

MOTIVATION AND EMPLOYEE PERFORMANCE: A CASE STUDY OF KAMPALA CAPITAL CITY AUTHORITY, CENTRAL DIVISION

Namubiru J , Makanga C N , Sendagi Mohammed

1-St Lawrence University, Mengo, Kampala

The study investigated motivation and employee performance in Kampala Capital City Authority, Central division. The main objective of the study was to establish the relationship between motivation and employee performance. The study used cross-sectional quantitative survey design. Using a self-administered questionnaire anchored on a five likert scale, data was collected from 62 respondents. Data was analyzed using SPSS for means, percentages frequencies and standard deviation. In the findings, respondents agreed to a high degree that motivation had a relationship with and in essence enhances employee performance (general average mean=3.62 and overall standard deviation =1.27). The study recommended that the organization continues to polish with the factors that it has at hand to increase on its motivation, for example; recognizing best performance and empowering the human resource department to look into employee performance challenges and address them, to encourage better employee performance.

Key words: Motivation, Performance, Employee, Human Resources

INTRODUCTION

The desire to achieve beyond expectations being driven by internal rather than external factors and to be involved in a continuous strive for improvement is what is known as employment motivation (Tonga, 2007). Halepota (2015) defines employee motivation as a person's active participation and commitment to achieve the prescribed results. On other hand organizational performance comprises the actual output or results of the organization as measured against its intended outputs (Richard

et al., 2009). Most commonly used methods for measuring organization performance can be classified into five categories of performance that is financial performance, operational performance, customer satisfaction, employee satisfaction and learning and growth (Tonga, 2007).

Globally the success or failure of any organization depends on its employees, how well they are motivated towards their work and with how much dedication they are performing (Kashmala and Faiza, 2015). Motivation plays a fundamental role in enhancing employee productivity and performance. Employee motivation is directly linked to employee commitment, productivity and business profits. An organization should know about its employees; those that are its great workers and those who need training. Every employee has his or her own motivational factors that motivate them to perform their work effectively and efficiently (Maduka and Okafor, 2014). Some employees are motivated by recognition and some are by rewards. Organizations should know the needs of their employees. Motivated employees are productive, happy, committed and satisfied with their jobs.

In Africa, employees strive at securing a stable tenure of jobs without being threatened by dismissals (Muogbo, 2013). However, in some organizations, employees are threatened by terminations of their services due to technological changes and wide spread unemployment. This affects employees' concentration on their jobs and in turn affects their performance (Ogbe, et al., 2010). Ogbe et al., (2010) suggest that it is logical to ensure that attention is paid to the nature of human resource and its management as this impacts on human resource behavior and performance and consequently the performance of the organization. Ogbe, et al., 2010 add that in Nigeria, in order to achieve goals and objectives, organizations develop strategies to compete in highly competitive markets and to increase their performance.

In Uganda, good remuneration has been found to be one of the policies the organization can adopt to motivate its workers and thereby increase productivity (Kirusa and Mukuru, 2009). Also with the present global economic trend, most employers in Uganda have realized the fact that for their organizations to compete favorably, motivation of the employees goes a long way in determining the success of the organization. On the

other hand, motivation of employees in an organization is vital not only for the growth of an organization but also for the growth of individual employees (Maduka and Okafor, 2014). Organizations must know their best performers, those who require extra motivation and those not adding value to the organization.

KCCA employees have endeavored to understand the role that motivation plays in increasing organizational performance (Muogbo, 2013). The success of any facet of business or company can be drawn back to motivated employees (Joseph, 2015). It begins with focused recruitment and employee retention, maintaining diligent and joyful employees leading to coherence and subsequent enhanced performance of an organization (Ryan, 2012).

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

Motivation

Rajput (2011), contends that the word motivation is derived from a Latin word “Movere” which literally means “to move”. He defined motivation as “the individual’s desire to demonstrate the behavior and reflects willingness to expend effort”. Motivation can be divided into extrinsic and intrinsic motivation (Campbell, 1990; Aguinis, 2009; Stanley, 2012; Chung, 2013). Extrinsic motivation refers to external factors, which can be measured in monetary terms, such as salary and benefits, promotion and disciplinary action. Intrinsic motivation refers to internal factors such as job satisfaction, responsibility, freedom to act, and to develop skills and abilities to address challenging work and explore opportunities for development.

