

Employee Motivation on Organizational Performance In Selected Information Technology Support Service Companies In Kampala, Uganda

Sabiiti Mulema

Abstract

The purpose of this study is to establish the impact of employee motivation on organizational performance in Information Technology Support Service Companies in Kampala, Uganda. It focused on a case of three selected information technology support service companies; Iwat Solutions, Mercury Group and Sky Hi Technology. The objectives of the study were; (1) To evaluate the relationship between employee motivation and organizational performance, (2) To assess the relationship between employee motivation and employee commitment and (3) To determine the major factors that increase employee motivation in Iwat Solutions, Mercury Group and Sky Hi Technology. This study employed descriptive research and cross-sectional design. Existing literature was used. Simple random sampling and purposive sampling were used to select respondents. Interviews were used as techniques of data collection, while questionnaire and interview guides were used as data collection instruments. The data collected is both quantitative and qualitative. The study population of 96 employees gave the sample size of 77 respondents based on slovin formula. The major findings of the study indicated that there is a positive relationship between motivation of employee and organizational performance ($r = 0.290$, $P\text{-value} < 0.05$), positive relationship between employee motivation and employee commitment ($r = 0.372$, $P\text{-value} < 0.01$), and a linear relationship ($F = 3.520$, $\text{Sig} = .036^b$) between employee motivation and employee commitment with organizational performance as in line with the bio-data. Employee motivation and employee commitment greatly explained organizational performance, employee motivation with a Beta = .229, followed by employee commitment with a Beta = .162 Major recommendations which should be adopted include; Managers should go for special in-service training in employee motivation and employees' involvement in policy formulation, further research should be carried out in other information technology support service Organizations in order to find out most of the factors affecting employee motivation and Organizational performance.

Keywords: Employee motivation, Organizational performance, Employee commitment, Information technology and Support Service.



IJSB

Accepted 29 July 2019
Published 08 August 2019
DOI: 10.5281/zenodo.3362940

About Author

Sabiiti Mulema, MBA-Management, St. Augustine International University, Bunga Hill, Kampala-Uganda.

Introduction

The study sets out to explore how employee motivation can lead to organizational performance in information technology support service companies in Uganda. The choice of these three companies was motivated by their accessibility and the fact that they have almost the same historical perspectives regarding the promotion of Information and Communication Technology in Uganda, despite their different years of experience in the market. Iwat solutions was established in Kampala in 2013 and Sky Hi Technology in 2014 and Mercury Group was established in 1996. There is now a rapid growth of many information technologies Support Service companies in Uganda, such as: Diro, Road man, Adon, Ach Tech etc. Therefore, the management teams of Iwat Solutions, Sky Hi Technology and Mercury Group are facing a situation where they should maximize strategies to allow the company to survive in this competitive market. Management teams will be able to understand their responsibility regarding the organizational goal achievement through employees' motivation and how to foster relationship between management and staff. It will also help those who are willing to venture into such business by giving them a picture or an image on what they may be facing and what they can do in order to survive. This study focused on Iwat solution, Mercury Group and Sky Hi Technology due to their expertise in the market. According to Kalimullah et al (2010), motivation is a set of courses concerned with a kind of strength that boosts performance and directs towards accomplishing some definite targets. McShane et al. (2003), defined motivation as a factor that exists in an individual which has the potential to affect the way, strength and eagerness of behaving towards work. Employees' motivation is a key to the overall effectiveness of an organization performance; high organization performance is a long term benefits of employees' motivation (Kat, 2009). The more the employees are motivated to tasks accomplishment the higher will be the organization performance and success (Suresh, 2013). This explains that in order to achieve assured organizational goals in an effective and efficient way, employees should be energetically satisfied and they should be considered as vital asset that needs to be attributed greater attention and all the time developed. While motivation is a set of energizing forces, commitment is a force that binds an employee to a course of action (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001). This implies that employee motivation can easily lead to employee commitment to the work and this in turn will lead to organizational success sustainability (Sims, 2007). According to Hunjra et al. (2010), well-motivated employees have effective performance which is enhanced through greater productivity due to their commitment to work and the quality of services provided. What has aroused scholars and researchers' interest is how best employees can be motivated so that they can achieve effective performance. Thus, they have come up with theories to explain how best employees should be motivated to reach a greater performance. It is still evident that what motivates one employee may not necessary motivates another employee within the same organization. Yet, a lot of people think that money is the only significant motivator within the workplace. This has been contradicted by Victor Lipman who stated: "how you feel is often more important than what you earn." Therefore, Maslow, John Adair Vroom, Herzberg and many other scholars have seen theories on how employees can be motivated (Needhman, 1999). According to Maslow (1946), human needs are hierarchical and can be generalized from one organization to another but he fails to explain how those needs can be met. On his side, Victor Vroom (1964) came up with his expectancy theory which claims that a particular action will lead to a required outcome. Finally Herzberg (1968) came up with the conclusion that employees are influenced by two factors which are: the motivators and hygiene factors. Motivators create job satisfactions which include achievement, recognition, autonomy and other intrinsic aspects when they are

