality against collectivism and femininity versus masculinity are all signs of organizational culture (Hofstede, 1980).

Organizational culture has favorable and significant impact on employee performance (Mahendra et al., 2022). Neither organizational culture nor workplace environment has an appreciable positive impact on worker performance (Fitria, 2018). Organizational culture acted as motivators and greatly increased worker productivity (Sapta et al., 2021). In contrast, the same study concluded that organizational culture has no direct or advantageous impact on employee performance. Furthermore, another research demonstrated that organizational culture has little impact on workers’ productivity (Paramita et al., 2020). In the perspective of Herzberg’s theory, the employees who are happy with both the motivation and hygiene elements will perform well. There should be a corporate culture that encourages both motivation and hygiene. Consequently, this study article develops the following third premise: H3: Organizational culture has positive and significant effect on employee performance.
Transformational Leadership’s Effect on Employee Performance

Transformational leadership is the capacity of a leader to exert influence over his followers Bass (1996). To illuminate this definition, a leader's ability to instill pride, trust, and respect in their followers as well as their capability to succinctly communicate the goals and objectives of the organization they are in charge of are both examples of charismatic leadership (Bass, 1990). The following are the seven signs of transformational leadership: a leader inspires their team members to have faith in them, be looked up to as a role model, admired and articulate a vision of the future, communicate upbeatly and enthusiastically, encourage subordinates to voice their thoughts, promote innovative thinking and involve subordinates in decision-making while taking their needs and skills into consideration (Riyanto et al. (2021).

First of all, transformative leadership has a significant impact on employee performance (Baig et al., 2019). For additional clarification, it is encouraging to note that research by shows that transformational leadership style has a good and significant impact on employee performance (Roz, 2019; Anshori et al., 2020; Ekhsan & Setiawan, 2021). However, a certain study demonstrates that the impact of transformative leadership on worker performance is minimal to nonexistent (Prabowo et al., 2018). Even worse, it was found that transformative leadership had little to no effect on worker performance even during the Covid-19 pandemic Kamar et al. (2019). Herzberg argues that managers should take advantage of hygienic and motivational elements in order to maximise staff motivation and productivity. It is imperative now to develop the fourth hypothesis: H4: Transformational leadership positively and significantly impacts employee performance.

Motivation’s Effect on Employee Performance

Motivation is a management technique that encourages workers to perform at a higher level for the company as a whole by providing them with motivational factors that are based on unfulfilled needs (Herzberg (1959). Herzberg's two-factor theory covers hygienic factors (Noermijati, 2015) and motivational factors (Chitiris, 1988) which include initiative, advancement in hierarchy, content of work itself, opportunity to learn and grow, merit rewards, company guidelines, interactions with coworkers, employment stability, private life, working circumstances and status.

Employee performance is positively and significantly impacted by work motivation (Bawono & Setyadi, 2020; Ihsani & Wijayanto, 2020; Yulianti, 2021). Extrinsic motivation rather than intrinsic motivation affects employee performance (Nilasari et al., 2021). In contrast, another study shows that there is no relationship between employee motivational attributes and performance after subordinates who are unmotivated as a result of leadership (Nelizulfa, 2018). According to the two-factor theory, the primary sources of motivation are intrinsic factors. This breeds the last hypothesis: H5: Employee performance is positively and significantly impacted by motivation.

Research and Methodology

This paper is a quantitative research piece of work. The study population comprises 170 respondents from the Phalombe District Hospital and the National Records and Archives Service. Specifically, the respondents are the civil servants whose qualifications range from a college certificate to a degree. The civil servants from Phalombe District Hospital comprise the serving doctors, nurses, midwives, pharmacists, laboratory technicians and were 140 in number. Whereas the civil servants team of the National Records and Archives Service consists of records managers and archivists and 40 in number. Since the population was small the sampling technique that was used was saturation sampling. Therefore the sample size was 170 respondents. Firstly, descriptive statistics was
tackled to analyze the sample's characteristics in terms of sex, age, education, and experience using SPSS version 26 that produced percentages, frequencies and pie charts.

