

Job security and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). A cross-sectional study.

David Gayen Logirangole*, Hope Evelyn Kyounda
School of Graduate Studies and Research, Team University

Page | 1

ABSTRACT

Background

The study aimed to assess the relationship between job security and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA).

Methodology

Study a descriptive mixed-methods design to assess relationships between working conditions and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area. The population was 140 employees, and the sample size was 104, determined using the Yamane formula. Purposive and simple random sampling were used. Data were collected through questionnaires, interviews, and documentary review. Instruments included questionnaires and interview checklists. Data analysis used SPSS descriptive and inferential statistics, including Pearson correlation. Validity and reliability were tested using CVI and Cronbach's alpha. Ethical procedures ensured confidentiality, voluntary participation, and approval.

Results

A response rate of 96.2% (100/104) was achieved. Respondents were male 68 (68%) and female 32 (32%). Education level included Bachelor's degree 36 (36%), Diploma 34 (34%), Secondary certificate 22 (22%), and Postgraduate 8 (8%). Departmental distribution showed Administration 32 (32%), Operations 28 (28%), Programs 26 (26%), and Leadership 6 (6%), indicating representation across key units. Job security recorded low mean scores ranging from $M=2.23-2.44$, reflecting weak stability ($M=2.33$), unclear policies ($M=2.23$), and limited promotion clarity ($M=2.36$). Employee performance ranged from $M=2.36-3.44$, with delays strongly affecting output ($M=3.44$) and low service delivery efficiency ($M=2.42$). Themes highlighted job insecurity, weak policy enforcement, poor communication, and limited career progression, contributing to reduced motivation and uneven performance across departments. A moderate positive correlation existed between job security and performance ($r=0.59$, $p<0.01$).

Conclusion

Job security in GPAA was relatively weak, with employees experiencing uncertainty regarding employment continuity, unclear promotion systems, and inadequate communication on job stability.

Recommendation

GPAA should strengthen job security mechanisms to improve employee motivation and performance.

Keywords: Job stability, employee motivation, public sector performance, local government administration, working conditions, career progression

Submitted: February 18, 2026 **Accepted:** March 17, 2026 **Published:** April 30, 2026

Corresponding Author: David Gayen Logirangole

Email: logga1972@gmail.com

School of Graduate Studies and Research of Team University

BACKGROUND OF THE STUDY

Job security refers to employees' perception of stability and continuity in their employment, particularly the assurance that their jobs are protected from arbitrary dismissal or unexpected termination. In human resource and organizational behavior literature, job security is viewed as

a key psychological factor that shapes employee attitudes, motivation, and performance. Employees who feel secure in their jobs are more likely to demonstrate organizational commitment, loyalty, and higher levels of productivity, while insecurity often leads to anxiety, low morale, and reduced performance (Bolatito & Mohamoud, 2024).

Empirical studies in Ugandan local governments provide strong evidence of this relationship. In the Kole District Local Government, a descriptive correlational study found a positive and significant relationship between job security and employee performance ($r = 0.325, p < 0.01$). The study revealed that employees who experienced unclear career progression, limited leadership opportunities, and inadequate remuneration perceived higher job insecurity, which negatively affected their motivation and performance. However, where institutions provided structured training programs and promotion pathways, employees reported improved confidence and better performance outcomes. Similarly, research conducted in Otuke District Local Government demonstrated that job security significantly influenced employee performance ($\beta = 0.413, p < 0.01$). The study emphasized that transparent recruitment processes, confirmation of staff in their positions, and timely promotions strengthened employees' sense of job stability, which in turn enhanced their commitment and productivity. These findings suggest that administrative fairness and predictable career progression systems are essential in reinforcing job security and improving performance outcomes in public institutions. Evidence beyond Uganda also supports these conclusions. In Nigeria, studies on local government councils indicate that job security significantly enhances employee commitment, which is a strong predictor of performance in public service delivery (Odia, Odigwe & Amakodi, 2026). The study aimed to assess the relationship between job security and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA).

METHODOLOGY

Research design

The study used a descriptive research design with both quantitative and qualitative approaches to examine the relationship between working conditions and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area. According to John W. Creswell (2018), descriptive research design helps describe characteristics and relationships between variables without manipulation. Quantitative data were collected through structured questionnaires and analyzed statistically, while qualitative methods provided a deeper understanding of employees' experiences and perceptions. The study was non-experimental, as variables were observed in their natural setting without manipulation.

Study population

The study population comprised employees working in the local government of the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). According to C. R. Kothari (2014), a study population refers to the entire group of individuals or objects from which data are collected and conclusions drawn. The study targeted 140 employees, as indicated in the Human Resource Records of GPAA. Participants included leadership, operational, program, and support staff involved in administrative and service delivery functions, such as the Chief Administrative Officer, Heads of Departments, Records Officers, Revenue Officers, Procurement Officers, Human Resource Officers, Community Development Officers, Health Inspectors, and Field Officers. These employees were selected because they worked under the conditions being studied and could provide reliable information on employee performance. The population helped assess how physical working conditions, job security, pay, and benefits affected employee performance within GPAA local government institutions.

Sample size

A sample refers to a subset of the population selected to represent the entire population in a research study. According to Yamane (1967), determining an appropriate sample size is important because it ensures that the collected data accurately represent the characteristics of the entire population.

The sample size for this study was determined using Yamane's formula (1967) for sample size determination.

The formula is expressed as:

Where:

$$n = N / (1 + N \times e^2)$$

Where:

n = sample size

N = population size

e = margin of error (in decimal form)

For this study:

Population size (N) = 140

Margin of error (e) = 0.05 (5%)

Step-by-Step Calculation

Square the margin of error:

$$0.05 \times 0.05 = 0.0025$$

Multiply the population size by the squared margin:

$$140 \times 0.0025 = 0.35$$

Add 1 to the result:

$$1 + 0.35 = 1.35$$

Divide the population size by this sum:

$$140 / 1.35 \approx 103.7$$

Final Sample Size

Rounding to the nearest whole number: $n = 104$ respondents

Therefore, the study used a sample size of 104 respondents drawn from the total population of 140 employees in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area.