fulfilled. On the other hand hygiene factors enhance dissatisfaction when they are not fulfilled.

LITERATURE REVIEW

Broni (2012) conducted a study on the assessment of factors influencing motivation of workers in the Catholic University of Ghana. Structured and semi structured questionnaire administered to 80 respondents selected from a staff population of 166. The study discovered that love for the job, career development prospects, good salary and healthy relations were largely responsible for the motivation of workers. Broni's study focused more on the factors that affect employees' motivation on organization performance, while this study focused more on the contribution of employees' motivation on organization performance in Iwat solutions, Mercury Group and Sky Hi Technology. Muze (2014), in his study on the assessment of motivation and its impact on employees' performance in goal attainment. The objectives were to assess the criteria which are being used by companies in motivating their employees; to examine the obstacles which face companies in motivating their employees; and to assess the impact of motivation on employees' performance. A case study design was done using a sample of 63 employees. In collecting the primary data, the study used questionnaire and interview guide as tools. Though Muze's study stated well the importance of employee motivation on organizational performance, it failed to identify some different indicators of employee motivation such as: recognition, empowerment, etc. This current study does not only talk about the contribution of employee motivation to organizational performance, but also the dimensions and attributes of employee motivation.

Theoretical review

Motivation

Although many scholars had tried to define clearly motivation, there seems to be no general agreement between them about how the term should be defined, basically due to the fact that it has roots in many academic disciplines such as psychology, sociology, education, political science, economics (Bratton et al., 2007). According to Ran (2009), motivation is generally defined as the process that accounts for an individual's passion, direction and determination of effort towards attaining a goal. It was also conceptualized by Elliot and Zahn as the strength and direction of behavior. In the same perspective Armstrong (2006) defines motivation as those factors that influence people to take specific actions, and further states that if you motivate people, they will move in the direction that you want them in order to achieve certain goals. Therefore, a motivated employee is responsive for the definite goals and objectives he/she must achieve (Shadare et al., 2009).

Forms of motivation

Stratford (2012) argues that all workers have different characters hence require different ingredients of motivation. Therefore, people can be motivated by a variety of things, and the two forms of motivation are intrinsic and extrinsic. According to Malone and Lepper (1987), intrinsic motivation is what people will do without external inducement such as hunger, a sense of duty, altruism, and a desire to feel appreciated. On the other hand, extrinsic motivation is what people will do to acquire material or social rewards or to avoid punishment. This incorporates the idea that the source of motivation is the consequence of the behavior not the behavior itself (Deci, 1975). Regardless of whether people are intrinsically or extrinsically motivated, they join and are motivated to work in organizations to obtain certain outcomes. Some outcomes such as autonomy, responsibility, feeling of

accomplishment and the pleasure of doing interesting or enjoyable work, result in intrinsically motivated behavior. Other outcomes such as pay, job security, benefits and vacation time result in extrinsically motivated behavior, (Deci and Ryan, 1985).

