ISSN: 2230-7850 IMPACT FACTOR : 5.1651 (UIF)

INDIAN STREAMS RESEARCH JOURNAL

VOLUME - 7 | ISSUE - 5 | JUNE - 2017

DETERMINANTS OF WOMEN WORK PERFORMANCE IN THE SELECTED ORGANIZATIONS AT HAWASSA CITY

Birukt Kifle Zegeye[1], Adamu Assefa Mihrka[2], Bhatara Mohit[3]
Department of Psychology, College of Social Sciences and Humanities, Hawassa University.

ABSTRACT :

In this time of competitive world, success and development of any country depends on its human resource. Organizational effectiveness plays a great role for the development of any country. Organizations need highly performing individuals in order to meet their goals, to deliver the products and services they specialized in and to achieve competitive advantage over others. Performance is also important for the individuals. Currently female employees are increasing on equal foot with male employees in organizations.

KEYWORDS: *Organizational effectiveness plays , products and services.*

INTRODUCTION:

This is also true in Ethiopia where many women are joining the work force. Performance means 'to carry out, accomplish or fulfill an action or task. It also means work, function, or to do something to a specific standard. Performance is an action or process of performing a task or function (Oxford Concise Dictionary 1999, 1060). Work performance assesses whether a person performs a job well. Work performance is the way employees perform their work an employ's performance is determined during work performance reviews, with an employer taking into account factors such as leadership skills, time-management, organizational skills and productivity to analyze each employee on an individual basis. Job performance reviews are often done yearly and can determine raise eligibility, whether an employee is right for promotion or even if an employee should be fired. Work performance, studied academically as part of industrial and organizational psychology (the branch of psychology that deals with the workplace) also forms a part of human resources management. Performance is an important criterion for organizational outcomes and success. Performance is an individual-level variable or something a single person does this differentiates it from more encompassing constructs such as organizational performance or national performance which are higher-level variables (Campbell, 1990). Every employee working within the organization is expected to perform his or her work in a dependable way. He or she is responsible for successful performance of tasks and duties involved in the job according to the employment contract. Employees accept certain job assignments and agree to do them dependably. They should feel a sense of responsibility for doing them well (Opatha, 2009). Some of the well known definitions of work performance provide clear insight of it and they can be extensive used for this research study. According to Moorhead and Griffin (1999), job

performance is made up of all work related behavior. Job performance is the accomplishment of those tasks that comprise a person's job (Porter & Lawler, 1968). It means execution of total set of job related tasks. The tasks that should be performed are different from one job to another. Borman and Motowidlo (1997) presented a model of job performance which reflected such behaviors that were comprehensive of job performance specialty, classified as either task or relative performance. In the performance literature, a distinction is made between in role and extra-role performance (Katz & Kahn, 1978). Extra-role performance is also conceptualized as organizational citizenship behaviors (Smith, Organ, & Near, 1983).

Review of literature: Organizational Performance: Performance is the actual conducting of activities to meet tasks according to standards. It is an indication of what is done and how sound it is carried out (Winch, Bhattacharyya, Debay, Sariot, Bertoli & Morrow, 2003). Performance is an action or process of performing a task or function (Oxford Concise Dictionary, 1999:1060). Performance is associated with magnitude of output, excellence of output, timeliness of output, presence or attendance on the job, efficiency of the work completed and effectiveness of work completed (Mathis & Jackson, 2009). Employee Performance is the successful completion of tasks by a selected individual or individual as set and measured by a supervisor or organization to predefined acceptable standards while capably and successfully utilizing available resource within a changing environment. Organizations have an engine in determining the economic, social and political progress precisely. For this reason, in the last twenty two years there were six Nobel prizes awarded to researchers who have focused on the important role in our daily lives and therefore, successful organizations represent a key ingredient for developing nations. Thus, many economists consider organizations and institutions similar to an analysis of organizations and institutions. Although the concept of organizational performance is very common in the academic literature, its definition is difficult because of its many meanings. For this reason, there isn't a universally accepted definition of this concept. In the 1950s organizational performance was defined as the extent to which organizations, viewed as a social system, fulfilled their objectives (Georgopoulos & Tannenbaum, 1957).