This sample size was considered adequate for obtaining reliable data that represented the entire population.

Table 1: Sample size distribution

| Category of Respondents | Study Population | Sample Size | Sampling Techniques |
|---------------------------------------|------------------|-------------|------------------------|
| County Commissioner | 01 | 01 | Purposive Sampling |
| Political Leaders (council members) | 38 | 28 | Simple random sampling |
| Human Resource Officer | 01 | 01 | Purposive sampling |
| Administrators (heads of departments) | 12 | 09 | Simple random Sampling |
| Other Employees | 88 | 65 | Simple random sampling |
| Total | 140 | 104 | |

Source: GPAA human resource records (2026)

The study sample size consisted of 104 respondents selected from a total population of 140 employees of the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). The sample size was considered adequate to provide reliable information regarding the relationship between working conditions and employee performance. The respondents were selected from different categories of employees and leaders within the local government administration to ensure that all relevant views were represented in the study.

The sample consisted of 1 County Commissioner, 28 Political Leaders (Council Members), 1 Human Resource Officer, 9 Administrators (Heads of Departments), and 65 other employees. Selecting respondents from different administrative and operational levels enabled the study to obtain comprehensive information regarding working conditions and employee performance in GPAA.

Sampling techniques

The study employed both purposive sampling and simple random sampling techniques to select respondents. Using multiple sampling methods enabled the study to obtain specialized information from key informants as well as general information from ordinary employees.

Purposive sampling technique

Purposive sampling was used to select the County Commissioner and the Human Resource Officer. These respondents were purposely selected because of their positions, knowledge, and experience regarding employee management, administrative policies, and working conditions within the Greater Pibor Administrative Area.

The key informants were considered to possess detailed and reliable information relevant to the study objectives. Purposive sampling, therefore, enabled the study to obtain in-depth information from respondents directly involved in

decision-making and human resource management within the organization.

Simple random sampling technique

Simple random sampling was used to select Political Leaders (Council Members), Administrators (Heads of Departments), and Other Employees. This technique gave all employees within the selected categories an equal chance of being included in the study.

Simple random sampling was used to minimize bias and ensure fairness in the selection process. Employees were randomly selected from staff lists obtained from the Human Resource Department of GPAA. This approach enabled the study to obtain representative views from employees working under different conditions and responsibilities within the local government institutions.

The use of simple random sampling also increased the reliability and generalizability of the study findings because respondents were selected without discrimination or favoritism.

Data collection methods

The study used questionnaires, interviews, and documentary review as the main data collection methods. Using multiple methods enabled the study to obtain comprehensive and reliable information on the relationship between working conditions and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA).

Questionnaire method

The questionnaire method was used to collect quantitative data from the respondents. Structured questionnaires containing both closed-ended and a few open-ended questions were administered to employees selected through simple random sampling.

The questionnaires were designed in line with the study objectives and variables, particularly focusing on physical working conditions, job security, pay and benefits, and employee performance. Closed-ended questions enabled respondents to provide specific answers that were easy to analyze statistically, while open-ended questions allowed respondents to express additional views regarding their working conditions.

The questionnaire method was preferred because it allowed data collection from a large number of respondents within a short time. It also ensured confidentiality and minimized interviewer bias, as respondents completed the questionnaires independently.

Interview method

The interview method was used to collect qualitative data from key informants such as the County Commissioner and the Human Resource Officer. Face-to-face interviews were conducted using a semi-structured interview guide aligned with the study objectives. This method enabled the collection of detailed information, opinions, experiences, and explanations regarding employee working conditions and performance in GPAA. It also allowed respondents to provide in-depth insights, helping to deepen the understanding of the study problem. Additionally, the interview method facilitated clarification of unclear responses and the collection of further information that could not easily be captured through questionnaires.

Documentary review method

The documentary review method was used to collect secondary data relevant to the study. Various organizational documents and records related to employee management and performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area were reviewed. These included human resource records, attendance registers, administrative reports, policy documents, staff performance reports, payroll records, and other official publications on working conditions and employee performance. Documentary review helped verify information obtained from questionnaires and interviews while also providing background information and additional evidence on existing working conditions and employee performance within the organization. The method was useful as it allowed access to existing information at relatively low cost and within a short period of time.

Research instruments

The study used questionnaires, interview guides, and documentary review checklists as the main research instruments for collecting data from respondents and relevant organizational records. These instruments were designed in line with the study objectives and research variables in order to obtain reliable and valid information regarding the relationship between working conditions and

employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA).

Questionnaire

The questionnaire was the main instrument used to collect quantitative data from employees selected through simple random sampling. The questionnaire consisted mainly of closed-ended questions and a few open-ended questions.

The closed-ended questions were structured using a Likert scale format to enable respondents to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement with statements related to working conditions and employee performance. The questionnaire was divided into sections covering demographic information, physical working conditions, job security, pay and benefits, and employee performance.

The questionnaire instrument was preferred because it allowed data collection from a large number of respondents within a short period of time. It also ensured confidentiality and reduced interviewer bias, as respondents filled in the questionnaires independently.

Interview guide

An interview guide was used to collect qualitative data from key informants such as the County Commissioner and the Human Resource Officer. The interview guide contained semi-structured questions that were prepared according to the objectives of the study.

The instrument enabled the collection of detailed explanations, opinions, and experiences regarding working conditions and employee performance in GPAA. The semi-structured interview guide allowed flexibility during the interview process, enabling follow-up questions and clarification where necessary. The interview guide was useful because it provided in-depth information that could not easily be obtained through questionnaires alone.

Documentary review checklist

A documentary review checklist was used to guide the collection of secondary data from organizational documents and records. It helped identify and review relevant documents related to employee management and performance within the Greater Pibor Administrative Area. The documents reviewed included human resource records, staff attendance reports, payroll records, administrative reports, staff appraisal reports, and policy documents concerning employee welfare and working conditions.