Theories of motivation

According to Analoui (2000), “the content theories have identified needs, incentives and the work itself as important factors that contribute towards job satisfaction and focus on the inner drivers of human behavior.” This explains that the main interest of content theories is to find out what controls and organizes the human behavior. Hence they are not very useful in predicting people’s behavior, but they can be useful in understanding the factors which motivate people in their place (Luthans, 1995). Although there are a number of content theories of motivation, for the purpose of this study only two of the most prominent and known content theories will be considered. These theories are Maslow’s Need Hierarchy (1946), and Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory (1968). Frederick Herzberg was interested in knowing what people expect from their jobs, in 1966 he carried a research on it, which involved interviewing 203 accountant and engineers; who were asked to identify issues in their job which make them feel satisfied. In his studies he came up with the conclusion that employees are influenced by two factors which are: the motivational factor or motivators and hygiene factors (Saiyadain, 2009). Motivators are those factors which are intrinsic in nature and are related to the job; they have a positive effect on job satisfaction. Those motivational factors are: achievement, advancement, possibility of growth, recognition, works itself and responsibility. Any increase in these factors will enhance the level of satisfaction, thus they can be used for motivating employees. Herzberg further concluded that today’s motivational factors are tomorrow’s hygiene factors. On the other hand, hygiene factors are those factors which do not motivate people, they simply prevent dissatisfaction and maintain status quo. Such factors do not produce positive results but prevent negative results. If they are not there it will lead to job dissatisfaction. Mullins (2006) agrees that the motivation-hygiene theory has extended Maslow’s hierarchy of need theory and is more directly applicable to the work situation. The theory suggests that if management is to provide motivation then attention must be given not only to hygiene factors, but also to the motivating factors. Though Herzberg theory has solved the problems of managers who were wondering why their policies failed to motivate the employees adequately, it has been criticized by some scholars for its methodology. Herzberg study was limited to the engineers and accountants; it is not conclusive. They criticized it to be more focus on job enrichment rather than job satisfaction of the workers due to motivators like pay, status, or interpersonal relationship within the workplace (Gaziel, 1986).

Relationships between variables

Employee motivation is one of the most important factors for increasing performance and productivity. Employees are expected to come to the workplace with the intrinsic motivation and desire to be successful, be value-added and contribute to the obtainment of an employer’s vision (Gutsy, 2012). The motivation theorists such as Maslow (1946), Herzberg (1968) and Aldefer (1972) agreed that by promoting a good working condition, providing monetary or non-monetary reward because of their efforts, and empowering employees help to satisfy the employees’ psychological needs which in turn also will enhance their engagement. Furthermore, when managers succeed to meet the needs of employees, this can enhance the commitment they will more likely have towards the organization which in turn will lead to job performance. According to Meyer & Allen (1997), commitment “is a psychological state

that characterizes the employees' relationship with the organizations and has an implication for the decision to continue membership in the organization." Making of a motivated and committed workforce is considered as the main objective and a key to organizational performance in today's competitive environment (Tella, 2007). This has been approved by Varsha and Monika (2012), who conceptualized that employee commitment and loyalty are central features in the high performance workplace literature in which they are seen as mediating factors linking different types of human resource management and employment practices to enhanced organizational performance.

METHODOLOGY

Spearman correlation coefficient was used to determine the degree of relationship between the study variables.

		Organizational Performance	Employee Motivation	Employee Commitment
Organizational Performance	Pearson Correlation	1.000		
	Sig. (2-tailed)			
	N	62		
Employee Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.290*	1.000	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.022		
	N	62	62	
Employee Commitment	Pearson Correlation	.248	.372**	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.052	.003	
	N	62	62	62

Source: Primary data computed

The results in table above indicate a positive relationship between motivation employee and organizational performance ($r = 0.290$, $P\text{-value} < 0.05$) which implies that employee motivation is a good strategy to increase organizational performance.