Employee Performance

Campbell (1990), Aguinis (2009) and Stanley (2012) stipulate performance is about behavior or what employees do, and not what employees produce or the outcomes of their work. Performance is an effort along with the ability to put efforts supported with the organizational policies in order to achieve certain objectives. There are several variables that determine performance (Aguinis, 2009; Stanley, 2012; Chung, 2013). These variables could be classified as general determinants of performance. For instance,

one's qualification can go a long way to enhance his performance. When one goes through education, development and training to acquire a certain level of qualification, it will enhance his working ability all other things being equal. Also, experience is a great asset that can improve an employee's performance. The longer the number of years' experience, the higher the level of performance all other things being equal. Again, quality and style of supervision is a key factor. The use of democratic and autocratic styles of supervision will have varying degree of results given different behaviors of employees; the working environment is another determinant that could have an effect on performance.

Motivation and Employee Performance

Motivation alludes to the strengths inside or past a man that emerges and supports their sense of duty regarding a strategy (Boddy, 2008). According to Robbins and Decenzo (2008) motivation is the readiness to apply elevated amounts of push to achieve hierarchical objectives, adopted by endeavors and capacity to fulfill.

Deci (2002) states that some of the main reasons for the organization to ensure motivation for its employees are a challenging job and a changing workforce. Changing workforce involves high cost of diversity management as the organization strives to effectively manage the diverse workforce, it undergoes mandatory diversity training during which supervisors, employees, and managers receive lessons on the best way to interact with employees and clients. These efforts cost the organization. Deci (2002) further asserts that in recent times, there are lots of diversity management programs available where companies could choose from, taking into account the size of the company and its employees. Some training programs require high travelling and participation cost. Ovidiu (2013) argued that different employees have different beliefs, attitudes, values, backgrounds and thinking. However, all organizations are not aware of the diversity in their workforce and thus are not aware and clear about different ways of motivating their diverse workforce, which can affect the performance of the organization negatively. It is crucial to understand the characteristics of the individual organization staff to develop tailored and adequate motivation approaches for them, in order to tap into their potential to improve organizational performance.

METHODOLOGY

The study used a cross sectional quantitative and qualitative survey design. The study population was 165 staff from different departments, Human Resource, Finance and Accounting and Operations. Using the Yamane (1967) formula, a sample size of 62 respondents was determined comprising of 10 Human Resource staff, 7 Finance and Accounting staff, 5 Directors and 40 staff at Operational level. The sample size was proportionately allocated to the respondents in the selected departments. Simple random sampling was used to select the respondents from the different departments. The research tools that were utilized included a questionnaire to enable the researcher to cover the respondents quickly and an interview guide for qualitative data. The cronbach's alpha coefficient test for reliability of the instruments was 0.922 and evaluated as good. According to Sekaran (2003) Cronbach alpha coefficients of 0.7 are acceptable. Therefore, from the Cronbach alpha coefficient, the questionnaire used to measure motivation and employee performance was a reliable measurement tool. Data was edited, coded and entered into SPSS and summarized using simple frequency tables and percentage distributions.

FINDINGS

Motivation

Generally, respondents agreed to a high degree on all statements concerning motivation practices by Kampala Capital City Authority. Motivation of employees was rated using a five point likert scale where the analysis and interpretation was based on scales of; 1-strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3-not sure, 4-agree and 5-strongly agree. The overall mean score from the questionnaires returned was 3.968. An overall standard deviation of 1.218 was attained, indicating that there was reasonable variability in the responses.

Employee Performance

Results revealed that respondents agreed to a high degree on all statements concerning performance of employees. Motivation of employees was rated using a five point likert scale where the analysis and interpretation

was based on scales of; 1-strongly disagree, 2- disagree, 3-not sure, 4-agree and 5-strongly agree. The overall mean score from the responses in accordance with the returned questionnaires was 3.575. An overall standard deviation of 1.405 indicates there was acceptable variability in the responses.

