THE EFFECT OF MOTIVATION ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE OF UNIVERSITIES IN UGANDA.

By

BUYONDO HAKIMU

PHD CANDIDATE, ISLAMIC UNIVERSITY IN UGANDA

Abstract.

It has not yet been fully explored how to successfully encourage personnel so that an organization can hit its performance goals. The purpose of this study was to investigate the motivationv and their performance as employees at Ugandan universities. The study specifically looked at the relationship between salary and employee performance, the relationship between recognition and employee performance, and the relationship between organizational atmosphere and employee performance. Data were gathered on the study's dependent and independent variables using a multi-dimensional questionnaire. Both public and private universities that ONLY offered authorized courses were used to gather the data. The analysis omitted universities that were identified on the NCHE website as offering expired programs. SPSS was used to examine the data. A statistical method called factor analysis was used to identify the fundamental elements or dimensions of a set of data. The statistical tests employed for the analysis were Bartlett's test of sphericity and the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy. The sample was suitable for factor analysis because the KMO was at $0.908 > 0.5$ and the Bartlett's test of sphericity was significant at $0.0000.005$. Organizational climate, remuneration, and employee recognition were identified as significant predictors with $R=0.403$, R square $= 0.163$, and Adjusted R square $= 0.154$, according to the results of correlation and regression analysis. According to the regression results, the goodness of fit is adequate (Adjusted $R2 = 0.14$), which means that the model's regressors only account for around 15.4% of the variability in employee performance at Ugandan universities, leaving the remaining 41.3% to factors outside the scope of this investigation. The level of significance for the regression model, according to further analysis, was 0.000, indicating that it is statistically significant, thus, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and upholds the alternative hypothesis that there is a statistically significant effect of motivation on employee performance of university in Uganda. Given that different motivational elements might sometimes have distinct effects on employee performance, the study suggests that firms should continually research what motivates employees. The study showed that non-financial elements like organizational atmosphere and recognition have a good impact on employee performance, thus the researcher advises that firms take them into consideration as potential motivators. The researcher thinks that researchers might still conduct studies outside of academic institutions to determine how motivation affects worker performance. This will assist managers in making judgments that are statistically significant based on several parameters.

Key words; Salary, Employee Recognition, Organization climate, Employee Performance, Motivation

Introduction

According to Hellriegel, Jackson, and Slocum (1999; Karakas (2010) as cited in Pradhan & Jena (2017), "employee performance" refers to an individual's work accomplishment after making the necessary effort on the job. This is associated with having a meaningful job, an engaged profile, and compassionate coworkers/employers nearby.

Why do certain businesses perform better than others and be named the year's most favored employers? The use of lucrative incentive programs has been recommended in previous research (Friedman, & Sunder, 1994; Roth, 1995; Smith, 1991; Sprinkle, 2000 as mentioned in Pradhan & Jena, 2017). At the same time, there are sufficient pragmatic evidences showing that financial offers have varying effects and may not be of much significance for escalating employee performance (Bonner et al., 2001; Camerer, & Hogarth, 1999; Gupta, & Shaw, 2014 as cited in Pradhan & Jena, 2017). This is owing to the changing nature of work and increase of knowledge workers in post-globalization, which has challenged the usual ideas of individual work performance (Frese, & Fay, 2001; Ilgen & Pulakos, 1999 as cited in Pradhan & Jena, 2017)

Why do certain companies outperform others and rank as the most favored employers of the year? Early research (Friedman, & Sunder, 1994; Roth, 1995; Smith, 1991; Sprinkle, 2000 as mentioned in Pradhan & Jena, 2017) recommended using lucrative incentive programs to encourage employees to engage in meaningful workplace involvement. However, there is enough empirical data to suggest that financial incentives may not have a significant impact on improving employee performance (Bonner et al., 2001; Camerer & Hogarth, 1999; Gupta & Shaw, 2014, cited in Pradhan & Jena, 2017). This is because of how the nature of work is changing and how knowledge workers are becoming more prevalent in the post-globalization era, which has challenged traditional notions of how well an individual performs at work (Frese, & Fay, 2001; Ilgen & Pulakos, 1999).