Women and work in Africa: Africa is known for its high rate of female labor force participation. But there are marked differences within the continent. Sub Saharan Africa is one of two regions worldwide with the highest rates (around 60%) of women's labor force participation the other being South East Asia. In both regions, women workers are highly visible, not only numerically (United Nation Research Institute for Social Development [UNRISD], 2005). Within Sub Saharan Africa, Burundi, Madagascar, Malawi, Mozambique and Tanzania have particularly high rates (over 80%) of women's labor force participation (Heintz & Valodia, 2008). On the other hand, North Africa is the region with the lowest rate (just over 20%) of women's labor force participation (UNRISD, 2005). By contrast, South Africa is known for its high rates of unemployment and formal employment (nearly 60% of total employment) and North Africa is known for a relatively low incidence of informal employment, particularly among women, compared to other regions in the developing world (ILO, 2002). summarized in the conference report, are grouped as follows women's occupation and workload women's entrepreneurship agricultural and rural economies, labor intensive manufacturing social protection advancing women's economic empowerment and three of the more general recommendations Women are overrepresented in the informal sector, which is characterized by poor wages, insecure working conditions Therefore, improving conditions in the informal sector is crucial Support capacity development of nongovernmental organizations, employer associations, and trade unions in advocating for women's economic empowerment and train women in organizing themselves in economic associations (instead of only social organization).

Most women in Africa are engaged in informal self employment Most are own account Workers Single person operators or heads of family businesses or unpaid contributing family workers. In Ghana, own account workers and unpaid contributing family workers accounted for 38 per cent of men's non agricultural employment and 77 percent of women's non agricultural employment. Similarly, in Kenya, where wage

employment is somewhat more prevalent, these categories of employment accounted for 27 per cent of men's non agricultural employment and 47 per cent of women's.

Women and work in Ethiopia: **As** in other traditional societies, in Ethiopia a woman's worth is measured in terms of her role as a mother and wife. Over 85 percent of Ethiopian women reside in rural areas, where households are engaged primarily in subsistence agriculture. In the countryside, women are integrated into the rural economy, which is often labor-intensive and exacts a heavy physical duty on all including children. Women comprise about 49.9% of the estimated Ethiopian population of 77.1 million. Among the total heads of households, 25.5% are females with 23% of them in rural and 39% in urban areas (Central Statistical Agency [CSA], 2007).
Like their counterparts in developing countries, women in Ethiopia face a set of multiple, cross cutting and interrelated problems. These problems limit Ethiopian women's access to productive resources, basic health services, and educational and employment opportunities. Hence most of them do not participate in decision making processes (Demissie & Yitbarek, 2008). In general, Women in Ethiopia occupy low status in the society. In spite of their contributions to the well of their family and community affairs in general, women experience lower socio-economic status as a whole and hence is marginalized from making decisions at all levels. Women are facing multiple forms of deprivation, such as gender based discrimination, lack of protection of basic human rights, violence, lack of access to productive resources, education and training, basic health services, and employment are widespread (National Committee for Traditional Practices Eradication [NCTPE], 2003). Ethiopian women suffer from work stereotype and gender distribution of labor, more are occupy in economically invisible work. Women experience lower socioeconomic status in general and hence is marginalized from being making decisions at all levels.

Objectives of the study, General objective: The general objective of this research is to assess factors that are associated with women work performance in the selected organizations of Hawassa city. **Specific objectives:** 1. To explain the perceived factors that has impact on women work performance. 2. To identify the effect of the selected demographic Independent variables (Marital status, Number of children, Pregnancy, Income, Educational level, Service year) on women work performance. 3. To explain the relationship between working environment and women work performance. 4. To identify the most basic factor among the study independent variables. 5. To determine the combined contribution of the independent variables considered for this study in explaining women work performance.
Research Design : A descriptive and correlational research design has been employed in the study to assess the key factors that affect the performance of women workers in Hawassa city.

Study Population: The eligible target populations for this study were 2,995 women workers of selected organizations.

Sample size and sampling technique: After identifying the total number of women workers, that is 2995, from Hawassa city civil service bureau, the researchers had determined the number of sample respondents from each sector proportionally by using lottery method. Carvalho (1984) sample size determination as mentioned by Getahun (2007) and Bokansa (2013*)* was used to determine the number of samples. So the sample appropriate for this population range is 200 female workers.

Source of data: The data for this study was obtained mainly from primary sources. The primary sources were respondents (participants) of the study from whom the relevant information has been collected through the administration of questionnaire, interview and focus group discussion. As secondary sources organization reports, documents and booklets was reviewed.

Data gathering instrument: Questionnaire: For the purpose of this study, the researchers have used a series of questions designed to find out required information which was filled out by the participants. The researchers used Likert scale which enables to understand respondents' degree of agreement with each statement. Hence, participants were made to complete a questionnaire. The first section consist of a demographic information sheet and enable the researchers to know Marital status, Pregnancy, Number of children, Education level, Income and Service year of respondents. The second part of the questioner is about perception of work environment index. The Perception of Work Environment Index (PWEI) is a valid and reliable ($\alpha = 0.813$). It measures the extent and nature of gender-based hostilities.

Interview: Through direct personal communication, by using purposive sampling, with women organizational leaders and experienced workers the researchers collected data on a face to face basis from the sources concerned.