Motivation and Employee Performance

The results from the study indicate a positive relationship between motivation and employee performance. The results are summarized in Table 1 below.

	Strongly disagree	disagree	Not sure	agree	Strongly agree	Mean	Std. Deviation
With the help of Management, my performance has improved over time	7 11.0%	5 8.2%	1 2.7%	20 31.5%	29 46.6%	3.95	1.35
My performance reduces when KCCA takes long to rotate the employees	12 19.2%	7 11.0%	3 5.5%	26 42.5%	14 21.9%	3.37	1.44
I always perform to my best when I know that am accepted at work	14 21.9%	8 13.7%	1 2.7%	35 57.5%	4 4.1%	3.08	1.33
Employees often endeavor to meet the set targets to be paid a bonus	3 4.1%	1 2.7%	6 9.6%	31 49.3%	21 34.2%	4.07	0.96
Overall average						3.62	1.27

Table 1: Results of the study on the relationship between motivation and employee performance

Source: Primary data, 2022

As observed in Table 1, respondents agreed to a high degree on all statements concerning the relationship between motivation and employee performance in KCCA with an overall mean score of 3.62. An overall standard deviation of 1.27 indicates that there was acceptable variability in the responses. The results therefore strongly support existence of a relationship between motivation and employee performance in KCCA.

We further analyze the results of the relationship between motivation and employee performance as depicted in Table 1. From statement stated as “With the help of Management, my performance has improved over time”, majority 46.6% of the respondents strongly agreed, 31.5% agreed, 8.2% disagreed and 11% strongly disagreed. A mean of 3.95 and

Standard deviation of 1.35 meant that with the help of Management, employee performance can be enhanced. On the statement stated as “My performance reduces when KCCA takes long to rotate the employees”, majority 42.5% of the respondents agreed, 21.9% strongly agreed, 19.2% strongly disagreed and 11% disagreed (Mean score=3.37 and SD=1.439). This implies that motivation is negatively affected, and subsequently performance reduces when KCCA takes long to rotate the employees. Therefore, there is need to rotate employees at KCCA.

Respondents were still asked the statement “I always perform to my best when I know that I am accepted at work”, majority 57.5% strongly agreed, 4.1% agreed, 21.9% strongly disagreed, 13.7% disagreed (Mean score=3.08 and SD=1.331). This implies employees always perform to their best when they know that they are accepted at work. Participants also responded to the statement “Employees often endeavor to meet the set targets to be paid a bonus”, and majority 49.3% of the respondents agreed, 34.2% strongly agreed and 4.1% strongly disagreed and 2.7% disagreed. A mean of 4.07 and Standard deviation of 0.962 were attained, meaning that employees often endeavor to meet the set targets when they expect motivation like receipt of bonuses.

CONCLUSION

There is a high consensus on the relationship between motivation and employee performance in different departments (overall mean of 3.62 and overall standard deviation of 1.27). The findings relate with literature review by Alnasrallah in 2016. The investigation discoveries demonstrate that an organization can spur its performance naturally by giving social support or motivation to its employees. This implies that organizations need to plan for motivation programmes to enable and propel staff towards their work. This consequently results in better performing employee teams in the organization. The study therefore infers that increased staff motivation increases staff productivity and improves overall employee performance. Different strategies might be utilized in enhancing motivation levels, such as staff recognition.

RECOMMENDATIONS

Whereas employee performance at KCCA is commendable, more needs to be done to encourage better employee performance by regularly recognizing the best performers and having ways to shun poor performance. This can be done by giving plagues, certificates of recognition or special trainings for top performers.

KCCA and other organizations need to empower the human resources departments to look into performance problems of employees and identify those which, if not done, may badly affect the organization. One way of doing this is by having suggestion boxes or forming focus group discussions to uncover important staff concerns that impact on motivation and subsequent staff performance. This is necessary in order to take early action and avoid the negative effects of poor staff performance on the overall organizational performance.

There is need for the organizations to continue and polish factors available at hand to increase on motivation of their employees and to put up other ways which will help employees get motivated to continue staying with their organization and improve performance. This can take the form of extrinsic forms of motivation like increasing on salaries and allowances as well as intrinsic forms of motivation such as better work terms and conditions of work, favorable working conditions and employee recognition.