The researchers organized an online questionnaire that targeted particular study objectives to generate the primary data. A questionnaire, which consists of closed-ended questions, gives data in the form of numbers, tables, graphs, percentages, and pie charts. Validity testing was done to make sure that the instruments measure what is needed. Reliability tests is beneficial for establishing whether a questionnaire as an instrument can be used more than once by the same respondents but still give reliable results.

There were three sections to the questionnaire's items. Data about the respondents' socio-economic and demographic characteristics are gathered in Part A whereas Part B concentrates on how respondents perceive employee performance as the only dependent variable and Part C deals with how respondents perceive the impact of each independent variable on employee performance. This questionnaire consists of very simple items distributed in this way: 4 items for personal information, 8 items for employee performance the sole dependent variable, 5 items for occupational health and safety, 11 items for work environment, 4 items for organizational culture, 9 items for transformational leadership and 11 items for motivation. Therefore, they make a total of 48 items. Each item on both independent and independent variables has five alternatives. Data on employee performance is gathered using a five-point Likert scale, with a range from 1 signifying "strongly disagree" to 5 denoting "strongly agree". The ethical consideration aspects such as confidentiality, anonymity and consent were strictly ensured through research committees and respondents themselves.

In terms of data analysis technique, validity and reliability of data was verified first before normality test, multicollinearity test, heteroscedasticity test (classical assumption tests), thereafter model fit tests were taken, lastly multiple linear regression test and t-test (partial test) were done.

**Results**

**Phalombe District Hospital**

The Phalombe District Hospital opened its doors on October 11, 2022. The Phalombe district of the Republic of Malawi is where this hospital is located. According to its mission statement, the goal of this institution is to "achieve a state of health for all the people in Phalombe that would enable them to lead a quality and productive life." It aims to "deliver a comprehensive range of quality, accessible, and efficient health services to all the people in Phalombe through the establishment and maintenance of a strong health system derived from national strategic plans". The ultimate objective of Phalombe is to advance towards Universal Health Coverage (UHC), which aims to provide high-quality, equitable, and inexpensive health care while reducing financial risk protection and client satisfaction. Over 30,000 people are reportedly served by Phalombe District Hospital in its capacity as a public institution. This facility is anticipated to help lower sickness rates and children's mortality rates. In terms of staffing, technically, the Phalombe District Hospital has the following:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Technical Staff</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>V</td>
<td>Nurses</td>
<td>115</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>W</td>
<td>Doctors</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Clinicians</td>
<td>16</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Lab Technicians</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>Pharmacists</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>140</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Phalombe District Hospital Administration

**The National Records and Archives Service of Malawi**

In Malawi's Ministry of Local Government, Unity, and Culture, the National Records and Archives Service is a government division. It recently moved over from the Ministry of Tourism, Culture, and Wildlife. From one ministry to another, it repeatedly changes. The National Records and Archives Service of Malawi, a regional branch of the erstwhile Central African Archives, was created in Zomba by British colonialists in 1947. It serves as a repository for official documents, public records, and historical manuscripts.
Both the National Archives Act (Chap. 28:01) and the Printed Publications Act (Chap. 19:01) give the National Records and Archives Service of Malawi the mandate to collect, classify, conserve, store, control and appraise public, historical, and general records for research, storage, and posterity as derived from two statutory obligations of the laws of Malawi (National Archives of Malawi, 2010).