Focus group discussion: When people come together or in a group there is high chance of expressing ideas, views and experiences. So, two focus group discussions associated with women work performance, each consisting eight women workers were held.

Pilot Study: The instruments tested for their reliability and validity on selected sample of 50 participants. Then, internal consistency reliability of items was computed by using SPSS version 16 and resulted in Cronbach's alpha (α) 0.862.

Questionnaire Administration: The questionnaire was administered in Amharic. Three data collectors were taught about the administration of the questionnaire and printed copies of the instruments were subsequently allocated to them. The researchers supervised the process of data collection.

Method of Data analysis: The qualitative data obtained through interview and focus group discussion was discussed by using thematic approach. The quantitative data is analyzed by using statistical software (SPSS version 16 and STATA). After the data were entered, different statistical analyses were made to achieve the stated objectives. Descriptive statistics such as percentage, mean, and standard deviations were used to express the proportion, average, and variability of certain characteristics of the variables. In addition, independent sample t-test was employed to know the relationship between marital status and women work performance.

2. One-way ANOVA of between groups with post hoc test was done to know the effect of number of children, pregnancy, Income level, service year, and education level on women work performance. In order to calculate effect size, eta squared was used, one of the most common effect size statistics, provided in the ANOVA table, Cohen's (1988:287). "Cohen classifies 0.01 as a small effect, 0.06 as a medium effect and 0.14 as a large effect".

3. Linear regressions were held between Gender Need Work Environment and Women Work Performance.

4. To know the combined contribution effect of the independent variables and to identify the most contributing independent variables multiple regression was done.

The dependent variable (Performance) is calculated using SPSS by transforming and linearizing it. Even though the dependent variable is categorical, a linear regression model can be used as long as it doesn't violate the major assumptions. For this linearity, normality, hetro-scedasticity, multicollenearity tests were made. The data was found to be linear.

The model: The multiple linear regression model used in this study is explained with seven -explanatory variables.

Variable Selection and Significance test: The number of variables that would be included in the model should be of the minimum possible: that is parsimonious and deliver optimum information. The important predictor variables are selected by considering their impact on the dependent variable (Performance). An independent-sample t-test for scale variables and Pearson analysis for nominal variables is done to analyze the significance of the relation or association between the mean (for scale variable) or percentage (for nominal variables) each predictor variable with the response variable before the final model was selected.

Assessment of model Specification Error and Goodness-of-fit: R^2 coefficient of determination was used to analyze whether the explanatory variables explain most of the variation in the dependent variable. The more percentage of R^2 is, the better the fit. The dependent variable of this study is women work performance. For the regression purpose this values are transformed to find the mean index of the variable and regressed in appropriate manner.

Variables of the study: Dependent variable: The dependent variable of this study is women work performance.

Independent variables: The Independent variables considered in this study are Marital status, Number of children; Pregnancy, Income, Educational level, Service year and Gender Need Work Environment.

Ethical consideration: The informed consent and debriefing of the study purposes were well done during data collection and confidentiality of the respondents was taken care of during analysis and report writing.

1. Demographic Characteristics of the Respondents

Table 1: Marital status, Pregnancy History and Number of children (N=200)

Characteristics	Category	N	%
Marital status	Married	131	65.5
	Single	69	34.5
	Total	200	100.0
Pregnancy History	not at all	78	39.0
	once before	35	17.5
	twice and above two times	80	40.0
	currently I am pregnant	7	3.5
	Total	200	100.0
Number of children of the respondents	I have no child	84	42
	I have one child	12	6
	I have 2- 5 children	89	44.5
	I have six and more than six children	15	5.0
	Total	200	100.0

In the quantitative study (questionnaire), 200 women were included. As it can be seen in Table 1, 131 (65.5%) of the respondents were married, and the rest 69(34.5%) were single. That is married women constitute more than half of the sample respondents. When we see the pregnancy history of respondents, 78(39%) were not pregnant at all, 35(17.5%) of the respondents were pregnant once before, 80(40%) of the respondents were pregnant twice and above and only 7(3.5%) of the respondents were pregnant during the data collection period. In relation with the number of children they had, the majority of respondents, 89

(44.5%) had 2-5 children, 84(42 %) had no child, 15(7.5 %) had 6 and more than 6 children and only 12(6%) of the respondents had 1 child and few children.

Table 2: Income of the Respondents

Characteristics	Category	N	%
Income	651-1400	6	3
	1401-2350	17	8.5
	2351-3550	42	21
	3551-5000	70	35
	above 5000	65	32
	Total	**200**	**100.0**

Regarding monthly income, as it is indicated in Table 2, 70(35%) of respondents gain monthly income between 3551-5000, 42(21%) of the respondents gain between 2351-3550, 17(8.5%) between 1401-2350, while 65(32.5%) of respondents gain monthly income above 5000 and only 6(3%) of the respondents gain monthly income between 651-1400.