Results indicate a significant positive relationship between employee motivation and employee commitment ($r = 0.372$, $P\text{-value} < 0.01$)

Table 1.4

ANOVA^a

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	2.457	2	1.228	3.520	.036 ^b
	Residual	20.591	59	.349		
	Total	23.048	61			

Source: primary data

Table 1.5

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted Square	R Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.326 ^a	.107	.076	.59077

Source: Primary data

The results in table above show a linear relationship ($F = 3.520$, $Sig = .036^b$) between employee motivation and employee commitment with organizational performance as in line with the bio-data. Employee motivation and employee commitment greatly explained organizational performance, employee motivation with a Beta = .229, followed by employee commitment with a Beta = .162

The researcher used factor loading based on EFA technique, in order to estimate how much a variable loads into its corresponding factor, and to find factor loadings which best reproduce correlation between observed variables under study. Straub (2004) suggests to that value of each item in factor loading should be at least 0.50 into its relative principal component.

Table 1.6

Variables	Factors			
	Payment	Reward	Working environment	Empowerment
There is fair payment in the company.				
The Company pays attractive allowances.				
Employees are paid on time.				
Employees' efforts are recognized by the management.				
There is opportunity for employees training and skills development in the company.				.960
There is promotion opportunity in the company.		.922		
The company has safe and healthy working conditions.				
There is good relationship with peers in the workplace.			.988	
There are fair disciplinary measures within the company.				
Employees are given opportunity to make necessary decisions to accomplish certain assigned tasks.	.973			
There is opportunity for creativity and innovation in the company.	.977			
There are opportunities for learning and development in the company.		.605		

Source: Primary data computed

The results in Table 1.6 above show how the factor loadings explained through estimation, at which levels factors under each variable correlated. The result is supported through EAF technique, and indicated that factors under employee motivation are relating to each other. The table still shows the exploratory factor analysis results of employee motivation variable, four factors were extracted and component restricted to 0.50 of consideration.

The scores were between 97.3 to 97.9%, 60.5 to 92.2%, 98.8 and 96.0 respectively. The factor results of employee motivation under payment estimated that there is opportunity for creativity and innovation in the company at 97.7% and employees are given opportunity to make necessary decisions to accomplish certain assigned tasks at 97.3%. Under reward the factor results estimated that there are promotion opportunities in the company at 92.2 % and that there are opportunities for learning and development in the company at 60.5%.

Under working environment the results estimated that there is good relationship with peers in the workplace at 98.8 %. Finally under empowerment the results estimated that there is opportunity for employees training and skills development in the company at 96.0%.

Table 1.7

Variables	Factor			
	Employee loyalty	Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative commitment
The company deserves my loyalty				
The company is known as a good employer			.918	
I enjoy discussing about my company with people outside		.821		
I emotionally feel attached to my company		.704		
I will be very happy to spend the rest of my career with my company	.566			
If would get a better job offer, i would go				
I was taught to believe in the value of loyalty in one organization	.502			
The company has a strong system to retain employees				
I would feel guilty if I leave the company	.582			
I would not leave the company right now, because i have a sense of obligation to it	.702			
The company encourages me to contribute effectively in its development				

Source: Primary data computed

The results in Table 1.7 above show how the factor loadings explained through estimations that employee commitment's factors correlate one another. The table 1.7 shows the exploratory factor analysis results of employee commitment variable, three factors were extracted and component restricted to 0.50 of consideration. The scores were as follows; between 50.2 to 70.2%, 70.4 to 82.1% and score 91.8.

The factor results of employee commitment under employee loyalty estimated that an employee would not leave the company right now because he has a sense of obligation to it at 70.2%, an employee would feel guilty if he/she leaves the company at 58.2%, he or she would be very happy to spend the rest of his or her career with the company and to believe in the value of loyalty at 50.2%. Under affective commitment, the results estimated that employees enjoy discussing about their company with people outside at 82.1%, and they feel emotionally attached to the company at 82.1%. Additionally under continuous commitment employees are willing to tell their friends that the company in which they are working is a good place at 91.8%