The mission of the National Records and Archives Service of Malawi is to preserve and provide access to the country’s documentary heritage through the establishment and promotion of economic and efficient records and archives management systems in Malawi. Besides, the vision of this organisation is to be the leading archival institution in the region and beyond. Moreover, it has the core values such as: client oriented, professional excellence, team spirit, resourcefulness and creativity. Below are its technical personnel:

Table 2: Technical Staff NRAS of Malawi

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Group</th>
<th>Technical Staff</th>
<th>Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Archivists</td>
<td>19</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Y</td>
<td>Records Managers</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>X</td>
<td>Librarians</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: NRAS Administration

Social Demographic Statistics

Age of Respondents

The majority of the employees are concentrated in age range of 18-30. They are represented by 55.30% (n=95) followed by those employees whose ages range from 31-50 and they curve 42.90% (n=72). Lastly there employees whose ages start from 51 and above and they reflect 1.80% (n=3).

Gender of Respondents

In terms of gender, 56% (n=95) of the participants of this study are male and 44% (n=75) are females. This entails that the majority of those who took party in this research are males as compared to females.

Education of Respondents

Educational background of the respondents in health, education, records management and human resources. It specifically illustrates that 11.80% (n=20) hold a certificates, 39.40 % (n= 67) have diplomas and 48.80% (n=83) are degree holders.

Years of Experience

In terms of work experience, it was shown that 4.10% (n=7) represents those participants whose years of work experience is 21 years and above. This is followed by those whose years of work experience range from 11-20 and they cover 21.80% (n=37) of the sample. The 74.10% (n=126) of participants represents those employees whose years of experience range from 1-10 years of work experience. This group, nevertheless, has the majority of workers

Instrument Test Results

Validity Test

Table 3: Results of Validity Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>KMO and Bartlett's Test</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.</td>
<td>0.892</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Bartlett's Test of Sphericity</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Approx. Chi-Square</td>
<td>5509.996</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Df</td>
<td>1128</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sig.</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Author 2023

The Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure, based on Table 3 above, verified the sample adequacy for the analysis, KMO = 0.892, which is much greater than the usually accepted limit of 0.5. The results of Bartlett’s sphericity test indicated that correlations between items were reliable enough to be employed in analysis, P is less than 0.001. Thus, the information was reliable.
Reliability

Table 4: Results of Reliability Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Reliability Statistics</th>
<th>Cronbach’s Alpha</th>
<th>Number of Items</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>0.954</td>
<td>48</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author 2023

The known value of Cronbach's alpha in this study is 0.954, according to Table 4 above. This result implies that Cronbach's alpha is greater than 0.6. In this way, it suggests that the test tool utilised in this study meets the criteria for being dependable.

Classical Assumption Test

Test for Normality

One sample of the Kolmogorov-Smirnov test was utilised in this investigation to assess normality. If the Sig. value is more than 0.05, the data is deemed typical. Look at the table below to appreciate:

Table 5: Results for Normality Test

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test for Normality</th>
<th>Kolmogorov-Smirnov</th>
<th>Shapiro-Wilk</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Statistic</td>
<td>Df</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employee Performance</td>
<td>0.05</td>
<td>170</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a. Lilliefors Significance Correction

**Source:** Author 2023

The data is thought to be normally distributed because the results of the one sample Kolmogorov-Smirnov test in the aforementioned Table 5 above reveal values of Sig 0.20 and 0.07 > 0.05. It is therefore undeniable to assert that the data passed normality test.

Test for Multicollinearity

A comparison between the Tolerance value (TOL) > 0.1 and the Variance Inflating Factor (VIF) value 10 are done to ascertain whether the data is multicollinear. The results of this study's multicollinearity test are shown in the following table:

Table 6: Collinearity Statistics

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Collinearity Statistics</th>
<th>Decision</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Tolerance</td>
<td>VIF</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Health and Safety</td>
<td>0.76</td>
<td>1.316</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>0.457</td>
<td>2.186</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
<td>0.64</td>
<td>1.562</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.477</td>
<td>2.096</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.399</td>
<td>2.505</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Source:** Author 2023

The summary results of the multicollinearity test are shown in Table 6 above. The values of TOL > 0.1 and VIF value 10 denote that each variable is declared free of multicollinearity symptoms. There is no multicollinearity.