Table 3: Service Years of the Respondents

Service Years	below two years	6	3
	2-5 years	30	15
	6-10 years	42	21
	11-14 years	86	43
	15 and above years	34	17
	Total	**198**	**100.0**

Concerning to service year of the respondents (Table 3), 86(43%) of women have worked for 11-14 years, 42(21%) of them have work experience from 6-10 years, 30(15%) between 2-5 years and 6(3%) of the respondents had worked only for less than two years.

Table 4: Educational Levels of the Respondents

Educational level	N	%
Master's degree level	10	5
Bachelor degree level	56	28
Diploma level	37	18.5
Certificate level	70	35
Secondary level second cycle (grade 11 and 12)	21	10.5
Secondary level first cycle (grade 9 and 10)	6	3
Total		

As depicted in Table 4, the greatest majority of the respondents, 70 (35%) have attended college level (certificate programs) followed by a considerable amount 56 (28%) who attended education at a bachelor degree level. Further, 37(18.5%) of the respondents were found to be educated at a diploma level, whereas 21(10.5%) of the respondents have only completed secondary level second cycle (grade 11-12). On the other hand, the number of respondents who have attended their education at master's degree level is

slightly greater than those who had only completed secondary level first cycle (grade 9-10). That is 10(5%) and 6(3%) respectively.

2. The Effects of the Demographic Variables on Women Work Performance

This part presents the mean, standard deviation, Sum of Squares, degree of freedom, and the significance level, from one way ANOVA result that was done between income, service year, education level, and service year of respondents respectively with mean performance.

Table 5: Descriptive Statistics of the Women Work Performance by Income Groups

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
651-1400	6	2.2404	.57503
1401-2350	17	2.5341	.28139
2351-3550	42	3.3457	.30734
3551-5000	70	3.8404	.22140
above 5000	65	4.4827	.23581
Total	**200**	**3.7862**	**.68952**

Table 6: ANOVA result of Women Work Performance by Income Groups

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	80.878	4	20.219	287.077	0.000
Within Groups	13.734	195	0.070		
Total	94.612	199			

As shown in Table 6, the finding indicated that there was a statistically significant difference at 0.05 level among the mean performance scores for the five income groups at F (4, 195) = 287.077, p < .001. The facts that there exists a significant difference in the mean performance scores of the five groups (2.24, 2.53, 3.34, 3.84, and 4.48, respectively from group 1-5) which explain that income level has an effect on actual performance of workers. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was 0.83. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for group 1 (M = 2.24, SD = .57) was significantly different from group 3 (M = 3.34, SD = .30), group 4 (M = 3.84, SD = .22), group 5 (M = 4.48, SD = .23). Group 2 differ significantly from all groups except from group1 and by transitivity the rest of the groups (3, 4, and 5) differ significantly with all the groups with a mean and standard deviation value given above.

Table 7: Descriptive Statistics of the Respondents' Performance by Pregnancy Histories

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
not at all	78	3.7598	.71549
once before	35	3.6484	.64992
twice and above two times	80	3.8997	.66738
currently I'm pregnant	7	3.4732	.73142
Total	**200**	**3.7862**	**.68952**

Table 8: ANOVA result of the Respondents' Performance by Pregnancy Histories `

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	**2.435**	**3**	**.812**	**1.726**	**.163**

Within Groups	**92.176**	**196**	**.470**		
Total	**94.612**	**199**			

As we can see in Table 7, participants were divided into four groups according to their pregnancy history (group 1, not pregnant at all, group 2, pregnant once before, group3 pregnant twice and above, and group 4 currently pregnant). As Table 8 shows, there was no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level among the four groups at F (3,196) =1.726, P> .05. This indicates that there exists likeness in the mean performance scores among the four groups (3.75, 3.64, 3.89, and 3.47) respectively and thus the actual difference in mean scores among the groups was quite small. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was 0.02 that indicates there is minimum performance difference with in the above pregnancy history groups.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics of Women Work Performance by Number of children

Groups	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
I have one child	12	3.6823	.55099
I have no child	84	4.3793	.27865
I have 2- 5 children	89	3.4747	.40984
I have six and more than six children	15	2.3962	.44300
Total	**200**	**3.7862**	**.68952**

Table 10: ANOVA result of Women Work Performance by Number of children

	Sum of Squares	**Df**	**Mean Square**	**F**	**Sig.**
Between Groups	**67.299**	**3**	**22.433**	**160.979**	**.000**
Within Groups	**27.313**	**196**	**.139**		
Total	**94.612**	**199**			

