
Effect of Reward Satisfaction on Job Performance: Employee Perspectives

Prakash Shrestha, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Nepal Commerce Campus, Faculty of Management, Tribhuvan University

e-mail: prakash.shrestha1@ncc.tu.edu.np

<https://orcid.org/0000-0002-6973-9343>

Guna Raj Chhetri, Ph.D.

Associate Professor, Balkumari College, Narayangarh, Chitwan

e-mail: grchhetri1@gmail.com (Corresponding author)

<https://orcid.org/0009-0004-5195-2228>

Keshab Khadka

Assistant Professor, Graduate School of Management, Mid- West University, Surkhet

e-mail: ku.keshab17@gmail.com

<https://orcid.org/0009-0005-9485-4473>

ABSTRACT

The purpose of this study is to analyze the effect of reward satisfaction on job performance of employees. This research employs a descriptive research design. A total of 350 questionnaires were distributed to seven insurance companies. The findings demonstrate a significant association between pay level satisfaction and job performance. They also show that salary administration has an important and positive effect on job performance. The findings indicate that raise satisfaction has a favorable and significant impact on job performance. They also demonstrate a positive and significant effect of benefits satisfaction on employee job performance. In fact, employee satisfaction with organizational rewards has a significant and favorable effect on job performance. Organizational rewards, both intrinsic (recognition, career growth chances) and extrinsic (bonuses, raises), have the potential to greatly increase enthusiasm. When employees believe their efforts are recognized and rewarded, they are more motivated to perform effectively. Rewards make employees feel valued and appreciated, which leads to increased job satisfaction. Employees who are satisfied with their rewards are more likely to be engaged and committed to their jobs. Therefore, today's organizations must focus on effective rewards that satisfy employees and effectively improve their performance levels.

Keywords: Job performance, Reward, Satisfaction, Employee, Insurance industry

Introduction

To remain competitive in the industry and expand market share, companies must implement efficient and effective strategies in several areas of operations. Employee performance is critically important to the company's productivity and profitability (Pradhan, 2022). For that, companies must focus on effective reward systems and ensure that their employees are satisfied with them. Employees are highly motivated at work when they believe their incentive is fair and efficient (Shrestha, 2023), which improves their performance level. In fact, with companies experiencing financial challenges as a result of the COVID-19 epidemic, boosting employee performance has become a major issue in organizational reward administration. Because a single money incentive is no longer considered the sole motivator for employees, companies strive to improve job performance by providing the appropriate overall reward system as an employee-driven system, particularly when it is difficult to provide higher financial rewards (Rai et al., 2019; Li & Yin, 2019; Landry & Whillans, 2018). Total reward encompasses all forms of non-financial and financial returns provided by firms to their employees (Gieter & Hofmans, 2015). Currently, numerous businesses across industries around the world use a total reward system (Sarkar, 2022; Li & Yin, 2019). A comprehensive reward system is distinguished by a personalized combination of rewards that can meet the needs or preferences of individuals (Hartmann et al., 2020; Bussin & Van Rooy, 2014). Therefore, many practitioners are increasingly interested in how total reward satisfaction improves job performance (Chunling et al., 2023).

Turning to the Nepalese context, insurance companies are essential components of the country's economic

development. These companies' transactions in Nepal are fast increasing, as they are in other nations. Nepalese insurance companies provide their clients with the best possible services. They have become more competitive in the current market as a result of a new trend in the insurance industry. The current trend in this industry merely requires trained and knowledgeable employees. The country now has significant growth in such skilled employees. Because of competitive tendencies, insurance companies are paying higher salaries and providing additional benefits to their opponents' workforce. Providing more and giving workers recognition is vital and in necessity right now (Ahmed & Shabbir, 2017). To sustain, these companies must keep their competent and skilled employees by offering higher pay and rewards that enhance their job performance.

Finding and keeping qualified personnel is one of the most critical difficulties facing companies today. Furthermore, employee gains and benefits are regarded as one of the primary advantages of any type of firm. Employee satisfaction is critical to achieving the highest levels of efficiency and effectiveness. Furthermore, Priya and Eshwar (2014) rightly say that employees give maximum effort when they believe their hard work and success are rewarded. As a result, reward satisfaction is an important factor in determining employee performance. In fact, today companies are extremely concerned with employee performance. It is because employee performance has a direct impact on organizational performance. In essence, when the majority of people perform poorly, the organization's performance suffers as a result. On the other hand, employees respect higher-level performance at work because it serves as the foundation for their pay, allowing them to raise their standard of living (Musse, 2012).