Heteroscedasticity

To obtain the variance variables for the heteroscedasticity test, the Glejser test is applied. By contrasting the Sig. value > 0.05, Glejser's test identified heteroscedasticity. The following table shows an overview of the heteroscedasticity test results:
Table 7: Heteroscedasticity

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients*</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1 (Constant)</td>
<td>8.844</td>
<td>1.972</td>
<td>4.484</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Health and Safety</td>
<td>-0.164</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>-0.155</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>-0.074</td>
<td>0.048</td>
<td>-0.156</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational Culture</td>
<td>0.038</td>
<td>0.077</td>
<td>0.046</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>0.000</td>
<td>0.037</td>
<td>-0.001</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.004</td>
<td>0.052</td>
<td>0.009</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: ANSUT

Source: Author 2023

The summary results of the heteroscedasticity test in Table 7 above make it abundantly evident that the regression model does not display heteroscedasticity because each variable has a significant value > 0.05. If the significant values are greater than 0.05 then there is no heteroscedasticity, in this case there is no heteroscedasticity.

The Model Fit Tests:

Test of Determination Coefficient (R²)

The initial model fit test used the Adjusted R-Square, as shown in the following table:

Table 8: Model Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model Summary</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>0.590a</td>
<td>0.348</td>
<td>0.328</td>
<td>4.58678</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Predictors: (Constant), Occupation Health and Safety, Work Environment, Organizational Culture, Transformational Leadership and Motivation, b. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

Source: Author 2023

Table 8 above displays the model fit test results. The modified R-Square value, or 32.8%, is 0.328. This means that variations in employee performance variable are influenced by occupation health and safety, work environment, organizational culture, transformational leadership and motivation. Other factors that are not included in the Table 8 above have an impact on the remaining 67.2 percent.

Simultaneous Influence Test (F-Test)

The F-test is used, as shown in the table below, to determine whether the regression model is part of the fit model.

Table 9: F-Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>ANOVA*</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 Regression</td>
<td>1839.802</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>367.960</td>
<td>17.490</td>
<td>.000b</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Residual</td>
<td>3450.321</td>
<td>164</td>
<td>21.039</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5290.124</td>
<td>169</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance b. Predictors: (Constant), Occupation Health and Safety, Work Environment, Organisational Culture, Transformational Leadership and Motivation

Source: Author 2023

The F test results are shown in Table 9 above. A Sig value of 0.000 and an F value of 17.490 shows that the regression model used in this study is considered to be well-fit.

Test for Multiple Linear Regressions

The summary of the multiple regression analysis's findings is shown in the table below:
The multiple linear regression equation derived from Table 10 above is

\[ Y = 15.9 + 0.424 \text{OHS} + 0.235 \text{WE} - 0.010 \text{OC} - 0.046 \text{TL} + 0.024 \text{M} + e. \]

i. The constant value (\(a\)) of 15.9 implies that employee performance is 15.9 when the occupational health and safety (OHS) work environment (WE), organizational culture (OC), transformational leadership (TL) and motivation (M) are zero.

ii. The value of \(\beta_1 = 0.424\) implies that if occupational health and safety (OHS) increases by 1 unit then the employee performance will increase by 0.424 assuming that work environment (WE), organizational culture (OC), transformational leadership (TL) and motivation (M) are considered constant.

iii. The value of \(\beta_2 = 0.235\) implies that if work environment (WE) increases by 1 unit then the employees' performance will increase by 0.235 assuming that occupational health and safety (OHS) organizational culture (OC), transformational leadership (TL) and motivation (M) are considered constant.

iv. The value of \(\beta_3 = -0.011\) translates into a 1 unit rise in organizational culture (OC) hence improving employee performance will decrease by 0.011 assuming that occupational health and safety (OHS), work environment (WE), transformational leadership (TL) and motivation (M) are considered constant.

v. The value of \(\beta_4 = -0.046\) translates into a 1 unit rise in transformational leadership (TL) improving employee performance will decrease by 0.046 assuming that occupational health and safety (OHS) work environment (WE) organizational culture (OC) and motivation (M) are considered constant.