The documentary review checklist ensured the collection of consistent and relevant information from available documents. It also helped verify and support data obtained through questionnaires and interviews.

Data collection procedures

Data collection refers to the systematic process of gathering information relevant to the research objectives. In this study,

several steps were followed to ensure organized and ethical data collection. First, an official introduction letter was obtained from the university and presented to the relevant authorities in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA), particularly the Human Resource Department and administrative offices, to request permission to conduct the study. After approval, the purpose of the study was explained to respondents, and their voluntary participation was sought, with assurance that the information provided would remain confidential and that the study was purely academic.

Questionnaires were then distributed personally to selected respondents, who were given sufficient time to complete them. Clarification was provided where necessary to ensure proper understanding of the questions, and completed questionnaires were collected for analysis to enhance response rate and accuracy. In addition, interviews were conducted with key informants through arranged face-to-face meetings using an interview guide, and notes were taken to capture important responses and explanations regarding working conditions and employee performance. Finally, a documentary review was carried out by examining relevant organizational documents and records related to employee management and performance.

Information obtained from documents such as human resource records, attendance reports, payroll records, and administrative reports was recorded systematically for analysis and comparison with primary data collected from respondents.

Validity and reliability of the research instrument

Ensuring the validity and reliability of research instruments is essential for producing accurate and trustworthy research findings.

Validity of the instrument

The Content Validity Index (CVI) was used to assess the validity of the research instrument. The questionnaire was presented to the research supervisor and two academic experts to evaluate the relevance of each item in relation to the study objectives and variables.

The experts were requested to examine the questionnaire items and rate them according to their relevance, clarity, and appropriateness in measuring working conditions and employee performance. Items considered relevant were retained, while those considered unclear or irrelevant were revised according to the recommendations provided by the experts.

The CVI was calculated using the following formula:

$$CVI = \frac{\text{Number of items rated relevant by the experts}}{\text{Total number of items in the questionnaire}}$$

For example, the questionnaire contained 40 items, and out of these, 32 items were rated as relevant by the experts. The CVI was therefore calculated as follows:

$$CVI = \frac{32}{40} = 0.8$$

The calculated CVI value of 0.8 indicated that the instrument was valid because it exceeded the acceptable minimum value of 0.70 recommended by Mary Lynn (1986).

It was therefore concluded that the questionnaire adequately covered the study variables and was suitable for collecting reliable data on working conditions and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA).

Reliability of the instrument

Reliability referred to the degree to which a research instrument produced consistent and stable results when administered repeatedly under similar conditions. According to Abdul Hameed Amin (2005), a reliable research instrument ensures consistency and accuracy in the measurement of variables.

To test the reliability of the questionnaire, a pilot study was conducted among a small group of respondents outside the actual study population but with similar characteristics to the target population. In this study, 10 respondents were selected for the pilot test. The purpose of the pilot study was to identify any ambiguities in the questionnaire and to assess the internal consistency of the items.

After data collection from the pilot study, the responses were coded and entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) software for analysis. Cronbach's Alpha coefficient was then computed to determine the internal consistency of the questionnaire items measuring the study variables.

The Cronbach's Alpha formula used in SPSS assesses the average correlation among items within the instrument. The output produced a reliability coefficient (α) value of 0.80. This value was obtained after all questionnaire items related to working conditions and employee performance were analyzed together.

The obtained Cronbach's Alpha value of 0.80 indicated that the instrument had good internal consistency because it was above the acceptable threshold of 0.70 recommended by David George and Paul Mallery (2016).

Therefore, the questionnaire was considered reliable and suitable for use in the main study. It was used for data collection with confidence that it would produce consistent and dependable results in measuring working conditions and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA).

Data analysis

After data collection, the data were organized for analysis. Completed questionnaires were checked for completeness and consistency to ensure accuracy and remove incomplete or incorrectly filled responses. The data were then coded and entered into the computer for statistical analysis.

Quantitative data were analyzed using the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 27. According to IBM SPSS Statistics (2018), SPSS is widely used in social science research for analyzing quantitative data and generating statistical outputs. The analysis involved both descriptive and inferential statistics.

Descriptive statistics were used to summarize and present data using frequencies, percentages, means, and standard deviations. Tables and charts were also used to clearly present respondents' characteristics and their views on working conditions and employee performance in GPAA.

Inferential statistics were used to determine the relationship between study variables. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was applied to examine the relationship between working conditions and employee performance. According to C. R. Kothari (2014), correlation analysis helps determine the strength and direction of

relationships between variables. The analysis specifically tested relationships between physical working conditions and employee performance, job security and employee performance, and pay and benefits and employee performance.

The results were presented in tables and interpreted according to the study objectives to draw conclusions on the relationship between working conditions and employee performance in GPAA.

Ethical considerations

Ethical considerations were observed to protect the rights, dignity, and privacy of all respondents throughout the study. First, permission was obtained from the relevant authorities in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA) before conducting the research, and respondents were informed about the purpose of the study, with participation being strictly voluntary. Second, confidentiality and anonymity were ensured by not recording respondents' names and using all information strictly for academic purposes, with data securely handled to prevent unauthorized access. Third, respondents were not forced or pressured to participate and were free to withdraw from the study at any stage without any consequences or penalties.

These ethical measures helped to promote honesty, protect participants' rights, and ensure the credibility and integrity of the research findings.

RESULTS

Table 2: Response rate of respondents

| Category of respondents | Questionnaires issued and interviews scheduled | Questionnaires collected and interviews conducted | Response rate (%) |
|---------------------------------------|--|---|-------------------|
| County commissioner | 01 | 01 | 100% |
| Political Leaders (Council Members) | 28 | 28 | 100% |
| Human Resource Officer | 01 | 01 | 100% |
| Administrators (Heads of Departments) | 09 | 08 | 88.9% |
| Other employees | 65 | 62 | 95.4% |
| Total | 104 | 100 | 96.2% |

Source: Primary Data (2026)

The results in Table 2 indicate that out of 104 questionnaires and interviews scheduled, 100 were completed and returned, representing an overall response rate of 96.2%. This response rate was considered very high and adequate for analysis, as it exceeded the minimum acceptable response rate for social science research.