Employees need to improve their quality of life. For that, they actively search for work in those types of companies, which offer higher-level of pay, incentives, benefits, and other perks. In fact, effective rewards and benefits are vital for employee job performance (Mokhtar 2011). Thus, Nepalese businesses must examine the realities of the workplace. In this context, the purpose of this study is to analyze the effect of reward satisfaction on employee performance at Nepalese insurance companies.

Literature Review

Conceptualizing Reward Satisfaction and Dimensions

Reward has become increasingly important, especially in today's dynamic and competitive economy. This is because it enables companies to recruit and retain personnel while also increasing productivity (Dalvi and Ebrahimi, 2013). A comprehensive reward system is an excellent management tool for motivating underperforming employees and enhancing high achievers' job satisfaction (Dewhurst et al., 2009). Sufficient rewards instill in employees a sense of worth, and management recognizes and values their efforts (Pradhan, 2022). Reward satisfaction is referred to as employee satisfaction with the pay and benefits that they receive from their companies (Ballentine & Scarpello, 2009). It occurs when employees' perceptions of how much money they should earn match the amount they really obtain. If such perceptions are equivalent, employee will be satisfied with their rewards (Milkovich & Newman, 2008).

Rewards satisfaction includes four key dimensions: pay level satisfaction, salary administration, and benefits satisfaction.

Pay level satisfaction

Employees tend to feel more satisfied with their pay if it is comparatively better or at least on par, with what other organizations offer for similar work (Malhotra et al., 2007). Pay satisfaction is more influenced by an individual's assessment of their current pay in proportion to where they believe it should be, rather than their actual pay level. The disparity between perceived pay levels and what employees believe their pay should be is likely to influence real pay levels and satisfaction (Till & Karren, 2011). Salaries or earnings, as indicators of pay level, have regularly been demonstrated to influence pay satisfaction (Miceli & Lane, 1991). To achieve pay satisfaction, organizations must have a clear policy about the perception of pay-for-performance. This view has a beneficial influence on pay satisfaction. This viewpoint has a positive impact on pay satisfaction. Perceived links between pay and performance explain greater variation in pay rise satisfaction than all demographic variables combined (Bordia & Blau, 1998). As a result, introducing a pay for performance compensation scheme may be the most successful technique for increasing pay level satisfaction (Majid, 2013).

Salary administration

Employees' understanding of pay criteria directly influences pay satisfaction. Therefore, employees who are familiar with pay criteria, structure, policies, and administration within an organization are likely to experience higher satisfaction with salary administration. Moreover, the perceptions of managers' impact on pay affect satisfaction with the structure and administration of the pay system. Employees who perceive that

managers have less influence over the pay system tend to be more satisfied with salary administration (Miceli & Lane, 1991). Furthermore, because most firms base pay choices on performance appraisals, employees who associate payment administration with performance appraisal outcomes are more likely to be dissatisfied with it (Majid, 2013).

Raise satisfaction

Pay raise satisfaction is influenced by three variables: (a) *past raise history*: individuals who have received pay raises in the past are likely to have a good reaction to future gains, positively influencing pay raise satisfaction; (b) *accuracy of performance assessment*: accurate performance assessments positively influence pay satisfaction; and (c) *perceived contingency between performance and pay*: when employees perceive a strong link between their performance and their pay, it positively influences pay raise satisfaction. In addition, if employees see pay raise criteria based on variables other than performance, they may view these criteria as appropriate, but this might lead to decreased satisfaction with pay raises. In addition to actual pay raises, differences in pay satisfaction can be explained by the perceived justice of raises in procedures (Folger & Konovsky, 1989; Majid, 2013).

Benefits satisfaction

Benefit satisfaction is frequently associated with employee satisfaction and is used as a retention tool. Many businesses use distinct benefits schemes to attract and retain employees. Dreher et al. (1988) found that benefit satisfaction is influenced by both benefit coverage and employee costs. Benefits are routinely provided to employees at all levels. As a result, it may be worthwhile to explore the elements that influence their views of benefit satisfaction (Miceli & Lane, 1991). Miceli and Lane (1991) found that age negatively influences benefit satisfaction. This implies that long-serving employees in an organization are less influenced by benefit satisfaction. This can be linked to the argument that the use of medical benefits, which are the most expensive benefits for both employers and employees, increases with age (Milkovich & Newman, 2008). Older employees, being particularly sensitive to out-of-pocket benefit expenses, are expected to be less satisfied with their benefits. Additionally, salary grade level is hypothesized to be negatively related to benefit satisfaction. Miceli and Lane (1991) noted that as inputs into the benefits system (such as co-payments, deductibles, etc.) increase relative to benefit outcomes, satisfaction with benefits decreases. This suggests that as employees' income levels rise within an organization, the impact of benefit satisfaction diminishes among higher-earning groups (Majid, 2013).