A one-way analysis of variance among groups of respondents with different number of children was conducted. Group 1 constituted women who had one child, group 2 women that had no child, and group 3 women who had from 2-5 children and group 4 consisted of women who had six and above children (see Table 9). There was a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level among the performance scores of the four groups at F (3,196) =160.97, p<.000 (see Table 10). In addition, as the effect size, calculated using eta squared (0.71) indicates, the actual difference in mean performance scores among the groups was somewhat great. Moreover, the post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean performance score of group 1(M=3.6,SD.55) was significantly different from group2 (M=4.3, SD .27) and group 4 (M=2.3, SD .27). Group 4(M=2.3, SD .44) was significantly different from group 1(M=3.6, SD .44) from group 2(M=4.3, SD .27) and from group 3 (M=3.4, SD .40). There is also significant difference between group 4(M2.3, SD .44) and group 2(M=4.3, SD .27) and additionally group 2 (M=4.3, SD .27) also differ from group 1(M=3.6, SD .55), group 3(M3.4, SD .4) and also differ from group 4(M=2.3, SD .44).

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics of Women Work Performance by Service Years

Groups	**N**	**Mean**	**Std. Deviation**
below two years	6	2.7779	.95065
2-5 years	30	2.9054	.54950
6-10 years	42	3.5497	.50154
11-14 years	86	4.0322	.43038
15 and above years	34	4.3808	.41860
Total	**198**	**3.7810**	**.69098**

Table 12: ANOVA results of Women Work Performance by Service Years

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	48.944	4	12.236	52.344	.000
Within Groups	45.116	193	.234		
Total	**94.060**	**197**			

In Table 11 respondents were divided into five groups. Group1 included women who had work experience below two years, group 2 women who worked from two years up to five years, group 3 women who had worked from six up to ten years, group 4 women who work from 11 up to 14 years and group 5 women who worked for 15 years and above. The finding showed a statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level in the performance scores of the five groups F (4,193) =52.33, P<.000 (see Table 12). Hence, the fact that there appears a difference in the mean performance score of the five groups (2.77, 2.90, 3.54, 4.03, 4.38,) respectively indicate the actual difference in mean scores among the groups was quite large. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was 0.51 which is large. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for group 1(M=2.77, SD.95) was significantly different from that of group 3 (M= 3.5, SD.50) and also differs from group 4 (M=4.0, SD.43) and from group 5 (M=3.7, SD.69). And group 3 (M= 3.5, SD.50) significantly differs from group 4 (M=4.0, SD.43) and from group 5 (M=3.7, SD.69). This clearly shows there is significant performance difference in relation to service years of the respondents.

Table 13: Descriptive Statistics of Women Work Performance by Educational levels

Groups	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
Secondary level first cycle(grade 9-10)	6	2.2521	.57773
Secondary level second cycle (grade 11-12)	21	2.6136	.31286
College certificate	70	3.5345	.31327
College diploma	37	4.0018	.21924
First degree	56	4.3917	.25184
Masters degree	10	4.7438	.12655
Total	**200**	**3.7862**	**.68952**

Table 14: ANOVA result of Women Work Performance by Educational levels

	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Between Groups	**78.851**	**5**	**15.770**	**194.110**	**.000**
Within Groups	**15.761**	**194**	**.081**		
Total	**94.612**	**199**			

A one-way analysis of variance between-group was conducted to explore if there was a difference in work performance among the respondents of different educational backgrounds. As it can be seen from Table 13 and Table 14, respondents were divided into six groups. Group 1 ,secondary level first cycle (grade 9-10), group 2 secondary level second cycle (grade 11-12 or preparatory), group 3 , college certificate , group 4 ,college diplomas, group 5, first degree and group 6, masters degree. A statistically significant difference was observed at the 0.05 level in the performance score for the six educational levels at F (5,194) =194.11, P<.001. As the effect size shows (eta squared 0.83), the actual difference in mean scores among the groups was quite large. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for group 1(M=2.25, SD.57) was significantly different from group 3 (M=3.53, SD =.31) from group 4 (M=4.0, SD .21) and from group 5 (M=4.3, SD .25 and also differ from group 6 (M=4.7, SD .12). Again the mean score for group 3 (M=3.53, SD =.31) differ from group 4 (M=4.0, SD .21), and group 4 (M=4.0, SD .21) differ from group 5 (M=4.3, SD .25), and again group 5 (M=4.3, SD .25) differ from group 6 (M=4.7, SD .12). Thus this finding reveals that the level of education attained by workers is associated with different levels of job performance.

Independent t-tests for Marital Status

Because of the non response rate for widowed and divorced, here respondents were grouped into two groups as married and single. Thus comparison was made by using independent sample t –test.