All respondents in the categories of County Commissioner, Political Leaders, and the Human Resource Officer fully

participated, achieving a 100% response rate. Administrators recorded a response rate of 88.9%, while Other Employees recorded 95.4%, which was still considered reliable for the study.

The high response rate was attributed to the researcher's follow-up efforts, personal administration of questionnaires, and assurance of confidentiality, which encouraged participation among respondents.

Table 3: Demographic characteristics of respondents (N = 100)

| Variable | Category | Frequency (n) | Percentage (%) |
|-------------------------|-----------------------|---------------|----------------|
| Gender | Male | 68 | 68% |
| | Female | 32 | 32% |
| Age group | 18–25 years | 14 | 14% |
| | 26–35 years | 41 | 41% |
| | 36–45 years | 31 | 31% |
| | 46 years and above | 14 | 14% |
| Education level | Secondary Certificate | 22 | 22% |
| | Diploma | 34 | 34% |
| | Bachelor’s Degree | 36 | 36% |
| | Postgraduate Degree | 8 | 8% |
| Department/unit | Leadership | 6 | 6% |
| | Operations | 28 | 28% |
| | Programs | 26 | 26% |
| | Administration | 32 | 32% |
| | Other (Specify) | 8 | 8% |
| Years of service | 1–3 years | 27 | 27% |
| | 4–6 years | 33 | 33% |
| | 7–10 years | 24 | 24% |
| | Above 10 years | 16 | 16% |

Source: Primary Data (2026)

The demographic results indicate that the majority of respondents were male (68%), while female respondents accounted for 32%, showing a higher participation of males in the study.

Regarding age distribution, most respondents were within the productive working age group of 26–35 years (41%), followed by 36–45 years (31%), suggesting that the workforce in GPAA is relatively youthful and active.

In terms of education level, the majority of respondents held a Bachelor’s Degree (36%), followed by Diploma holders (34%), while a smaller proportion had Postgraduate qualifications (8%). This shows that most employees had at least a post-secondary education.

For departmental distribution, most respondents were from Administration (32%), Operations (28%), and Programs

(26%), indicating that the study captured views from key functional units of the organization.

Finally, results on years of service showed that most respondents had worked between 4 and 6 years (33%), followed by 1 and 3 years (27%). This implies that a significant proportion of employees had moderate work experience, which made their responses relevant and reliable for the study.

Job security in the GAAP local government in South Sudan

Descriptive analysis of job security in the GAAP local government in South Sudan

Table 4: Responses on job security in GPAA local government (N = 100)

| Statement | SA (%) | A (%) | N (%) | SD (%) | D (%) | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|-----------|
| 1. I feel secure in my current job position | 12 (12%) | 18 (18%) | 10 (10%) | 30 (30%) | 30 (30%) | 2.42 | 1.32 |
| 2. Employment provides stability and continuity | 10 (10%) | 16 (16%) | 12 (12%) | 31 (31%) | 31 (31%) | 2.33 | 1.29 |
| 3. Clear employment security policies exist | 9 (9%) | 14 (14%) | 11 (11%) | 33 (33%) | 33 (33%) | 2.23 | 1.27 |
| 4. Employees are protected from unfair dismissal | 11 (11%) | 15 (15%) | 12 (12%) | 31 (31%) | 31 (31%) | 2.34 | 1.30 |
| 5. Job security motivates better performance | 13 (13%) | 17 (17%) | 10 (10%) | 30 (30%) | 30 (30%) | 2.43 | 1.33 |

| | | | | | | | |
|--|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|------|
| 6. I am confident about my future in this organization | 10 (10%) | 16 (16%) | 12 (12%) | 31 (31%) | 31 (31%) | 2.33 | 1.29 |
| 7. Termination processes are fair and transparent | 9 (9%) | 15 (15%) | 12 (12%) | 32 (32%) | 32 (32%) | 2.27 | 1.28 |
| 8. Clear promotion and career advancement procedures exist | 11 (11%) | 16 (16%) | 11 (11%) | 31 (31%) | 31 (31%) | 2.36 | 1.31 |
| 9. Management communicates job stability clearly | 10 (10%) | 15 (15%) | 12 (12%) | 31 (31%) | 32 (32%) | 2.29 | 1.28 |
| 10. Job security reduces stress and uncertainty | 12 (12%) | 18 (18%) | 10 (10%) | 30 (30%) | 30 (30%) | 2.44 | 1.33 |

Source: Primary Data (2026)

The results in Table 4 indicate that respondents generally disagreed that job security in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA) was strong or well established. The mean scores for all statements ranged between 2.23 and 2.44, which are below the average benchmark of 3.0, showing overall dissatisfaction with job security conditions. The lowest mean score ($M = 2.23$, $SD = 1.27$) was recorded for the statement on the existence of clear employment security policies, suggesting that most employees were uncertain about formal job security guidelines. Similarly, low mean scores were observed for confidence in future employment ($M = 2.33$) and employment stability ($M = 2.33$), indicating that employees lacked assurance about long-term job continuity.

Responses also showed that a majority of employees disagreed that they were protected from unfair dismissal ($M = 2.34$) and that termination procedures were fair and transparent ($M = 2.27$). This suggests concerns about fairness and consistency in human resource management practices.

In addition, respondents disagreed that management clearly communicated job stability ($M = 2.29$), further indicating poor communication regarding employment conditions.

The standard deviation values ranged from 1.27 to 1.33, indicating moderate variation in responses, but with a general trend toward disagreement.

Overall, the findings suggest that job security in GPAA local government institutions was perceived as weak. This lack of job stability and unclear employment policies likely contributed to employee stress, low motivation, and reduced performance within the organization.