Conceptualizing Job Performance

An organization's success in achieving its strategic objectives depends on its employees' ability to perform at their best. A prior study (Carragher & Buckley, 2008) reported that perceived workplace injustice can lead to counterproductive work behaviors and demotivation. Injustice, particularly related to pay diversity and resource distribution, directly impacts employee motivation. There are various ways to evaluate employee performance (Williams & Anderson, 1991). Williams and Anderson (1991) identified two measures for assessing employee performance: the benefits offered to organizational citizenship behaviors and the contributions to these behaviors by individuals and organizations. Borman and Motowidlo (1997) introduced the concept of task performance, defined as the effectiveness with which job incumbents perform activities that contribute to the organization's technical core. They argued that such behaviors are crucial because they shape the organizational, social, and psychological context that facilitates task activities and processes (Majid, 2013).

Impact of Reward Satisfaction and Job Performance

There is a strong link between the reward procedures and employee satisfaction. Employee job performance rises when they are satisfied with their rewards (Ahmed & Shabbir, 2017). Flynn (1998) contended that reward and recognition programs boost employee spirits and foster job performance. Similarly, a study demonstrated a relationship between pay level and rewards (Till & Karren, 2011; Wu & Wang, 2008). Williams et al. (2006) found that pay satisfaction often depends on the discrepancy between the perceived pay level and what employees believe their pay should be. Additionally, Gresham (2006) also reported a positive association between benefits and satisfaction. Heneman III and Schwab (1985) also found a positive association between reward satisfaction and employee job performance. They noted that organizations and the workforce may have differing perceptions of satisfaction concerning various dimensions such as pay level, benefits, raises, and pay structure. Stredwick (2000) argued that employees are motivated by rewards to showcase high performance, and their satisfaction with these rewards is crucial for enhancing work performance. Similarly, Nithy (2010) and Musse (2012) suggested that rewards help employees focus on organizational goals and work towards receiving them.

Based on these discussions, this study proposes the following hypotheses:

- H1: Pay level satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on job performance.
 H2: Salary administration has a positive and significant effect on job performance.
 H3: Raise satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on job performance.
 H4: Benefits satisfaction has a positive and significant effect on job performance.

Research Methods

This research employs a descriptive research design. It assumes that employee job performance is a consequence of reward satisfaction. This study's population consists of personnel from the Nepalese insurance sector. This sector was chosen because of its rapid and significant growth in this nation. This sector is thought to be a suitable match for such a study since it has (a) top, medium, and lower-level employees, as well as (b) people with similar characteristics. A snowball sampling technique was employed to get input regarding the responses.

A total of 350 questionnaires were distributed to seven insurance companies: Citizen Life Insurance Limited, SuryaJyoti Life Insurance Company Limited, Rastriya Jiban Beema Company Limited, Sun Nepal Life Insurance Company Limited, Nepal Life Insurance Company Limited, National Life Insurance Company Limited, and Life Insurance Corporation (Nepal) Limited. Only 237 (67.71 percent) were given responses. Table 1 presents the demographic characteristics of participants.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Participants

Characteristics	N	%
Gender		
Male	127	53.59
Female	110	46.41
Marital status		
Single	97	40.93
Married	140	59.07
Age in years		
20-30 years	112	47.26
31-40 years	81	34.18
41-50 years	34	14.35
>50 years	10	4.219
Experience		
1-5 years	45	18.99
6-9 years	58	24.47
10-15 years	53	22.36
>15 years	81	34.18

Reward satisfaction was measured using the 18-item scale established by Heneman and Schwab (1985). These 18 items evaluate employees' overall satisfaction with organizational rewards. Williams and Anderson (1991) developed a six-item scale used to assess job performance. A Likert Scale of 1 to 5 (1 = highly dissatisfied, 2 = unsatisfied, 3 = not unhappy, 4 = satisfied, and 5 = strongly satisfied) was used as the measurement scale.