A strong organizational culture has a positive impact on employee performance, as highlighted by Shahzad et al. (2012), who also point out that more than 60 studies conducted between 1990 and 2007 have demonstrated this. A high performing employee will be encouraged to stay with the company for as long as possible due to the advantages he provides and the positive impression he fosters. great performance comes with great expectations, nevertheless (Vosloban, 2012).

Study objective

The study aimed to establish the effect of motivation on employee performance of university in Uganda.

Specific objectives

I. The study examined the effect of salary on employee performance of university in Uganda.

II. The study examined the effect of employee recognition on employee performance of university in Uganda.

III. The study examined the effect of organization climate on employee performance of university in Uganda.

Hypothesis

There is not statistically significant effect of motivation on employee performance of universities in Uganda.

Literature review

Salary and Employee Performance

Employee performance is highly influenced by pay, and Nagaraju & Pooja's 2017 study found that salary had a beneficial effect on employee performance. Further, when performance, contentment, and productivity rise, reward and benefit packages continue to have an impact on the value of employee performance. According to Ivancevch and Glueck (1989), if salary is good, employees will perform well since both the quality and quantity of their labor will improve. Henman and Schwab, et al. (1987) found that an organization's salary directly effects an employee's decision to leave their job as well as how they perceive the salary, they receive in comparison to that of other organizations. People remain or quit a company depending on how satisfied they are with their employment, career opportunities, and work environment (Mitchall and Holton et al. 1993).

Reward is the most crucial component to encourage people to put out their best efforts in order to produce innovation and new ideas, according to Dewhurst et al. (2010), as mentioned in Hamid et al. (2014). This shows that both the company's financial and non-financial performance have improved. Organizations use reward systems and techniques to encourage

their employees and boost their performance, according to research by Güngör (2011) who reviewed the literature on earlier studies to reach this conclusion. This backs up Darma & Supriyanto's (2017) assertion that employee satisfaction is a crucial factor since it serves as a mediator in determining how compensation affects employee performance.

In the context of Pakistan, Chaudhry et al. (2011) created a model that assessed the degree of variation in salary satisfaction and how it affected work satisfaction in both public and private sector firms. They found that salary satisfaction had an impact on employee motivation, job engagement, and work inspiration. The results show that employees in public sector organizations are slightly more satisfied with their salaries than their counterparts in the private sector. Additionally, job happiness in both circumstances is strongly correlated with salary satisfaction. Furthermore, income satisfaction served as a catalyst for raising workers' levels of job satisfaction. It has been found that employees prefer consistent income in the form of monthly pay checks over incentive-based remuneration packages that are flexible in nature.

Organisation Climate and Employee Performance

Organizations are struggling more than ever in the twenty-first century.The rising number of changes affecting organizations today pose a particular challenge to organizational climate (Nair, 2006). Organizations are always trying to improve their execution in order to compete with their rivals and thrive. Given the assurances that organizations must provide, according to Brown and Leigh (1996), organizational environment is becoming more important than ever. that those who raise the bar for the organization's values must stay on staff and continue to put their all into their work in order to benefit the organization.

Over the decades, a range of wide researches has been developed and published on organisational climate. Two concepts exist in the organisational climate which is perceptual and descriptive. McMurray (2003) as cited in Li & Mahadevan (2017) claimed that the opinions and agreement of employees on different organisation elements such as system, structure and practices show the descriptive concept in it.