Interview responses on job security

The researcher conducted interviews with the Human Resource Officer, the County Commissioner, and selected Heads of Departments to obtain qualitative insights on job security in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). Their responses were summarized in reported speech as follows:

The Human Resource Officer reported that job security in GPAA was not fully guaranteed, stating that *“employees are generally employed under government structures, but there*

are still concerns about stability due to administrative and budgetary uncertainties.” He/she further reported that although employment procedures existed, *“implementation of clear job security policies is still weak, and some employees are not fully aware of their employment rights.”* The officer also noted that *“promotion and career advancement opportunities exist, but they are not clearly structured or regularly communicated to staff.”*

The County Commissioner reported that job security in the local government system was influenced by government policies and financial limitations. He/she stated that *“while employees are not easily dismissed without reason, financial constraints sometimes affect staffing stability and contract renewals.”* The Commissioner further reported that *“management tries to ensure fairness in employment decisions, but challenges in communication and resource allocation sometimes create uncertainty among employees.”*

The Heads of Departments reported that employees were often uncertain about their job future, stating that *“many staff members are not confident about long-term employment due to unclear communication from management.”* They further reported that *“promotion procedures are not well understood by all employees, which creates perceptions of unfairness.”* In addition, they stated that *“job security is not strongly felt among employees, and this sometimes affects motivation and commitment to work.”* In summary, the interview findings revealed that job security in GPAA was perceived as weak and uncertain. Respondents reported limited clarity on employment policies, inadequate communication on job stability, and unclear promotion procedures. These factors were reported to contribute to employee uncertainty, reduced motivation, and lower performance in local government institutions.

Thematic analysis of job security

The qualitative data obtained from the Human Resource Officer, County Commissioner, and Heads of Departments were analyzed using thematic analysis. The analysis focused on identifying key patterns and meanings related to job security in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). Several themes emerged from the respondents' views.

Theme 1: Uncertainty of Job Stability

The findings revealed that employees experienced uncertainty regarding job stability. The Human Resource Officer reported that although employees were under government structures, *“there are still concerns about stability due to administrative and budgetary uncertainties.”* Heads of Departments also stated that *“many staff members are not confident about long-term employment due to unclear communication from management.”* This theme indicates that employees were generally unsure about their job future.

Theme 2: Weak Implementation of Job Security Policies

Another key theme was the weak implementation of employment security policies. The Human Resource Officer reported that *“implementation of clear job security policies is still weak, and some employees are not fully aware of their employment rights.”* This suggests that although policies may exist, they are not effectively communicated or enforced, leading to confusion among employees.

Theme 3: Inadequate Communication on Employment Matters

The analysis also revealed poor communication between management and employees regarding job stability and employment conditions. Heads of Departments reported that *“job security is not clearly communicated to staff, which creates uncertainty and misunderstanding.”* The County Commissioner also acknowledged that communication gaps sometimes affect employee confidence in the system.

Theme 4: Limited Clarity on Promotion and Career Advancement

Respondents highlighted unclear promotion and career progression procedures. The Human Resource Officer stated that *“promotion and career advancement opportunities exist, but they are not clearly structured or regularly communicated.”* Heads of Departments also confirmed that *“promotion procedures are not well understood by employees, which creates perceptions of unfairness.”* This theme reflects a lack of transparency in career development processes.

Theme 5: Job Security and Employee Motivation

The findings showed a strong link between job security and employee motivation. Heads of Departments reported that *“lack of job security sometimes affects motivation and commitment to work.”* Similarly, the Human Resource Officer noted that uncertainty in employment conditions negatively influences employee performance and morale.

Overall, the thematic analysis revealed that job security in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area was characterized by uncertainty, weak policy implementation, poor communication, and unclear promotion procedures. These factors contributed to employee insecurity, reduced motivation, and lower performance within local government institutions.

Documentary review findings on job security

The researcher reviewed relevant organizational documents in order to support and validate the findings obtained from questionnaires and interviews. The documents examined included human resource records, employment contracts, staff deployment lists, internal memos, promotion records, and administrative reports related to personnel management in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). The findings from the documentary review were summarized as follows:

1. Employment Records and Staff Contracts

The human resource records indicated that employees in GPAA were generally employed under government administrative structures. However, the records showed inconsistencies in contract documentation for some staff members, particularly those employed on temporary or project-based terms. This suggested that job security was not uniform across all employees, contributing to uncertainty in employment continuity.

2. Promotion and Career Progression Records

The promotion records reviewed showed limited and irregular staff promotions over time. In several departments, few employees had been promoted despite long periods of service. The documents also indicated that promotion procedures were not frequently documented or clearly standardized, which supported the finding that career advancement structures were weak.

3. Staff Deployment and Transfer Records

Staff deployment records revealed frequent transfers and reassignments of employees between departments and administrative units. In some cases, transfers were not accompanied by clear communication or formal explanations. This contributed to perceptions of job instability and uncertainty among employees.

4. Internal Memos and Administrative Communications

The internal memos reviewed showed limited communication regarding job security policies, employment conditions, and career progression guidelines. In several cases, communication focused mainly on administrative instructions rather than long-term employment stability or staff welfare matters. This supported the finding of inadequate communication on job security issues.

5. Performance and Staffing Reports

Staffing and performance reports indicated that some employees exhibited inconsistent performance patterns, which were occasionally linked to uncertainty about job continuity and motivation. The reports suggested that unclear employment conditions may have contributed to reduced morale and productivity in some departments.

Overall, the documentary review confirmed the findings from questionnaires and interviews. The reviewed records indicated that job security in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area was characterized by irregular promotion practices, inconsistent contract documentation,

frequent staff transfers, and limited communication on employment stability. These factors collectively contributed to uncertainty among employees and negatively influenced motivation and performance in local government institutions.