Table 15: Independent t -test of Job Performance between Married and Single Women

Single **(N=69)**		Married **(N=131)**		**t**	**Sig.**
M	**SD**	**M**	**SD**		
3.7678	.63942	3.7960	.71669	.075	.784

Table 15 above summarizes the findings of an independent sample t-test conducted to see if there is a statistically significant difference in the mean job performance scores for married and single women. It was found that there was no statistically significant difference at the 0.05 level at t (1,198) = .075, p>.05; (.784). The apparently small difference in the mean performance of two groups (3.79, 3.76) testifies that the actual difference is little. The effect size Eta squared, 0.0003 is very small indicating that marital status has a very limited effect on job performance.

3. The Effect of Gender Need Working Environment on Women Work Performance

Table 16: Regression result between Gender Need Working Environment and Women Work Performance

Source	**SS**	**DF**	**MS**	
Model	11.531912	1	11.5319	Number of obs = 170
Residual	66.725464	168	0.39718	F (1, 168) = 29.03
Total	***78.2573759**	**169**	**1.46306**	Prob> F = 0.0000
				R-squared = 0.1474
				Adj R-squared = 0.1423
				Root MSE = 0.63022

Performance	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>|t|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
PWEI	0.319954	0.059378	5.39	0.000	0.2027299	0.4371773
Cons	2.814514	0.192932	14.59	0.000	0 2.433629	3.195398

The simple regression output (STATA output in Table 16) revealed that work environment significantly affects the performance of the respondent. A unit increment in the average indexed value of work environment resulted in a 0.31 increment in the mean indexed value of women's performance. As it can be observed from the above table, work environment with a (p-value 0.000) significantly and positively affects the women's work performance. The Adj.R^2 result of (0.1423) indicates that, even though there exists a significant relationship between work environment and women work performance, it only explained 14.23% of the variation in dependent variable. The majority of the variation which exists in the dependent variable is not explained by the independent variables of work environment. Hence it is important to regress the dependent variable with other explanatory variables to best explain the major one that affect performance.

4. The Combined Contribution of the Selected Predictor Variables in Explaining Women Work Performance

Table 18: The Combined Contribution of Predictor Variables

Performance	Coef.	Std. Err.	t	P>|t|	[95% Conf. Interval]	
Marital Status	0387013	0.0404371	0.96	0.340	-0.041062	0.1184647
Pregnant	-0.0054324	0.0521505	-0.10	0.917	- 0.1083007	0.097436
Number of child	0.0255394	0.0226526	1.13	0.261	0.0191435	0.070222
Education*	0.0797659	0.0289479	2.76	0.006	0.0226654	0.1368664
Income*	0.3601682	0.0000391	9.22	0.000	0.0002831	0.0004372
Experience*	0.0744853	0.0162973	4.57	0.000	0.0423383	0.1066322
PWEI*	0.1106552	0.0384718	2 .88	0.004	0. 0347686	0.1865419
Cons	0.5411677	0.3902347	1.39	0.167	-0.2285814	1.310917

The result of the multiple regression model (Table 18) estimates revealed that, out of seven explanatory variables included in the model Income, Experience, work Environment, Education level, has been found to have a significant influence on the performance of women. The coefficients of Income, Experience, PWEI and Education; 0.3601682, 0.0744853, 0.1106552, and 0.0797659 respectively are statistically significant at 0.1 significance level; whereas, pregnancy, marital status, and number of children are found to be statistically not significant.

Income is one of the major significant determinants of women's work performance. Accordingly, the performance of women increases as the income increase. Having a small income significantly decreases the percent increment in performance. As the income increases by 1000 ETB or one unit as it is defined above performance will increase by 0.36.Income is indeed an important motivator for work performance.The number of school year attended by the respondent significantly affects the work performance. According to the regression result a one year increment in attendance of education resulted in a 7.9% increment in the work performance. It can also be inferred that as the number of school year attended by the respondent increases women work performance will also increase.

The third variable which was found to significantly affect work performance was experience. Accordingly as the experience of the respondent increases, work performance will also improve in the same direction. The above regression table revealed that as the experience of women increases by one year the work performance will improve by 0.07 units. From this result we can conclude that experience of the respondent significantly affects her performance.The last important variable which was found to be a significant determinant of women's work performance was gender need work environment. Of course the one-to-one relationship with performance has previously explained the significant relationship, the multiple linear regression result confirmed PWEI is one of the most significant variable which affects women's work performance. A unit change in the indexed mean of PWEI resulted in a 0.11 unit increment in the mean indexed value of performance.