In a review of studies examining the relationship between organizational climate and workers' performance, the Ozge (2016) study, which Li and Mahadevan (2017) cited, concluded that environments where roles are clearly defined and roles are clearly understood lead to greater levels of employee satisfaction and performance. The characteristics of an organizational climate were described by Peek (2003) and Li & Mahadevan (2017). For

example, having a high level of self-governance, providing opportunities for employees, maintaining connections among employees, caring about and demonstrating enthusiasm for employees, perceiving workers' achievements also, and holding them in high regard lead to more contented employees.

According to Garg and Talwar (2017), the employer can use the workplace to raise employee commitment and satisfaction. Through the shrewd engagement of multinational corporations (MNCs), Malaysia has experienced remarkable industrial growth over time. The collaborative nature of the organizational climate and creative activities have led to an increase in creativity among MNCs (Goh et al., 2020).

Employee Recognition and employee performance

Particularly when it is only given to the top achievers, recognition significantly improves subsequent performance. Surprisingly, employees who were not recognized are primarily to blame for this performance improvement. Our findings are consistent with workers favoring conformity while also being reciprocal (Bradler et al., 2016).

Employee recognition is becoming a more popular tool used by many organizations to inspire staff members to provide high levels of performance and productivity. Research has demonstrated that organizations with strong supportive cultures, an understanding of the psychology of recognizing employees for their hard work, and the application of employee recognition principles experience effective recognition. It also attempted to make the case that employee appreciation, when considered from formal, informal, and daily perspectives, might inspire workers to assure good performance in Ghanaian universities. In order to produce the desired results, it is advised that management of Ghanaian institutions devote respectable resources to the development and execution of employee appreciation programs (Amoatemaa & Kyeremeh, 2016).

One of the main conclusions was that offering career advancement options to employees who have demonstrated success leads to better performance both inside and outside the firm. In order to increase performance at both the individual and organizational levels, the paper's conclusion promotes the development and implementation of appropriate employee recognition initiatives (Munene, Atambo, & Kabare, 2012).

The findings of a survey looking at the value of recognition to all levels of employees in a big, nonprofit institution are reported in a study to explore the background on the nature and importance of employee recognition as a successful leadership tool. These workers stated that

a crucial component of their compensation system is highly individualized praise for a job well done. These results offer additional proof that executives should pay more attention to employee appreciation as they work to address the difficulties of productivity and retention facing today's firms (Bishop, 1987).

The findings revealed that while job stress has a large and detrimental impact on employee performance, employee rewards and recognition have a big and favorable impact. Findings also showed that the relationship between employee rewards, recognition, job stress, and performance is significantly and entirely mediated by perceived organizational support. Therefore, this study sheds light on key elements that promote improved employee performance. Employee recognition and rewards are crucial to overall employee performance. Negative effects could result if the companies do not take it seriously. However, occupational stress also has a significant impact on how well employees perform (Hussain et al., 2019).

Regardless of the economic level (high, middle, or poor) and cultural orientation (collectivist or individualist) of the home country, it was discovered that employee rewards, salary, and perks had a substantial impact on job satisfaction. The impact of perks on job satisfaction was, however, much greater for respondents from the United States than from Malaysia and Vietnam. The authors come to the conclusion that both monetary and non-monetary rewards play a part in determining job satisfaction, which in turn affects worker performance. Theoretical and practical ramifications for formulating efficient hiring and personnel retention practices are also covered (Tessema et al., 2013).

To feel good about their work and perform at their best, the majority of employees need motivation. While some workers are driven by money, others are personally motivated by praise and awards. The level of motivation at work directly affects how productive employees are. Employers must get to know their staff members well in order to encourage each of them individually based on their unique wants and needs. In order to increase employee performance and productivity, we want to emphasize the significance of motivation in the workplace in this essay. Even so, we would want to discuss the ideas and practices of workplace motivation (Ganta, 2014).

Methodology

Both the independent and dependent variables of the study were the subject of a multi-dimensional questionnaire that was used to gather data. The dependent variable that

explained employee performance was only one dimension, however the independent variable was assumed to contain numerous sub-dimensions. Data from both public and private universities that only offered authorized courses were gathered for the study. The analysis omitted universities that were identified on the NCHE website as offering expired programs. While choosing study participants from the chosen universities.