Employee performance in the GAAP local government in South Sudan
Descriptive analysis of employee performance in the GAAP local government in South Sudan

Table 5: Employee performance in GPAA local government (N = 100)

| Statement | SA n (%) | A n (%) | N n (%) | SD n (%) | D n (%) | Mean | Std. Dev. |
|--|----------|----------|----------|----------|----------|------|-----------|
| I complete a high volume of work within a given period | 12 (12%) | 20 (20%) | 10 (10%) | 30 (30%) | 28 (28%) | 2.48 | 1.31 |
| I complete assigned projects on time | 14 (14%) | 22 (22%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 26 (26%) | 2.60 | 1.29 |
| I reduce backlog effectively | 10 (10%) | 18 (18%) | 12 (12%) | 30 (30%) | 30 (30%) | 2.38 | 1.32 |
| I meet service delivery targets | 13 (13%) | 20 (20%) | 10 (10%) | 30 (30%) | 27 (27%) | 2.52 | 1.30 |
| I use resources efficiently | 12 (12%) | 19 (19%) | 11 (11%) | 30 (30%) | 28 (28%) | 2.46 | 1.30 |
| Delays in my work reduce service delivery (R) | 25 (25%) | 30 (30%) | 10 (10%) | 20 (20%) | 15 (15%) | 3.40 | 1.25 |
| I resolve citizen complaints on time | 11 (11%) | 18 (18%) | 12 (12%) | 30 (30%) | 29 (29%) | 2.42 | 1.31 |
| My work meets quality standards | 14 (14%) | 20 (20%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 28 (28%) | 2.54 | 1.30 |
| I frequently make errors in documentation (R) | 18 (18%) | 25 (25%) | 12 (12%) | 25 (25%) | 20 (20%) | 2.88 | 1.28 |
| I follow procedures and guidelines | 13 (13%) | 21 (21%) | 10 (10%) | 29 (29%) | 27 (27%) | 2.44 | 1.30 |
| I receive positive feedback | 12 (12%) | 18 (18%) | 12 (12%) | 30 (30%) | 28 (28%) | 2.46 | 1.31 |
| My work is free from audit queries | 10 (10%) | 16 (16%) | 14 (14%) | 30 (30%) | 30 (30%) | 2.36 | 1.29 |
| I ensure transparency and accountability | 15 (15%) | 22 (22%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 25 (25%) | 2.64 | 1.30 |
| Citizens are satisfied with my services | 12 (12%) | 18 (18%) | 12 (12%) | 30 (30%) | 28 (28%) | 2.46 | 1.31 |
| I am present at my duty station during working hours | 20 (20%) | 25 (25%) | 10 (10%) | 25 (25%) | 20 (20%) | 3.00 | 1.26 |
| I am frequently absent without authorization (R) | 15 (15%) | 20 (20%) | 10 (10%) | 30 (30%) | 25 (25%) | 2.60 | 1.30 |
| I take leave as scheduled | 18 (18%) | 25 (25%) | 10 (10%) | 25 (25%) | 22 (22%) | 2.92 | 1.27 |
| I accumulate leave that disrupts operations (R) | 14 (14%) | 20 (20%) | 12 (12%) | 28 (28%) | 26 (26%) | 2.60 | 1.29 |
| I comply with assigned postings | 16 (16%) | 24 (24%) | 10 (10%) | 25 (25%) | 25 (25%) | 2.76 | 1.28 |
| Employees are often absent for long periods (R) | 12 (12%) | 18 (18%) | 12 (12%) | 30 (30%) | 28 (28%) | 2.48 | 1.30 |
| I arrive at work on time | 20 (20%) | 25 (25%) | 10 (10%) | 25 (25%) | 20 (20%) | 3.00 | 1.26 |
| I remain at my workstation during working hours | 18 (18%) | 24 (24%) | 10 (10%) | 26 (26%) | 22 (22%) | 2.90 | 1.27 |

| | | | | | | | |
|---|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|-------------|------|------|
| I attend meetings on time | 22 (22%) | 26 (26%) | 10 (10%) | 22 (22%) | 20 (20%) | 3.08 | 1.24 |
| I frequently arrive late (R) | 14 (14%) | 20 (20%) | 12 (12%) | 28 (28%) | 26 (26%) | 2.60 | 1.30 |
| I respond promptly to urgent tasks | 15 (15%) | 22 (22%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 25 (25%) | 2.64 | 1.29 |
| I complete tasks within deadlines | 14 (14%) | 22 (22%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 26 (26%) | 2.60 | 1.29 |
| I submit reports on time | 16 (16%) | 24 (24%) | 10 (10%) | 26 (26%) | 24 (24%) | 2.72 | 1.28 |
| I complete processes without delays | 15 (15%) | 22 (22%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 25 (25%) | 2.64 | 1.29 |
| I ensure timely service delivery | 18 (18%) | 24 (24%) | 10 (10%) | 26 (26%) | 22 (22%) | 2.90 | 1.27 |
| Delays affect my performance (R) | 26 (26%) | 30 (30%) | 10 (10%) | 20 (20%) | 14 (14%) | 3.44 | 1.24 |
| I am willing to work in hardship areas | 20 (20%) | 28 (28%) | 10 (10%) | 24 (24%) | 18 (18%) | 3.08 | 1.26 |
| I perform effectively despite limited resources | 16 (16%) | 22 (22%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 24 (24%) | 2.74 | 1.28 |
| I work without constant supervision | 14 (14%) | 20 (20%) | 12 (12%) | 28 (28%) | 26 (26%) | 2.60 | 1.29 |
| I take initiative in my duties | 18 (18%) | 24 (24%) | 10 (10%) | 26 (26%) | 22 (22%) | 2.90 | 1.27 |
| I participate in community activities | 15 (15%) | 22 (22%) | 10 (10%) | 28 (28%) | 25 (25%) | 2.64 | 1.29 |
| I remain professional during instability | 20 (20%) | 26 (26%) | 10 (10%) | 24 (24%) | 20 (20%) | 3.02 | 1.25 |
| I am committed to organizational goals | 22 (22%) | 28 (28%) | 10 (10%) | 22 (22%) | 18 (18%) | 3.14 | 1.23 |
| I take responsibility for my duties | 21 (21%) | 27 (27%) | 10 (10%) | 22 (22%) | 20 (20%) | 3.07 | 1.24 |

Source: Primary Data (2026)

The findings in Table 5 show a mixed level of employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA) local government. The mean scores ranged approximately from 2.36 to 3.44, indicating moderate to low performance levels across several indicators.