DISCUSSION:

The main objective of this research was to know factors associated with women work performance in Hawassa city. It inherently intends to examine the relationship between the major factors considered in the study and then predict performance among the study population. The findings were discussed in line with the fundamental research questions raised. In this study, the independent variables thought to have relationship with women's work performance are grouped as demographic and work related variables. Women's work performance is strongly influenced by the demographic features of the respondent. This feature, to a certain extent, influences the women's performance on the work place. In view of this, an attempt is made to assess the difference in the status or level of performance that exists between different respondent's demographic, and work related characteristics. It has long since been established that no single factor could be seen as singularly influencing women work performance substantially to such an extent that it can be seen as the secret key to performance enhancement considering the factors influencing on such factors. The findings of this study are comparable with the finding from study by Czaja et al. (1995**)** and

Sharkey and Davis (2008). Previous study done by Kolz et al. (1998) proved that experienced people do have better work performance due to their huge amount of knowledge on the tasks need to be done. This research also shows there is better work performance on women who work between 11-14 years and women's who work for 15 and above years than women who work below this year. The present finding in relation with income and women work performance is also comparable with a study done by Dieleman et al. (2003). It showed that work performance is influenced by financial incentives of women; that is, those who get high salary perform highly. Financial factor is identified as the main motivator for employee to perform their best (Torgler, Schmidt, & Frey, 2006). They found that the better work performance is related with the higher income receivers' employee. Income is indeed an important motivator for work performance in this study also. Women who gain between 3551-5000 and women who get above 5000 have better work performance than the other groups. In addition, the findings of this study regarding number of children and women work performance can also be compared to the findings from a more similar study by (Yi, 1993) who found that even when a woman has a professional job outside home and has achieved much, she also tries to carry out her household responsibilities in relation to her children's in turn has effect on her achievement (Liao, 1998). Women who have six and more than six children scored less mean performance than women who have no child and from women who have one child. Women with high level of educational perform better than from women with low level education. Individuals with higher levels of education have both greater solution and crystallized intelligence (Ceci, 1991; Neisser et al, 1996). Education is assumed to have a positive impact on performance of the respondent therefore women's work performance for more educated is high and more productive and earn more. Similarly, the result of this research appear to be consistent with the above scholars, women who have college diploma; first degree and masters degree perform better than other educational level groups. The finding of this research in relation to work environment and work performance is also consistent with previous research findings. According to (Spector 2008) work environment is an important determinant of work performance. The work environment in the new researches was found to be better determinant of work performance by the scholars (Reiner & Zhao, 1999; Carlan, 2007; Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001; Forsyth & Copes, 1994). The absence of such working conditions amongst other things, can impact poorly on the workers mental and physical well-being (Baron & Greenberg, 2003). Robbins (2001) advocates that working conditions will influence work performance, as employees are concerned with a comfortable physical work environment in turn this will render a more positive level of work performance. Employees may feel that poor working conditions will only provoke negative performance since their jobs are mentally and physically demanding. Job performance is reduced by overcrowded conditions and dark, noisy environments, with extreme temperature and poor air quality. Poor working conditions have been found to cause greater fatigue, negligence, absenteeism, indiscipline and insubordination among the employees (Saiyadain, 1999).By having the research questions in mind the researchers concludes that there exists a significant association between the educational level attended by the respondent and women work performance; there exists a significant association between service year and women work performance. This research also indicates that there exists a significant association between working environment and women work performance. Again it showed that there exists a significant association between income of respondents and women work performance. But, out of the researchers' anticipation the result showed that there exists week association between marital statuses, number of children's and women work performance. Finally, the impact of pregnancy in this research was not as such significant.

REFERENCES:

1. Bateman, T. S. & Organ, D. W. (1983) *Job satisfaction and the good soldier*: The relationship between affect and employee.
2. Bokansa, T. (2013*). Determinants of employees job performance and satisfaction a case study of Adare hospital.*

3. Borman, W. C, & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance, 10*, 99–109.
4. Borman, W. C. & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993*) Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In Personnel Selection in Organizations (N. Schmitt & W. C.*
5. Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1993). Expanding the criterion domain to include elements of contextual performance. In N. Schmitt & W. C. Borman (Eds.), Personnel Selection in Organizations (Pp. 71-98). San Francisco: Jossey-Bass.