RESULTS

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity

KMO and Bartlett's Test

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.908
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	6122.143
	df	703
	Sig.	.000

Factor analysis is a statistical approach for locating underlying components or dimensions in a set of data. The two statistical measures used in factor analysis are the Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) measure of sample adequacy and Bartlett's test of sphericity. If the variables in the study are appropriate for factor analysis, it is determined using the KMO sampling adequacy measure. It spans from 0 to 1, with values closer to 1 suggesting a more suitable dataset for factor analysis. Since your KMO measure is 0.908, it appears that the variables in your analysis are excellent candidates for factor analysis.

On the other hand, Bartlett's test of sphericity looks at whether the correlation matrix between the variables significantly differs from the identity matrix, which would suggest that the variables are connected and appropriate for factor analysis. Degrees of freedom (df), a significance level (sig.), and an approximate chi-square value are all output by the test. Your situation has a 6122.143 chi-square value, 703 degrees of freedom, and a significance level of.000. The interrelationship between the variables and their suitability for factor analysis are shown by the low p-value (Sig.), which shows that the correlation matrix differs significantly from the identity matrix

Overall, it appears that your dataset is eligible for factor analysis based on the KMO measure and Bartlett's test.

Total variance explained (sum of variances of all individual principal components extracted using Principal component analysis)

Total Variance Explained

Component	Initial Eigenvalues			Extraction Sums of Squared Loadings			Rotation Sums of Squared Loadings		
	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %	Total	% of Variance	Cumulative %
1	9.995	26.302	26.302	9.995	26.302	26.302	6.434	16.932	16.932
2	4.222	11.111	37.413	4.222	11.111	37.413	5.360	14.105	31.037
3	3.448	9.073	46.485	3.448	9.073	46.485	4.586	12.067	43.104
4	2.962	7.795	54.280	2.962	7.795	54.280	4.200	11.053	54.157
5	1.157	3.044	57.324	1.157	3.044	57.324	1.203	3.167	57.324
6	.965	2.538	59.862						
7	.952	2.506	62.369						
8	.898	2.363	64.732						
9	.830	2.184	66.916						
10	.767	2.019	68.935						
11	.743	1.955	70.890						
12	.670	1.763	72.653						
13	.642	1.689	74.342						
14	.631	1.660	76.002						
15	.605	1.591	77.593						
16	.574	1.512	79.105						
17	.556	1.464	80.569						
18	.521	1.371	81.940						
19	.515	1.356	83.296						
20	.482	1.270	84.565						
21	.461	1.212	85.777						
22	.442	1.163	86.940						
23	.432	1.138	88.078						
24	.412	1.085	89.163						
25	.409	1.076	90.239						
26	.388	1.022	91.261						
27	.357	.939	92.200						
28	.354	.930	93.130						
29	.337	.886	94.016						
30	.302	.795	94.811						
31	.296	.779	95.590						
32	.276	.727	96.317						
33	.267	.703	97.020						
34	.257	.676	97.696						
35	.246	.646	98.342						
36	.226	.595	98.937						
37	.208	.547	99.484						
38	.196	.516	100.000						

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Communalities (The proportion of each variable's variance that can be explained by the factors)