Some positive performance aspects were observed in areas such as meeting meetings on time ($M = 3.08$), commitment to organizational goals ($M = 3.14$), professionalism during instability ($M = 3.02$), and taking responsibility for duties ($M = 3.07$). These results suggest that employees demonstrated some level of commitment and discipline in certain areas of their work.

However, many core performance indicators recorded low mean values below 3.0, such as completing high volumes of work ($M = 2.48$), reducing backlog ($M = 2.38$), resolving complaints on time ($M = 2.42$), and meeting service delivery targets ($M = 2.52$). This indicates inefficiencies in service delivery and workload management.

The reversed items also revealed performance challenges. For example, delays affecting performance recorded a high mean ($M = 3.44$), indicating that delays were a major

challenge affecting employee output. Similarly, reliance on attendance and punctuality items showed only moderate compliance.

The standard deviation values (approximately 1.23–1.32) indicate variation in responses, suggesting differences in performance levels among employees across departments.

Overall, the findings suggest that employee performance in GPAA local government was moderate but largely constrained by delays, resource limitations, and inconsistent service delivery outcomes.

Interview findings on employee performance

The researcher conducted interviews with the Human Resource Officer, the County Commissioner, and selected Heads of Departments to obtain qualitative insights on employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). Their responses were presented in reported speech as follows:

The Human Resource Officer reported that employee performance in GPAA was generally moderate but affected by several operational challenges. He/she stated that “some

employees perform well and complete their tasks on time, but overall performance is affected by limited resources and poor working conditions." The officer further reported that "delays in service delivery are common, especially in departments with insufficient equipment and staffing gaps." The County Commissioner reported that employee performance varied across departments. He/she stated that "there are employees who are committed and meet their responsibilities, but others are affected by a lack of motivation and inadequate support systems." The Commissioner further reported that "service delivery is sometimes slow due to logistical and resource constraints rather than lack of effort by employees."

The Heads of Departments reported that employee performance was inconsistent. They stated that "some staff members are hardworking and meet deadlines, but others struggle due to workload pressure and limited resources." They further reported that "delays in completing tasks and responding to citizens' complaints are common challenges in some departments." In addition, they stated that "performance is negatively influenced by poor working conditions, low motivation, and lack of incentives."

In summary, the interview findings revealed that employee performance in GPAA local government was moderate but inconsistent across departments. Respondents reported that while some employees demonstrated commitment and responsibility, overall performance was hindered by inadequate resources, poor working conditions, and low motivation. This resulted in delays in service delivery and reduced efficiency in local government operations.

Thematic analysis of employee performance

The qualitative data obtained from the Human Resource Officer, County Commissioner, and Heads of Departments were analyzed using thematic analysis. The analysis focused on identifying recurring patterns related to employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). Several themes emerged from the responses.

Theme 1: Mixed levels of employee performance

The findings revealed that employee performance in GPAA was generally inconsistent across departments. The Human Resource Officer reported that "some employees perform well and complete their tasks on time, but overall performance is affected by limited resources and poor working conditions." Similarly, the County Commissioner noted that "there are employees who are committed and meet their responsibilities, but others are affected by lack of motivation and inadequate support systems." This theme indicates that performance levels varied among employees.

Theme 2: Delays in service delivery

Another key theme was delays in service delivery. The Human Resource Officer reported that "delays in service delivery are common, especially in departments with insufficient equipment and staffing gaps." Heads of

Departments also stated that "delays in completing tasks and responding to citizens' complaints are common challenges." This suggests that service delivery efficiency was a major concern in GPAA.

Theme 3: Influence of working conditions on performance
Respondents consistently linked employee performance to working conditions. Heads of Departments stated that "performance is negatively influenced by poor working conditions, low motivation, and lack of incentives." The County Commissioner also reported that performance challenges were often related to resource constraints rather than employee effort. This theme shows a clear relationship between the working environment and performance outcomes.

Theme 4: Motivation and resource constraints

The analysis revealed that lack of motivation and inadequate resources significantly affected performance. The Human Resource Officer highlighted that limited equipment and infrastructure affected productivity, while Heads of Departments emphasized low motivation among staff. This theme indicates that both financial and non-financial factors contributed to performance gaps.

Theme 5: Presence of committed employees

Despite challenges, respondents acknowledged the presence of committed employees. The County Commissioner stated that "there are employees who are committed and meet their responsibilities." This theme suggests that although overall performance was affected by constraints, there were still individuals who maintained good performance standards.

Overall, the thematic analysis revealed that employee performance in GPAA was mixed and inconsistent. While some employees demonstrated commitment and responsibility, overall performance was affected by poor working conditions, resource limitations, low motivation, and delays in service delivery.

Documentary review findings on employee performance

The researcher reviewed relevant organizational documents in order to support and triangulate findings obtained from questionnaires and interviews. The documents examined included staff performance appraisal reports, attendance registers, departmental activity reports, service delivery records, internal memos, and administrative progress reports in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA). The findings from the documentary review were summarized as follows:

1. Performance appraisal records

The performance appraisal reports indicated that employee performance was generally rated as average across most departments. While a few employees were rated as good performers, the majority were assessed as meeting expectations only partially. The reports further showed that

consistent high performance was limited, suggesting variation in employee output across departments.

2. Attendance and punctuality records

The attendance registers revealed cases of irregular attendance and occasional lateness among some employees. Although many employees reported to duty regularly, the records indicated that absenteeism and delays in reporting to work were present in certain departments. This supported findings that punctuality and consistency were moderate rather than strong.

3. Service delivery and activity reports

Departmental activity reports showed delays in completion of assigned tasks and slow response rates in some service delivery areas. The records indicated that a backlog of work was present in certain units, and some activities were not completed within expected timelines. This confirmed inefficiencies in service delivery.