6. Campbell, J. P. (1990). Modeling the performance prediction problem in industrial and organizational psychology. In Dunnette MD, Hough LM (Eds.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology* (Vol. 1, 2nd ed., pp. 687–732). Palo Alto, CA: Con-sulting Psychologists Press.
7. Ceci S. J. (1991). *How much does schooling influence general intelligence and it's cognitive Components? A reassessment of the evidence. Developmental Psychology*, 27, 703–722.
8. Central Statistics Agency (2007). Population and Housing Census: Strategy and Implementation Plan, Addis Ababa.
9. Cohen, J. (1988). Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences (2nd edition). Hillsdale, NJ: Lawrence Erlbaum Associates.
10. Czaja, S. J. (1995). *Aging and Work Performance*. Journal Review of Public Personnel Administration, Volume 15, Issue 2, pp. 46-61
11. Demissie, S. & Yitbarek, T. (2008). Digest of Ethiopia's policies, programs and strategies: A review of national policy on Ethiopian women. EEA, Addis Ababa.
12. Dieleman M, Viet Cuong P, Vu Anh L, Matrineau T (2003). Identifying factors for job motivation of rural health workers in North Viet Nam. Human Resources for Health 1 (10). Available from (https://human-resources-health.biomedcentral.com/articles/10.1186/1478-4491-1-10)
13. Ellickson, M. & Logsdon, K. (2001). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. State Local Gov. Rev., 33(3): 173- 84.
14. Forsyth, C. J. & Copes, J. H. (1994). Determinants of job satisfaction among police officers. Int. R. Modern Sociol. 24(1): 109-16.
15. Georgopoulos, B., Tannenbaum, A. (1957). A Study of Organizational Effectiveness. American Sociological Review 22:534-40.
16. Getahun, T. (2007). E*mployee's opinion about human resource development practice of national bank of Ethiopia, unpublished master's thesis.*
17. Heintz, J, & Valodia, I. (2008). Informality in Africa: a review. Background working paper for the Swedish International Development Cooperation Agency (Sida), Sweden.
18. Katz, D., & Kahn, R. (1978). The social psychology of organizations (2nd edition.) NY: Wiley.
19. Kolz, A. R. Mcfarland, L. A. & Silverman, S. B. (1998). Cognitive ability and job experience as predictors of work performance. The Journal of Psychology Interdisciplinary and Applied, 132(5): 539-548.
20. Liao, T.F. (1998). Dealing with a double day: Role strain among married working women in Japan and South Korea. In The changing family in comparative perspective: Asia and the U.S, ed. K.O. Mason, N.O. Tsuya, and M.K. Choe, 137–154. Honolulu: The East-West Center.
21. Mathis, R. L. & Jackson, J. H. (2009). Human resource management. Mason, OH, USA: SouthWestern Cengage Learning.
22. Moorhead, G. & Griffin, R.W. (1999). Organizational Behaviour; Managing people andorganizations (3rd edition.) Mumbai: Jaico Publishing House.
23. National Committee on Harmful Traditional Practices in Ethiopia [NCTPE] (2003). *Harmful traditional practices in Ethiopia*. United printers Addis Ababa, Ethiopia.
24. Neisser, U., Boodoo, G., Bouchard, T. J., Jr., Boykin, A. W., Brody, N., Ceci, S. J., . . . Urbina, S. (1996). Intelligence: Knowns and unknowns. American Psychologist, 51, 77–101.
25. Opatha, H. H. D. N. P. (2009), Human Resource Management.

26. Oxford Concise Dictionary, (1999).10th edition. Oxford University Press, Oxford.
27. Porter, L. W. & Lawler, E. E. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. Irwin- Dorsey, Homewood, IL.
28. Reiner, M. D., & Zhao, J. (1999). The determinants of job satisfaction among United States air force's security police. Rev. Public Personnel Adm., 19(3): 5-18.
29. Robbins, S. P. (2001). "Organizational behaviour" (6th Edition.) *Prentice-Hall of India*.
30. Saiydain, M. (1999). Human resources management (10th edition.) New Delhi: Tara McGraw Hill Publishing Company Limited.
31. Sharkey, B. J. & Davis, P. O. (2008). Hard *Work: Defining Physical Work Performance Requirements. Human Kinetics Publisher*, Champaign, Illinois.
32. Smith, C. A., Organ, D. W., & Near, J. P. (1983). Organizational citizenship behavior: Its nature and antecedents. Journal of Applied Psychology, 68, 653-663.
33. Spector, P. (2008). Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice (5th edition.) New York: John Wiley & Sons.
34. Torgler, B., Schmidt, S. L. & Frey, B. S. (2006). Relative income position and performance: An empirical panel analysis. FEEM Working Paper No. 39. Available at: https://papers.ssrn.com/sol3/papers.cfm?abstract_id=889328
35. United Nations Research Institute for Social Development (2005). Gender equality: striving for justice in an unequal world. Geneva, Switzerland: UNRISD.
36. Winch, P. J., Bhattacharyya, K., Debay, M., arriot, E.G., Bertoli S.A. & Morrow, R.H., (2003). Improving the performance of facility- and community-based health workers, State-of-the-Art Series: Health Worker Performance, CSTS, Maryland.
37. Yi, K.E. (1993). From gentry to middle class: The transformation of family, community, and gender in Korea. Dissertation abstracts international, Chicago University, 29921743, 487