1	Q1	Financial recognition is the most used type of recognition given to staff who perform well in my organization.	Salary	Q1	1	0.581
2	Q2	Salary advances are provided to staff in my organization	Salary	Q2	1	0.629
3	Q9	Staff who get low salaries are given bonuses in order to improve their incomes in my organization	Salary	Q9	1	0.501
4	Q11	Staff who get low salaries are also given housing allowances as a top up to get better accommodation.	Salary	Q11	1	0.524
5	Q16	Salaries in my organization are paid to staff on time.	Salary	Q16	1	0.596
6	Q19	Good salaries paid by my organization attract the best staff.	Salary	Q19	1	0.646
7	Q20	Staff can use their salaries as surety to get loans from banks.	Salary	Q20	1	0.548
8	Q33	My organization pays the best salaries to its staff.	Salary	Q33	1	0.641
9	Q35	Salaries are used as a means of motivating staff in my organization.	Salary	Q35	1	0.538
10	Q37	My organization provides salary increment every year to its staff.	Salary	Q37	1	0.565
11	Q3	I perform well because my organization is transparent to all staff	Employee Performance	Q3	1	0.624
12	Q4	I perform well because my organization sets clear expectations to the staff	Employee Performance	Q4	1	0.621
13	Q12	Staff performance is different because they have different targets.	Employee Performance	Q12	1	0.563
14	Q15	The performance of staff in y organization has risen because managers appreciate their good work.	Employee Performance	Q15	1	0.631
15	Q24	Good performance of staff at my organizations is due to giving staff development opportunities to staff.	Employee Performance	Q24	1	0.577
16	Q25	The staff performance has improved due to putting in place good reward systems.	Employee Performance	Q25	1	0.564
17	Q26	Good staff performance is my organization is due to the positive work culture set by the organization.	Employee Performance	Q26	1	0.682
18	Q27	Good planning in this organization has brought about good employee performance.	Employee Performance	Q27	1	0.555
19	Q28	The good staff performance in my organization is due to encouragement of diversity in terms of staffing.	Employee Performance	Q28	1	0.572

20	Q29	I perform well in my organization because the organization has proper performance appraisal methods	Employee Performance	Q29	1	0.566
21	Q5	Best employees are recognized every month at my work place	Employee Recognition	Q5	1	0.659
22	Q6	The most recognized staff at the end of the year is given a trip out of the country. Recognition is done monthly.	Employee Recognition	Q6	1	0.647
23	Q8	A prize worthy good service is given to a recognized staff(s) every month	Employee Recognition	Q8	1	0.615
24	Q22	Employees who are recognized more than ten times, their names are written in the organization's hall of fame.	Employee Recognition	Q22	1	0.513
25	Q30	Every labour day, the best employees are recognized by my organization.	Employee Recognition	Q30	1	0.533
26	Q10	The organizational climate at this workplace helps workers to provide a service above self.	organisation climate	Q10	1	0.513
27	Q13	The climate of the organization allows staff to undertake professional development programmes	organisation climate	Q13	1	0.598
28	Q14	The organization climate prioritizes fun for the staff	organisation climate	Q14	1	0.603
29	Q18	The organizational climate allows top management to delegate responsibilities to lower level managers	organisation climate	Q18	1	0.566
30	Q23	The organizational climate allows me to do my personal work	organisation climate	Q23	1	0.664
31	Q31	The organizational climate is that of high standards	organisation climate	Q31	1	0.635
32	Q32	The climate in the organization renders financial cooperation among staff for personal development.	organisation climate	Q32	1	0.594
33	Q34	The organizational climate helps staff to have a proportional work-life balance.	organisation climate	Q34	1	0.63

Coefficient analysis

Coefficients[a]

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	1.540	.258		5.966	.000
	Salary	.211	.066	.184	3.188	.002
	Employee_Recognition	.190	.055	.199	3.440	.001
	Organisation_Climate	.159	.059	.153	2.692	.007

a. Dependent Variable: Employee_Performance

The coefficients of a regression model with the dependent variable "Employee Performance" are shown in the table above. The independent variables "Salary," "Employee Recognition," and "Organisation Climate" are shown together with their respective coefficients."