4. Work output and efficiency records

The reviewed documents indicated that resource limitations, including insufficient equipment and operational tools, contributed to reduced productivity in some departments. Reports highlighted that staff output was affected by a lack of adequate support systems, leading to delays and reduced efficiency.

5. Administrative memos and internal reports

Internal memos showed that management frequently issued reminders regarding punctuality, timely reporting, and improved service delivery. These communications suggested ongoing concerns about employee discipline and performance standards within the organization.

Overall, the documentary review confirmed that employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area was generally moderate, with variations across departments. The records indicated issues such as irregular attendance, delayed service delivery, and inconsistent productivity, which aligned with findings from questionnaires and interviews. These performance challenges were linked to resource constraints, working conditions, and management-related factors within the local government system.

Correlational analysis

This section presents the results of the inferential statistical analysis used to determine the relationship between job security and employee performance in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA), South Sudan. The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to test the relationship.

Table 6: Correlation matrix between working conditions and employee performance (N = 100)

| Variables | Job Security | Employee Performance |
|----------------------|--------------|----------------------|
| Job security | 1 | |
| Employee performance | 0.59** | 1 |

| *Sig. (2-tailed)* | 0.000 | 0.000 | 0.000 | |

Note: Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Source: Primary Data (2026)

Job security had a moderate positive relationship with employee performance ($r = 0.59$), implying that employees who felt more secure in their jobs tended to perform better than those who experienced uncertainty.

Discussion

The study established that job security in GPAA was perceived as weak, with employees expressing uncertainty about employment continuity, unclear promotion procedures, and limited communication regarding job stability. The correlation results indicated a positive relationship between job security and employee performance, suggesting that employees who feel more secure tend to perform better.

These findings are consistent with Bolatito and Mohamoud (2024), who argued that job security is a key component of psychological well-being that enhances employee morale and performance. Similarly, the findings align with research conducted in Kole District Local Government, which found a positive and significant relationship between job security

and employee performance ($r = 0.325$, $p < .01$), where insecurity reduced motivation and performance levels.

The results also support findings from Otuke District Local Government, where job security significantly influenced employee performance ($\beta = .413$, $p < .01$), particularly through promotion transparency and confirmation in service. Additionally, Odiya, Odigwe, and Amakodi (2026) emphasized that job security enhances employee commitment, which is critical for sustained performance in local government institutions.

In line with these studies, the current findings suggest that insecurity in employment, weak communication, and unclear career progression in GPAA contribute to reduced motivation and lower employee performance. Strengthening job security mechanisms would therefore improve commitment and productivity.

Conclusion

It was concluded that job security in GPAA was relatively weak, with employees experiencing uncertainty regarding

employment continuity, unclear promotion systems, and inadequate communication on job stability. The study further established a moderate positive relationship between job security and employee performance ($r = 0.59, p < 0.05$). This indicates that employees who felt more secure in their jobs tended to perform better than those who were uncertain, implying that strengthening job security would improve motivation and performance.

Recommendation

It is recommended that GPAA strengthen job security mechanisms to enhance employee motivation and performance.

The local government should clearly communicate employment policies, promotion procedures, and career progression pathways to all employees to reduce uncertainty.

Furthermore, transparent recruitment, fair performance appraisal systems, and timely confirmation of staff in positions should be implemented.

Management should also ensure that employees are protected from unfair dismissal and that disciplinary procedures are clearly documented and consistently applied.

Acknowledgement

I would like to express my sincere gratitude to Almighty God for granting me life, wisdom, strength, and good health throughout the period of my studies and during the completion of this dissertation.

I extend my heartfelt appreciation to the management, lecturers, and staff of Team University-Uganda, especially the School of Graduate Studies and Research, for the academic knowledge, guidance, and support offered to me during my Master's program.

My special thanks go to my supervisor(s) for their invaluable guidance, constructive criticism, encouragement, and professional advice throughout the research process. Their continuous support greatly contributed to the successful completion of this dissertation.

I also appreciate the authorities and employees in the Greater Pibor Administrative Area (GPAA), South Sudan, for their cooperation, willingness to provide information, and participation in this study. Without their contribution, this research would not have been possible.

I am deeply grateful to my family, friends, and colleagues for their moral support, prayers, encouragement, and patience throughout my academic journey. Your support gave me the determination to continue despite the challenges encountered along the way.

Lastly, I acknowledge all individuals who contributed directly or indirectly to the success of this study. May God bless you abundantly.

List of abbreviations

GPAA – Greater Pibor Administrative Area

SPSS – Statistical Package for Social Sciences

CVI – Content Validity Index

HR – Human Resource

α – Cronbach's Alpha (Reliability Coefficient)

Source of funding

The study had no funding.

Conflict of interest

The study had no funding.

Informed consent

Written informed consent was obtained from all participants before their inclusion in the study. Participants were informed about the purpose of the study, procedures involved, potential risks and benefits, and their right to withdraw at any time without penalty.

Author contributions

GDL: collected the data.

HEK: supervised the study.

Data availability

Data is available upon request from the author.

Author biography

David Gayen Logirangole: a student pursuing a master's degree in human resource management at Team University

Hope Evelyn Kyounda: research supervisor at Team University

References

1. Bolatito, A., & Mohamoud, A. (2024). *Job security and employee performance: Psychological well-being and organizational outcomes in public institutions*. African Journal of Public Administration.
2. International Labour Organization (ILO). (2020). *Working conditions and employment relations in developing countries*. International Labour Organization.
3. Kole District Local Government. (2023). *Job security and employee performance in Kole District Local Government*. Ministry of Local Government, Uganda.
4. Odia, J., Odigwe, A., & Amakodi, R. (2026). *Quality of work life and employee commitment in local government councils in Nigeria*. International Journal of Research and Innovation in Social Science. <https://doi.org/10.47772/IJRIS.2025.91200166>
5. Odur, D. O., & Nsisi, C. (2021). *Employee motivation and job performance in Otuke District Local Government*. Lira University.

6. Otuke District Local Government. (2023). *Job security and employee performance in Otuke District*. Ministry of Local Government, Uganda.