Table 1.8

Variables	Factors		
	Employee performance	Effectiveness and efficiency	Organizational goals
Qualified employees are those who perform well at the workplace.			
Motivated employees are those who perform well their tasks.			.971
Provision of feedback to employees leads to performance.	.992		
Motivation improves the level of efficiency and effectiveness of the employees.			.885
Motivation increases the level of productivity.	.979		
There should be a change in focus whenever needed.			
Motivation puts employees to action.			
Motivation leads to accomplishment of organizational goals.		.936	
Motivation leads to stability of work force.		.992	

Source: Primary data computed

The results in table 1.8 above show how the factor loadings explained through estimations that organizational performance's factors correlate one another. The results indicated that the rotation converged in 5 iterations

The table 1.8 shows the exploratory factor analysis results of organizational performance variable. Three factors were extracted and component restricted to 0.50 of consideration. The first one scores between 97.9 to 99.2%, the second scores between 93.6 to 99.2% and the last one scores between 88.5 to 97.1%

The factor results of organizational performance under employee performance estimated that provision of feedback to employees leads to performance at 99.2% and motivation increases

the level of productivity at 97.9%. Under effectiveness and efficiency the results estimated that motivation leads to stability of work force at 99.2% and motivation leads to accomplishment of organizational goals at 99.2%. Finally under organizational goals the results estimated that motivation leads to accomplishment of organizational goals at 97.1% and motivation improves the level of efficiency and effectiveness of the employees at 88.5%.

Table 1.9

Variables	Factor			
	Employee loyalty	Affective commitment	Continuance commitment	Normative commitment
The company deserves my loyalty				
The company is known as a good employer locally			.918	
I enjoy discussing about my company with people outside		.821		
I emotionally feel attached to my company		.704		
I will be very happy to spend the rest of my career with my company	.566			
If I would get another job offer, i would go				
I was taught to believe in the value of loyalty in one organization	.502			
The company has a strong system to retain employees				
I would feel guilty if I leave the company	.582			
I would not leave the company right now, because i have a sense of obligation to it	.702			
The company encourages me to contribute effectively to its development				

Source: Primary data

Table 2.0

Employee motivation	Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Education level	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2 59 61	.076 .233	.327	.723
Duration	Between Groups Within Groups Total	2 59 61	.985 .390	2.526	.089

Source: Primary data

The results in table 2.0 above indicates a statistically significant difference between Education level of the respondents and how employee motivation would influence

organizational performance with result (.327; .723) and difference between duration of the respondents within the company and how employee motivation would influence organizational performance with result (2.526; .089).

Table 2.1

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Education level	Between Groups	.540	3	.180	.782	.509
	Within Groups	13.347	58	.230		
	Total	13.887	61			
Duration	Between Groups	.972	3	.324	.782	.509
	Within Groups	24.012	58	.414		
	Total	24.984	61			

Source: Primary data

The results in table 2.1 above indicate a statistically significant difference between education level of the respondents and how employee commitment would influence organizational performance with result (.782; .509). Additionally, it shows a statistically significant difference between duration of the respondents within the company and how employee commitment would influence organizational performance with result (.782; .509)

Table 2.2

		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Education level	Between Groups	.327	2	.164	.712	.495
	Within Groups	13.560	59	.230		
	Total	13.887	61			
Duration	Between Groups	.127	2	.063	.150	.861
	Within Groups	24.857	59	.421		
	Total	24.984	61			

The result in table 2.2 above indicates a statistically significant difference between education level of the respondents and how changes would influence organizational performance with result (.712; .495) In addition, the years spent in the company intervals had statistical significant difference with values (.150; .861).