The constant coefficient, which represents the intercept term in the regression equation when all independent variables are zero, is 1.540. The "Salary" coefficient is 0.211. The performance of the employee is therefore anticipated to increase by 0.211 units for every unit increase in salary. This coefficient has a 0.066 standard deviation. "Employee Recognition" has a 0.190 coefficient. According to the data, an employee's performance is predicted to improve by 0.190 units for every unit rise in employee recognition. This coefficient has a 0.055 standard deviation. It is 0.159 for the "Organisation Climate" coefficient. It implies that employees' performance is anticipated to rise by 0.159 units for every unit improvement in the workplace climate. This coefficient has a 0. 059 standard deviation.

In conclusion, the regression model shows that employee performance is positively influenced by salary, employee recognition, and organizational climate. Organization climate has a somewhat lesser but nonetheless considerable impact compared to salary and employee recognition

Variance analysis
ANOVA[a]

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	24.782	3	8.261	20.003	.000[b]
1	Residual	127.609	309	.413		
	Total	152.391	312			

a. Dependent Variable: Employee_Performance
b. Predictors: (Constant), Organisation_Climate, Salary, Employee_Recognition

The analysis of variance for the regression model using "Employee Performance" as the dependent variable is described in the given ANOVA table. The sum of squares (SS) for the regression was 24.782, indicating the variability in the regression model. The regression's

degrees of freedom (df) were 3, which corresponds to the number of predictors (constant, organizational climate, salary, and employee recognition). The F-statistic was obtained by dividing the regression's mean square by the residual's mean square. It is 20.003 in this situation. The regression model's level of significance was 0.000 indicating that it is statistically significant. In summary, the ANOVA table suggests that the regression model, with predictors including constant, organization climate, salary, and employee recognition, significantly explains the variability in employee performance.

Multiple regression

Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.403[a]	.163	.154	.64263

a. Predictors: (Constant), Organisation_Climate, Salary, Employee_Recognition

R=0.403, which stands for the correlation coefficient. It reflects the degree and direction of the linear relationship between the dependent variable (employee performance) and the independent factors f(organizational Climate, salary, and employee recognition). Despite the mild strength of the link, the correlation in this instance is positive, indicating a positive relationship. 0.163 is the value of the R Square coefficient of determination. The amount of the dependent variable's variance that can be accounted for by the independent variables is represented by this term. The model's independent variables in this instance can account for about 16.3% of the variation in employee performance. The adjusted R Square is 0.154. It takes into account the number of predictors and the sample size, adjusting the R Square value. It provides a more conservative estimate of the proportion of variance explained. In this case, approximately 15.4% of the variance in employee performance is explained, considering the number of predictors and the sample size. However, it is important to note that there is still a considerable amount of unexplained variance, as indicated by the relatively low R Square value.

CONCLUSION

The study aimed to establish the factor structure of motivation that predicts employee performance among staff in Universities, it established that salaries, organization climate and employee recognition had significant effect on employee performance. Further analysis indicated that regression model's level of significance was 0.000 indicating that it is statistically significant, thus, the researcher rejects the null hypothesis and upholds the

alternative hypothesis that there is a statistically significant effect of motivation on employee performance of university in Uganda.

Recommendations

The researcher recommends that organizations should continuously study what motivates employees given that with times, different motivation factors affect employee performance differently.

The researcher recommends that organizations may consider other non-financial factors as motivators since the study proved that non-financial factors like organization climate and recognition had a positive effect on employee performance.

Area of further researcher.

The researcher suggests that scholars may still carryout studies to establish the effect of motivation on employee performance in other settings others than universities. This will help managers undertake decisions based on different dimensions.

References

Amoatemaa, A. S., & Kyeremeh, D. D. (2016). Making Employee Recognition a Tool for Achieving Improved Performance: Implication for Ghanaian Universities. *Journal of Education and Practice*, *7*(34), 46-52.

Armstrong, Michael, 2006, Performance Management: Key Strategies and Practical Guidelines, 3rd Edition, , Kogan Page Limited, London, cap. 13 http://www.books24x7.com/assetviewer.aspx?bookid=13040&chunkid=109933909&rowid=503

Bishop, J. (1987). The recognition and reward of employee performance. *Journal of labor Economics*, *5*(4, Part 2), S36-S56.