Results and Findings

Results of Descriptive Analysis, Correlation Analysis and Internal Consistencies

Table 2 presents the results of descriptive analysis, correlation analysis and internal consistencies.

Table 2: Results of Descriptive Analysis, Correlation Analysis and Internal Consistencies

Scales	Mean	SD	PLS	SAS	RS	BS	JP	Alpha
Pay Level Satisfaction	4.35	0.35	1					0.81
Salary Administration Satisfaction	3.57	0.39		1				0.84
Raise Satisfaction	3.64	0.43	0.32		1			0.91
Benefits Satisfaction	4.21	0.47	0.18	0.29	0.41	1		0.89
Job Performance	3.78	0.42	0.63**	0.54**	0.64**	0.69**	1	0.93

Note: Significant at * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$ (2-tailed).

Cronbach coefficients for all variables exceed 0.70. So, the tools used to test each variable in this study are reliable and offer useful information.

The results show that employees are quite satisfied with their compensation. The average satisfaction with compensation administration is moderate. They are moderately satisfied with their raises. The employees are very satisfied with their benefits. In fact, they are most satisfied with their compensation and benefits. However, they rate their job performance moderately high. The results also show that all four satisfaction scales (Pay Level, Salary Administration, Raise, and Benefits) have significant positive associations with job performance. The strongest correlation is between benefits satisfaction and job performance, followed by raise satisfaction, pay level satisfaction, and salary administration satisfaction.

Table 3: Regression Results

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
Constant	17.26	1.637		10.54	0.00
Pay Level Satisfaction	0.322	0.107	0.143	3.019	0.01 *
Salary Administration Satisfaction	0.495	0.118	0.235	4.21	0.00**
Raise Satisfaction	0.326	0.064	0.326	5.096	0.02 *
Benefits Satisfaction	1.316	0.085	0.69	15.53	0.00 *

$R^2 = 0.784$; Adjusted $R^2 = 0.781$, F -Value = 211.138

Note: * $p < 0.05$, ** $p < 0.01$

Dependent Variable: Job Performance

The R-squared value of 0.784 indicates that approximately 78.4% of the variance in job performance can be explained by the predictor variables (pay level satisfaction, salary administration satisfaction, raise satisfaction, and benefits satisfaction). This suggests a very good fit for the model.

The results show all the satisfaction scales (Pay Level, Salary Administration, Raise, and Benefits) are significant predictors of job performance. Salary Administration Satisfaction and Benefits Satisfaction are the most significant predictors. Pay Level Satisfaction and Raise Satisfaction are also significant predictors. The results support all the hypotheses of this study.

Discussion and Conclusion

The findings demonstrate a positively significant impact of pay level satisfaction on employee performance. It suggests that if the workforce is content with existing salary levels, they will increase their job performance positively (Mokhtar, 2011; Till & Karren, 2011; Williams et al., 2006). In fact, pay level has a positive effect on reward satisfaction. Therefore, pay level satisfaction can be viewed as a crucial indicator of great job performance as assessed by insurance company employees (Majid, 2013). The findings also show that salary administration has an important and positive effect on job performance. Mainly, the perceived managerial influence over payment influences satisfaction with the pay system's structure and administration (Miceli & Lane, 1991). Employees who believe that supervisors have less control over the pay system are happier with salary administration (Mokhtar, 2011). Thus, effective salary administration is a critical driver of job performance. Organizations can improve employee performance, satisfaction, and retention by creating and executing fair, transparent, and motivating wage structures, which ultimately contribute to corporate success.

The findings indicate that raise satisfaction has a favorable and significant impact on job performance. Employees receive raises as a tangible reward for their hard work and dedication, motivating them to maintain or enhance their performance to continue receiving such incentives. A raise is a kind of appreciation from the

company, making employees feel valued and appreciated. This increases their morale and job happiness, resulting in improved performance. Competitive pay helps keep top personnel. Employees are less inclined to seek other job options if they believe they are being appropriately compensated, ensuring the organization's continuity and performance requirements. Raises can also encourage loyalty and dedication to the organization. Loyal employees are more engaged and dedicated to their jobs, which leads to improved performance.