The value of \(\beta_5 = 0.024\) translates into a 1 unit rise in motivation (M) improving employee performance will increase by 0.024 assuming that occupational health and safety (OHS) work environment (WE) organizational culture (OC) and transformational leadership (TL) are considered constant.

T-Test (Partial Test)

From the table 4.16 above, the \(t_{\text{count}}\) has a value for occupational health and safety of 4.775 > \(t_{\text{table}}\) whose value is 1.973 with a \(p\) value of 0.000 < 0.05. This manifests that \(H_0\) is accepted and \(H_1\) is denied, it can be concluded that the first hypothesis claimed that occupational health and safety has a positive and significant effect on performance has been accepted.

The \(t_{\text{count}}\) has a value for work environment of 3.921 > \(t_{\text{table}}\) whose value is 1.973 with a \(p\) value of 0.000 < 0.05. This signifies that \(H_0\) is accepted and \(H_1\) is denied, therefore, it can be inferred that the second hypothesis which claimed that work environment has a positive and significant effect on employee performance has been accepted.

The \(t_{\text{count}}\) has a value for organizational culture of -0.098 < \(t_{\text{table}}\) whose value is 1.973 with a \(p\) value of 0.922 > 0.05. This means that \(H_0\) is accepted and \(H_1\) is denied. Therefore, it can be concluded that the third hypothesis which claimed that organizational culture has a positive and significant effect on performance has been denied. Therefore, it can confirmedly be asserted organizational culture has no effect on performance.

The \(t_{\text{count}}\) has a value for transformational leadership of -0.850 < \(t_{\text{table}}\) whose value is 1.973 with a \(p\) value of 0.397 > 0.05. This underscores that \(H_0\) is accepted and \(H_1\) is denied. Therefore, it can be concluded that the fourth hypothesis which stated that transformational leadership has positive and significant effect on performance is denied. Subsequently, it is undeniable fact that transformational leadership has no effect on employee performance.

The \(t_{\text{count}}\) has a value for motivation of -0.406 < \(t_{\text{table}}\) value of 1.973 with a \(p\) value of 0.685 > 0.05. This manifests that \(H_0\) is accepted and \(H_1\) is rejected. Therefore, it can be concluded that the fifth hypothesis which claimed that motivation has positive and significant effect on performance has been denied. It is indispensable that motivation has no effect on employee performance.

### Table 10: Multiple Linear Regression Test Results

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Coefficients</th>
<th>Unstandardized Coefficients</th>
<th>Standardized Coefficients</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Model</td>
<td>B</td>
<td>Std. Error</td>
<td>Beta</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>(Constant)</td>
<td>15.900</td>
<td>1.890</td>
<td>8.412</td>
<td>0.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Occupation Health and Safety</td>
<td>0.424</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>0.345</td>
<td>4.775</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Environment</td>
<td>0.235</td>
<td>0.060</td>
<td>0.366</td>
<td>3.921</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organisational Culture</td>
<td>-0.011</td>
<td>0.111</td>
<td>-0.008</td>
<td>-0.098</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transformational Leadership</td>
<td>-0.046</td>
<td>0.054</td>
<td>-0.078</td>
<td>-0.850</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Motivation</td>
<td>0.024</td>
<td>0.058</td>
<td>0.041</td>
<td>0.406</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a. Dependent Variable: Employee Performance

**Source:** Author 2023
Discussion

Effect of Occupational Health and Safety on Employee Performance

The first objective tried to assess the impact of occupational health and safety on employee performance. The findings of this study show that occupational health and safety in the post the Covid-19 pandemic significantly and favourably affect employee performance in Malawi's public sector. The research's findings are consistent with the first hypothesis, which holds that workplace safety and health have a positive and significant influence on employee performance.