Bradler, C., Dur, R., Neckermann, S., & Non, A. (2016). Employee recognition and performance: A field experiment. *Management Science*, *62*(11), 3085-3099.

Brown, S.P. & Leigh, T.W. (1996). A new look at psychological climate and its relationship to job involvement, effort and performance. Journal of Applied Psychology, 81(4), 358-368.

Chaudhry, M. S., Sabir, H. M., Rafi, N., & Kalyar, M. N. (2011). Exploring The Relationship Between Salary Satisfaction And Job Satisfaction: A COMPARISON OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTOR ORGANIZATIONS. *Journal of Commerce (22206043)*, *3*(4).

Darma, P. S., & Supriyanto, A. S. (2017). The effect of compensation on satisfaction and employee performance. *Management and Economics Journal (MEC-J)*, *1*(1).

Ganta, V. C. (2014). Motivation in the workplace to improve the employee performance. *International Journal of Engineering Technology, Management and Applied Sciences*, *2*(6), 221-230.

GARG, P., & TALWAR, D. (2017). IMPACT OF ORGANISATIONAL CLIMATE ON EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: A STUDY WITH REFERENCE TO THE EDUCATIONAL SECTOR OF INDORE. *CLEAR International Journal of Research in Commerce & Management*, *8*(4).

Goh, S. K., Jayaraman, K., Mostafiz, M. I., & Leow, Y. M. (2020). The effect of organisational climate on employees' creative performance through knowledge sharing behaviour. *Electronic Journal of Knowledge Management*, *18*(1), 1-14.

Gruman, Jamie A, Saks, Alan M, 2011, Performance management and employee engagement, Human Resource Management Review, 21:123-136, p.123

Güngör, P. (2011). The relationship between reward management system and employee performance with the mediating role of motivation: A quantitative study on global banks. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, *24*, 1510-1520.

Hameed, A., Ramzan, M., & Zubair, H. M. K. (2014). Impact of compensation on employee performance (empirical evidence from banking sector of Pakistan). *International journal of business and social science*, *5*(2).

Hussain, S. D., Khaliq, A., Nisar, Q. A., Kamboh, A. Z., & Ali, S. (2019). The impact of employees' recognition, rewards and job stress on job performance: Mediating role of perceived organization support. *SEISENSE Journal of Management*, *2*(2), 69-82.

Li, Y. P., & Mahadevan, A. (2017). A study on the impact of organisational climate on employee performance in a malaysian consultancy. *International Journal of Accounting & Business Management*, *5*(1), 1-13.

Munene, C., Atambo, M., & Kabare, K. (2012). Enhancing the role of employee recognition towards inproving performance: a survey of Kenyatta National Hospital, Kenya.

Nagaraju, B., & Pooja, J. (2017). Impact of salary on employee performance emperical evidence from public and private sector banks of Karnataka. *International Journal of Marketing and Human Resource Management*, *8*(4), 43-51.

Nair, R. (2006). Climate studies and associated best practices to improve climate issues in the workplace. Paper presented at Women in Engineering Programs and Advocates Network, Pennsylvania.

Pradhan, R. K., & Jena, L. K. (2017). Employee performance at workplace: Conceptual model and empirical validation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, *5*(1), 69-85.

Tessema, M. T., Ready, K. J., & Embaye, A. B. (2013). The effects of employee recognition, pay, and benefits on job satisfaction: cross country evidence. *Journal of Business and Economics*, *4*(1), 1-12.

United States Office of Personnel Management, 2001, A handbook for measuring employee performance: aligning employee performance plans with organizational goals, Performance Management Practitioner Series, p. 5

Vosloban, R. I. (2012). The Influence of the Employee's Performance on the company's growth-a managerial perspective. *Procedia economics and finance*, *3*, 660-665.