The findings demonstrate a positive and significant effect of benefits satisfaction on employee job performance (Ballentine & Scarpello, 2009; Gresham, 2006). It indicates that when big promotion plans are used in firms, employee happiness increases (Phelan & Lin, 2001). Benefits satisfaction encourages management to employ the reward and incentive systems to optimize workforce activities in order to increase their performance level and effectiveness as motivators (Noor et al., 2020; Ngwa et al. 2019; Rai et al., 2018; Majid, 2013; Mokhtar, 2011). Adequate benefits, including health insurance, retirement plans, and wellness initiatives, help employees feel better overall. When employees feel valued, they are more satisfied with their jobs which increase their performance. Furthermore, benefits satisfaction boosts employee morale. A good attitude toward the workplace and colleagues promotes teamwork and overall productivity. Furthermore, performance-based incentives, including bonuses, stock options, and profit-sharing programs, are directly linked to job performance, driving employees to perform better.

In conclusion, employee satisfaction with organizational rewards has a significant and favorable effect on job performance. Organizational rewards, both intrinsic (recognition, career growth chances) and extrinsic (bonuses, raises), have the potential to greatly increase enthusiasm. When employees believe their efforts are recognized and rewarded, they are more motivated to perform effectively. Rewards make employees feel valued and appreciated, which leads to increased job satisfaction. Employees who are satisfied with their rewards are more likely to be engaged and committed to their jobs. Therefore, today's organizations must focus on effective rewards that satisfy employees and effectively improve their performance levels.

REFERENCES

- Ahmed, I., & Shabbir, S. (2017). The effects of rewards on employee's performance in banks: a study of three districts (Lodhran, Vehari, Khanewal) commercial banks in Pakistan. *International Review of Management and Business Research*, 6(1), 352-361.
- Ballentine, T. J., & Scarpello, V. G. (2009). *Compensation decision making* (4th ed.). Cincinnati, Ohio: South-Western College Publishing.
- Bordia, P., & Blau, G. (1998). Pay referent comparison and pay level satisfaction in private versus public sector organisations in India. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9(1), 155-167.
- Borman, W. C., & Motowidlo, S. J. (1997). Task performance and contextual performance: The meaning for personnel selection research. *Human Performance*, 10, 99-109.
- Bussin, M., & Van Rooy, D.J. (2014). Total rewards strategy for a multi-generational workforce in a financial institution. *SA Journal of Human Resource Management*, 12(1), 1-11.
- Carraher, S.M. & Buckley, M.R. (2008). Attitudes towards benefits and behavioral intentions and their relationship to absenteeism, performance, and turnover among nurses. *Academy of Health Care Management Journal*, 4(2), 89-109.
- Chunling Li, Xueyun Duan, Xiangling Chu, & Yong Qiu (2023). Total reward satisfaction profiles and work performance: A person-centered approach, *Heliyon*, 9(3), e14154, <https://doi.org/10.1016/j.heliyon.2023.e14154>.
- Dalvi, M., & Ebrahimi, H. (2013). Investigating the effects of reward on the cooperation in the sale and marketing department from managers' perspective (Isfahan Food industries Case Study). *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social sciences*, 3(1), 144-153.
- Dewhurst, M., Guthridge, M., & Mohr, E. (2009). Motivating people: Getting beyond money. *McKinsey Quarterly*, 1 (4), 12-15.
- Dreher, G.F., Ash, R.A., & Bretz, R.D. (1988). Benefit coverage and employee cost: Critical factors in explaining compensation satisfaction. *Personnel Psychology*, 41, 237 -254
- Flynn, G. (1998). Is your recognition program understood? *Workforce*, 77(7), 30-35.
- Folger, R., & Konovsky, M.A (1989). Effects of procedural and distributive justice on reactions to pay raise decisions. *Academy of Management Journal*, 32, 115-130.
- Gieter, S. De, & Hofmans, J. (2015). How reward satisfaction affects employees' turnover intentions and performance: an individual differences approach. *Human Resource Management Journal*, 25(2), 200-216.
- Gresham, L. (2006). Employees' satisfaction with benefits is rising. *Employee- Consumer*. April 15, 17-18.
- Hartmann, C., Stuedemann, J., & Viney, B. (2020). The right stuff: exploring total rewards in 2021 and beyond. *Workspan*, 63(6), 12-17.
- Heneman III, H. G., & Schwab, D. P. (1985). Pay satisfaction: its multidimensional nature and measurement. *International Journal of Psychology*, 20(1), 129- 141.
- Landry, A.T., & Whillans, A. (2018). The power of workplace rewards: using self-determination theory to understand why reward satisfaction matters for workers around the world. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 50(3), 123-148. <https://doi.org/10.1177/0886368719840515>
- Li, C., & Yin, L. (2019). Can total rewards satisfaction improve employees' job performance in retail enterprises? *China University of Labor Relations*, 33(4), 88-100.
- Majid, A.R. (2013). Relationship between organizational rewards satisfaction and work performance of human resource professional in group human capital sector, Maybank. Malaysia: Othman Yeop Abdullah Graduate School of Business, Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Malhotra, N., Budhwar, P., & Prowse, P. (2007). Linking rewards to commitment: an empirical investigation of four UK call centres. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 18(12), 2095-128.
- Miceli, M.P., & Lane, M.C. (1991). *Antecedents of pay satisfaction: A review and extension*. In G.R. Ferris & K.M. Rowland (Eds.), *Research in personnel and human resources management* (Vol. 9, pp. 235-309). Greenwich, CT: JAI Press
- Milkovich G. T., & Newman J. M. (2008). *Compensation* (9th ed.). New York: McGraw Hill International.