DISCUSSION OF THE FINDINGS

The results indicated a positive relationship between motivation employee and organizational performance ($r = 0.290$, $P\text{-value} < 0.05$) which implies that employee motivation is a good strategy to increase organizational performance. The results are in line with Hunjra et al. (2010) who said that well-motivated employees have effective work performance. Even though it is still evident that what motivates one employee may not necessary motivate the other within the same organization. Many people think that money is the only significant motivator within the workplace. This has been contradicted by Victor Lipman who stated: "how you feel is often more important than what you earn." And by analyzing qualitative data 70% of respondents agreed that motivating employees is one of the strategies to make employees more concerned about organizational goals achievement. Other factors are; good working environment, training programs, rewards, etc. as suggested by Maslow (1946), Herzberg (1968) and Aldefer (1972) who agreed that by promoting a good working condition, providing monetary or non-monetary reward because of their efforts, and empowering employees help to satisfy the employees' psychological needs which in turn also

will enhance their engagement. There is a significant positive relationship between employee motivation and employee commitment ($r = 0.372$, $P\text{-value} < 0.01$). This means that employee motivation influences the degree to which employees can be committed to their work and would spend more years with in the same Company. This has been supported by Meyer & Allen (1997), who described commitment as a psychological state that characterizes the employees' relationship with the organization and has an implication on the decision of membership continuity within the organization. The results show a linear relationship ($F = 3.520$, $\text{Sig} = .036^b$) between employee motivation and employee commitment with organizational performance in line with the bio-data. Employee motivation and employee commitment greatly explained organizational performance, employee motivation with a Beta = .229, followed by employee commitment with a Beta = .162. This is also in line with (Meyer and Herscovitch, 2001) who said that while motivation is a set of energizing forces, commitment is a force that binds an employee to a course of action. This has been well explained by (Sims, 2007) who stated that employee motivation can easily lead to employee commitment at the work and this in turn would lead to consistent organizational success. The results also indicate a statistically significant difference between Education level of the respondents and how employee motivation would influence organizational performance with result (.327; .723). And it also indicates a difference between duration of the respondents within the company and how employee motivation would influence organizational performance with result (2.526; .089). This implies that whenever employee motivation is implemented as a strategy in a company, education levels should be put into consideration. It indicates a statistically significant difference between education level of the respondents and how employee commitment would influence organizational performance with result (.782; .509). Additionally, it shows a statistically significant difference between duration of the respondents within the company and how employee commitment would influence organizational performance with result (.782; .509). This implies that whenever the company is trying to increase the level of employee commitment education levels should be put into consideration. There is also a statistically significant difference between education level of the respondents and how likely changes would influence organizational performance with result (.712; .495) In addition, the years spent in the company intervals had statistical significant difference with values (.150; .861). This implies that whenever the company is trying to increase the organizational performance, education levels should be put into consideration.

CONCLUSIONS & RECOMMENDATIONS

The study established that in general terms, employee motivation and employee commitment play a positive role when it comes to increase the organizational performance of information technology support services in Uganda. The challenge however, is that the market for such business is becoming saturated and very competitive. Therefore in order to survive in such market, the management teams of Information technology industry should understand their responsibility regarding the organizational goal achievement through employees' motivation by considering factors such as good working environment, employees empowerment, payment, reward, etc.

Based on the study findings and the conclusions, the researcher derived few recommendations. Information technology support services companies should invest more in their employees in order to achieve the competitive edge they are looking for. They should do beyond what they are doing now. 72% of respondents agreed that the best way to motivate employees is providing them with training programs. Needs and behaviors of employees

should be well identified and understood so that they may be fully satisfied. Information technology support services companies should ensure that their employees are engaged fully to achieve the organizational goals, not only by equipping them with skills and knowledge but also by seeking to meet their priorities. There is need to employee loyalty in terms of employee commitment to avoid absenteeism, negligence, employees' turnover which affects negatively the pursuit of organizational goals within a workplace. Information technology support services should encourage their employees to have a sense of obligation to the organization to avoid instability at the workplace. Information technology support services should strive to provide effective feedback to employees regarding the tasks that have been assigned to them so that they can be effectively and efficiently productive towards goals achievement.

Areas of further research

The study was carried out in three selected companies in Kampala Uganda, but a similar research could be conducted using multiple case studies in different information technology support service companies in other parts of Uganda and East African Countries at large.