According to Herzberg's two-factor theory, certain workplace elements contribute to job satisfaction, whereas their absence results in neither job satisfaction nor discontent. These practices at the workplaces have affected work performance by either fostering satisfaction or preventing unhappiness. Employee performance may benefit significantly from and be significantly impacted by the observation of occupational health and safety at the workplaces.

On the one hand, the findings of this study are consistent with those that reported the positive and significant effects of occupational health and safety on worker performance (Segbenya & Yeboah, 2022; Perera, 2019; Rantung et al., (2021). On the other hand, these findings go against those whose research found no connection between worker performance and occupational health and safety (Ekowati & Amin, 2018; Jinnett, 2022).

Effect of Work Environment Effect on Employee Performance

The second objective tried to assess the impact of work environment on employee performance. The findings of this study demonstrate that the work environment in Malawi has a positive and significant impact on staff performance following the Covid-19 epidemic. The findings in this instance were consistent with the second hypothesis, the working environments in Malawi a positive and significant influence on staff performance.

According to Herzberg's interpretation of the two-factor theory, workplace components can either make employees happy or unhappy. According to this study, the workplace atmosphere significantly and favourably affects employee performance. This suggests work environments in Malawi have satisfaction-causing and satisfaction-preventing factors. This indicates that they provide working conditions that encourage employees to give their best effort.

The results of this study also support the fact that happy work environment improves job performance (Suyoto & Murthiarsi, 2019). Another research demonstrated that the workplace has a positive and significant impact on worker performance (Izzah et al., 2019). A certain study showed that work environment has a significant impact on job performance (Putra et al., 2020; Ramlit's, 2019). However, the findings of this study are at odds with the one that found that the workplace has no bearing on worker performance (Emita, 2022).

Effect of Organisational Culture on Employee Performance

The third objective tried to evaluate the impact of organizational culture on employee performance. The study's findings show that employee performance in Malawi is unaffected by organizational culture. These findings support the third research hypothesis, which was that organizational culture not significantly and favorably affect how well employees perform.

According to Herzberg's hypothesis, performance effects are more frequently linked to satisfiers than to dissatisfiers, hence the word "motivators". According to the study's findings, organisational culture has little bearing on workers' productivity. Therefore, it is possible to conclude that the organisational culture in Malawi either has no motivators at all or has more hygiene factors than motivation factors.

Furthermore, this study's findings support those of a study by which discovered that organisational culture had little bearing on worker performance (Paramita et al., 2020). However, the research's results are at odds with those of a study which found that corporate culture had an impact on employee performance (Mogi et al., 2022). Another study found that organisational culture has a positive and significant influence on worker performance (Mahendra et al., 2022). The results of this study also run counter to the one whose findings highlighted the beneficial and significant impact that organisational culture has on employee performance (Sapta et al. 2021).

Effect of Transformational Leadership on Employee Performance

The fourth objective tried to evaluate the effect of transformational leadership on employee performance. This study's conclusion is that transformative leadership has no impact on workers' productivity. The fourth hypothesis asserted that transformational leadership significantly and favorably affects employee performance is not supported by these findings.

Herzberg's approach recognizes the value of job enrichment, which includes greater responsibility and engagement, career chances, and a sense of accomplishment. It is reflected in this research that 49.1% of employees states that, as subordinates, they feel to be part of the process because of their involvement in decision making at workplace. This suggests that most of the staff is outside the decision-making process and not intrinsically motivated hence cannot perform well. Moreover, only 45.2% feel motivated because
their leaders at workplace take into account of their needs. Inversely, the majority are not intrinsically motivated and are unsatisfied hence cannot perform effectively.