- Mokhtar, K.B.A (2011). *Relationship between organizational rewards satisfactions and work performance*. Malaysia: Universiti Utara Malaysia.
- Musse, A. (2012). *The influence of rewards and satisfaction on employees' performance in organization*. Malaysia: Insaniah University College.
- Ngwa, W.T., Adeleke, B.S., Agbaeze, E.K., Ghasi, N.C., & Imhanrenialena, B.O. (2019). Effect of Reward System on Employee Performance among Selected Manufacturing Firms in the Litoral Region of Cameroon. *Academy of Strategic Management Journal*, 18(3), 1-16.
- Nithy, T. (2010). *Rewards don't work: Courting Changes*, retrieved on March 24, 2011, Available at <http://thestar.com.my/education/story.asp?file=/2010/7/11/education/6597335&sec=edu..>
- Noor, Z., Nayaz, N., Solanki, V., Manoj, A., & Sharma, A. (2020). Impact of rewards system on employee motivation: A study of a manufacturing firm in Oman. *International Journal of Business and Management Future*, 4(2), 6-16. <https://doi.org/10.46281/ijbmf.v4i2.692>
- Phelan, S.E., & Lin, Z. (2001). Promotion Systems and Organizational Performance: A Contingency Model. *Computational & Mathematical Organization Theory* 7, 207–232.
- Pradhan, G. M. (2022). Impact of Reward Systems on Employee Performance of Service Sector Institutions in Nepal. *The Batuk*, 8(2), 1–13. <https://doi.org/10.3126/batuk.v8i2.47008>
- Priya, T. U. & Eshwar, T.S. (2014). Rewards, motivation and job satisfaction of employees in commercial banks- an investigative analysis. *International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences*, 4(4), 70-78.
- Rai, A., Ghosh, P., Chauhan, R., & Sing, R. (2018). Improving in-role and extra-role performances with rewards and recognition. *Journal of Management Research Review*, 41(8), 902-919.
- Rai, A., Ghosh, P., & Dutta, T. (2019). Total rewards to enhance employees' intention to stay: does perception of justice play any role? *Evidence-based HRM*, 7(3), 262-280.
- Sarkar, J. (2022). Measuring total rewards satisfaction: a scale development study. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 57(3), 430-449,
- Shrestha, P. (2016). *Organizational justice and employee work outcomes in service sector of Nepal*. Kathmandu: Tribhuvan University.
- Shrestha, P. (2023). Motivating employees through job design and compensation: an observation. *Nepalese Journal of Management Research*, 3(1), 26–31. <https://doi.org/10.3126/njmgtr.v3i1.57912>
- Stredwick, J. (2000). Aligning rewards to organisational goals and a multinational's experience. *European Business Review*, 12(1), 9-18.
- Till, R. E., & Karren, R. (2011). Organizational justice perceptions and pay level satisfaction. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 26 (1), 4257.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S.E (1991). Job satisfaction and organizational commitment as predictors of organizational citizenship and in-role behaviors. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601-617.
- Williams, M.L., McDaniel, J.A., & Nguyen, N.T. (2006). "A meta-analysis of antecedents and consequences of pay level satisfaction", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 91, 392-413.
- Wu, X., & Wang, C. (2008). Impact of organizational justice on employees' pay satisfaction, work attitudes and performance in Chinese hotels. *Journal of Human Resources in Hospitality & Tourism*, 7(2), 181-195.