REFERENCES

- Adams, J. S. (1965). *Inequity in Social Exchange: Advances in experimental social psychology*. New York: Academic Press
- Ali, R., & Ahmad, M. S. (2009). The impact of reward and recognition programs on employees motivation and satisfaction: An empirical study. *International review of business research papers*, 5(4), 270-279
- Analoui, F. (2000). What motivate senior managers? *Journal of managerial psychology*, 15(4), 324-340
- Armstrong, M. (2006). *A handbook of human resource management practice*. 10th Ed. London: Kogan page Ltd.
- Armstrong, M., and Murlis, H. (2004). *Reward management: a handbook of remuneration strategy and practice*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Bennet, R. (1995). *Organizational Behaviour*. London: Longman Ltd.
- Benson, S., Dundis, S. (2003). Understanding and motivating health care employees: intergrating Maslow's hierarchy of needs, training and technology. *Journal of nursing management*, (11) 315-320
- Biljana, D. (2004). Employee Commitment in Times of Radical Organisational Changes. *Economics and organization*, 2(2), 111-117.
- Bratton, J., Callinan, M., Forshaw, C. & Sawchuk, P. (2007). *Work and organizational behavior*. Palgrave Macmillan: Basingstroke
- .Broni, A. (2012). Factors influencing workers motivation in a private African university. *Academic journal*, 3(3), 315-340
- Constant, D. & Offodile, O. (2001). Managing for organizational effectiveness in Sub-Saharan Africa: a culture-fit model. *The international journal of human resources management*, (12)4, 535-550
- Deci, E. L. (1975). *Intrinsic Motivation*. Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behavior: Perspectives in Social Psychology*. Plenum Press.
- Elliot, A., & Zahn, I. (2008). Motivation. *Encyclopedia of educational psychology*, Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage publications, Inc.
- Gaertner, s. (1999). Structural Determinants of Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment in Turnover's Models. *Human Resource Management Review*, 9(4), 479-493.
- Gaziel, H. (1986). Correlates of job satisfaction: A study of the two factor theory in

- an educational setting. *The Journal of Psychology*, 120(6), 613-626.
- Gregory, S. (2008). How does an employee motivation impact organization performance? Retrieved from [http:// www.salesvantage.com](http://www.salesvantage.com) on 6th, July
- Gutsy, G. (2012). Project on Employee Motivation. Retrieved from [http:// www.studymode.com](http://www.studymode.com) on 3rd, July
- Herzberg, F. (1968). One more time: how do you motivate people? *Harvard business review*
- Huczynski, A. & Buchanan, D. (2001). *Organisational Behaviour: An Introductory Text*. London: Prentice Hall.
- Hunjra, A.I., Ali, M.A., Chani, M.i., Khan, H. & Rehman, K. (2010). Employee voice and intent to leave: *An empirical evidence of Pakistani banking sector. African journal of business management*, 4(14), 3056-3061.
- John, A. (2007). *Leadership and Motivation*. Kogan Page Publishers, Inc.
- Kallimullah, A. R., Yaghoubi, N. M., & Moloudi, J., (2010). Survey of Relationship between Organizational Justice and Empowerment (A Case Study). *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Sciences*, (24) 165-171.
- Kat, M. (2009). The effects of employee motivation on organization performance. Retrieved from [http:// www.allafrica.com](http://www.allafrica.com) on 29th, June
- [Luthans, F. \(1995\). *Organizational behavior*. \(7th Ed.\) New York: McGraw-Hill.](#)
- [Mahapatro, B.B.\(2010\). *Human resource development*. New Delhi: New age international Ltd publishers.](#)
- Malone, T. W., & Lepper, M. R. (1987). Making Learning Fun: A taxonomy of Intrinsic Motivations for Learning. *Conative and Affective Process Analysis*, (3) 3
- Maslow, A. (1946). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological review*, (50) 370-396.
- Matthew, J., Grawhich, & Barber, L. K. (2009). Employees and Organizational Outcomes: organizational health initiative. *Dissertation*. Saint Louis University
- McShane, S. L & Von, M. A. (2003). *Organizational behavior*. New York: McGraw Hill
- Meyer, J. P & Allen, N. J. (1997). *Commitment in the workplace Theory, research and application*. Thousand Oaks, CA: Sage
- Meyer, J. P & Allen, N. J. (1990). The Measurement and Antecedents of Affective, Continuance and Normative Commitment to the Organization. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 63(4), 1-18
- Meyer, J. P., & Herscovitch, L. (2001). Commitment in the workplace: Toward a general model. *Human Resource Management Review*, 11, 299-326.
- Mullins. L. J. (2001). *Hospitality Management and Organisational Behavior*. Pearson/Longman, Harlow
- Mullins. L. J. (2007). *Management and organisational behaviour*. New York: Practice Hall, Inc.
- Mullins, L. J. (2006). *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. London: Prentice Hall
- Muze, R. W. (2014). Assessment of motivation and its impact on employees' performance in goal attainment: a case of Vodacom Tanzania Limited. *Dissertation*. The open university of Tanzania
- Namara, K. (2010). Organization Performance. Retrieved from [http:// www.helpme.com](http://www.helpme.com) on 23rd, May
- Needham, D. (1999). *Business for higher awards*. Heinemann educational publishers.
- Ongori, H. (2007). A review of the literature on employee turnover. *African journal of business management*. 49-74.
- Ott, J. (1989). *Classic readings in organizational behavior*. Pacific Grove: Brooks/Cole publishing Company.
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. (1968). *Managerial Attitudes and Performance*. Homewood: Irwin
- Puplampu, B. (30213). Employee motivation. *Management in Africa macro and micro perspectives*. 53 (10), 270.