The study's conclusions support the claims made some researchers (Prabowo et al., 2018; Kamar et al., 2019), who assert that the effectiveness of employees is not significantly impacted by transformative leadership. In contrast to these results, other researches highlight the beneficial and significant influence that transformative leadership has on employee performance (Roz, 2019; Baig et al., 2019, Anshori et al., 2020; Ekhsan & Setiawan, 2021).

**Effect of Motivation on Employee Performance**

The fifth objective tried to assess the effect of motivation on employee performance. The findings of this study demonstrate that motivation has little bearing on employee performance. On the one hand, the research findings go against the fifth hypothesis, which claimed that the post Covid-19 pandemic, employee performance was greatly and positively affected by motivation.

Putting the two-factor theory in focus, on one hand, it states that motivation factors are intrinsic motivators which include recognition, achievements, self-esteem, and level of responsibility, self-actualization, and the need for personal growth. On the other hand, according to Herzberg’s theory, extrinsic job-related hygiene variables include interpersonal interactions, rewards, remuneration, working conditions, status symbols, supervision, and company policy.

On the one hand, one of the studies demonstrated that there is no correlation between employee motivation and performance (Nelizulfa, 2018). This is consistent with the findings of this study. Contrary to the conclusions of this study, a certain study found that work motivation had a positive and significant impact on employee performance (Bawono & Setyadi, 2020). Another research showed a strong impact of intrinsic motivation on instructors' performance (Fauzan et al., 2021; Mkubwa & Lyimo, 2019).

**Conclusions**

The following are the conclusions drawn from this study: Firstly, on the one hand, it has been established that occupational health and safety in Malawi has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in the post Covid-19 pandemic. This entails that an improvement in occupational health and safety will land into an improved employee performance. Similarly, this study found that work environment in Malawi has a positive and significant effect on employee performance in the post Covid-19 pandemic. This underscores that enhancing work environment alternatively leads to an improvement in employee performance. On the other hand, the study concludes that organizational culture in public institutions in Malawi has no effect on employee performance in the post Covid-19 pandemic. This implies that a decline in organizational culture will not result in a decline in employee performance, vice versa. In the same way, this study has shown that transformational leadership in public sector in Malawi has no effect on employee performance in the post Covid-19 pandemic. To elucidate this, any rise in transformational leadership will not have any bearing on employee performance. Lastly, this research has found that motivation in Malawi’s public institutions has no effect on employee performance in the post Covid-19 pandemic. Therefore, this denotes that any change in motivation makes no change on employee performance.

The research suggests the following: firstly, in terms of approach, another researcher should consider collecting data from same institutions such as hospitals only or archival organisations. The data will be collected from respondents of the same professions. This research took data from respondents from different careers hence side-lined those without electronic gadgets. Secondly, methodologically, other researches should consider data collection using an offline questionnaire to allow technologically challenged to participate. Thirdly, a follow up research should consider investigating how occupational health and safety, work environment, organisational culture, transformational leadership and motivation affect employee performance in Malawi before Covid-19 pandemic. Fourthly, subsequent researches should consider finding out how these independent variables affect organisational performance in Malawi. It will help to know how the public organisations are affected in terms of performance by these same factors.

The research registered a number of setbacks. In the first place, the researcher only collected data only from public organisations hence its findings are only limited to public institutions in Malawi. Moreover, the online data collection automatically excluded other potential respondents who lacked access to internet, laptops and android phones to fill the online questionnaire. Lastly, it was very challenging for the researcher to meet most of the expenses especially during data collection due to lack of funding.

The implications derived from this study are as follows: It is necessary that the management in public institutions in Malawi to capitalize on the aspects of occupational health and safety as well as work environment because they influence their employees' performance in a positive way. Besides, in order to develop an organizational culture that is supportive of employee performance at the public institutions, management should assess their respective organizational cultures. Given that transformational leadership has failed to produce the desired results, management at each public organization should consider using a different leadership approach other than transformational leadership which has no influence on employee performance. Consequently, the management should devise new ways of motivating employees to ensure that good performance is achieved in the civil service.
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