- Ran, B. (2009). Motivation. *Encyclopedia of business in today's research in personality*, 42(4), 1109-1115.
- Robbins & Judge S. P. and Judge T. A. (2007). *Organizational Behavior*. (12th Ed.). New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall
- Ruge, T. (2012). Impact of Employees Motivation on organizational effectiveness. Retrieved from [http:// www.studymode.com](http://www.studymode.com) on 1st, August
- Saiyadain, M. (2009). *Human Resources Management*. New York: McGraw-Hill, Inc.
- Shadare, O., Hamed, A., & Ayo, T. (2009). Influence of Work Motivation, Leadership Effectiveness and Time Management of Employees' Performance in some Selected Industries in Nigeria. *European Journal of Economics, Finance and Administrative Science*, 1450-2887(16), 7-17.
- Sims, R. (2007). *Human resource management: contemporary issues, challenges, and opportunities*. International Age Publishing, Inc.
- Soper, B., Milford, G., Rosenthal, G. (1995). Belief when evidence does not support theory. *Psychology and marketing*, 12(5), 415-422
- Stratheford M. (2012). *Motivating Employees: How to Keep employees Happy While Maximising Productivity*. Kindle Ed.
- Srivastava, S. K. (2005). *Organizational Behaviour and Management*. Sarup & Sons, Inc.
- Suresh, L. (2003). Employee motivation. Retrieved from [http:// www.investorwords.com](http://www.investorwords.com) on 15th, July
- Tella, A. (2007). Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-6.
- Thompson, P. & Mchugh, D. (2002). *Work organization*. Palgrave
- Varsha, D. & Bhati, M. (2012). A study about employee commitment and its impact on sustained productivity in Indian auto-component industry. *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 1(6), 34-51.
- Victor, L. (2013). New employee study shows recognition matters more than money. Retrieved from [http:// www.psychologytoday.com](http://www.psychologytoday.com) on 8th, May
- Vroom, V. H. (1969). *Work and motivation*. New York: John Wiley and sons Inc.

Cite this article:

Mulema, S. (2019). Employee Motivation on Organizational Performance In Selected Information Technology Support Service Companies In Kampala, Uganda. *International Journal of Science and Business*, 3(4), 161-174. doi: <https://doi.org/10.5281/zenodo.3362940>

Retrieved from <http://ijsab.com/wp-content/uploads/384.pdf>

Published by