REFERENCES

Aguinis, H. (2012). *Performance Management* (Second ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.

Allen, R. & Helms, M. (2011). Reward Practices and Organizational Performance. *Compensation Benefits Review*, Vol 33, Issue 4, pg. 74-80.

Anthony, R. & Govindarajan, V. (2007). *Management Systems Control*. Singapore, SG: Irwin Publishers.

- Armstrong, D. (2007). *Employee Reward Management and Practice*. London, UK: Kogan Page.
- Balunywa, T. (2005). *An examination of leadership and employee creativity: The relevance of traits and relationships*. Kampala: Makerere University.
- Baron, H., Henley, S., McGibbon, A. & McCarthy, T. (2012). *Motivation Questionnaire Manual and User's Guide*. Sussex, NJ: Saville and Holdsworth Limited.
- Carter, McN. (2004). *Field Guide to Leadership and Supervision*. New York: Routledge.
- Chib, S. (2012). Quality of Work Life and Organizational Performance Parameters at Workplace. *SEGiReview*, Vol. 5, Issue 2, pg. 36-47.
- Chin-Ju, T. (2010). *Reward and Incentive Compensation and Organizational Performance*, Dallas, TX: Evidence from the Semi-Conductor Industry.
- Clifton, J.M. (2000). *Restructuring the employee relationship: implication for firms, unions and employers*. USA: CUNA international, Inc.
- Cole, F. (1998). A model of achievement motives, goal orientations, intrinsic interest and academic achievement. *Psychological Reports*.
- Cole, G. A. & Kelly, P. (2011). *Management Theory and Practice*. London, UK: Cengage.
- Cole, G. A. (2000). *Personal Management*. London, UK: Letts Educational.
- Daniel, T. & Metcalf, G. (2009). *Employee Recognition: Selling, Implementing and communicating the program*. Illinois, CH: American Society for Training and Development HR.
- Deci, E., Ryan, R.M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. New York: A division of Plenum Publishing

Corporation.

Deming, W. (1986). *Out of the Crisis*. Cambridge, MA: M.I.T., Center for Advanced Engineering Study.

Doellgast, L. (2006). *Discretionary effort and the organization of work: Employee participation and work reform since Hawthorne*. New York: Columbia University.

Drucker, P. (1954). *The Practice of Management*. New York: Harper & Row William G.

Fowler, J.M. (2001). *The relationship among subordinate personality and their need for motivation*. Published dissertation, South Africa: De Mont Fort University.

Fried, Y. & Slowik, L. H. (2004). *Enriching goal-setting with time: An integrated approach*. *Academy of Management and Review*, Vol.29, Issue 3, pg. 404-422.

Gregor, McD. (1999). *The Human side of Enterprise*. New York: Hill Book Company.

Heneman, R.L. (1992). *Merit Pay: Linking pay increases to performance ratings*. New York. Addison-Wesley.

Judge, T. & Ferris, G. (2013). *Social context of performance evaluation decisions*. *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol 36, Issue 3, Pg. 80-105.

Koontz, H. (1990). *Essentials of management*. New York: The Free Press
Likert, R. (1967). *The Human Organization: Its Management and Value*. New York: McGraw-Hill.

Lun, C. C. (2003). *Explorations in achievement motivation*. Paper presented at the annual meeting of the American Psychological Association, Washington, DC.

McClelland, D.C. (1971). *Assessing Human Motivation*. Morristown,

NJ: General Learning Press.

Miles, A.M. (2004). *Index of Economic Freedom*. Heritage Books: Amazon.

Milkovich, G., Wigdor, A.K. (1991.) *Pay for performance. Evaluating performance appraisal and merit pay*. Washington DC: National Academy Press.

Newstrom, J. W. (2011). *Human Behavior at Work*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Perrin, T. (2003). *Working today: Understanding what drives employee engagement. The 2003 Towers Perrin Report*.

Resker, J. (2007). *Employee performance indicators*.

Roberson, Q. M. & Stewart, M. M. (2016). Understanding the motivational effects of procedural and informational justice in feedback processes. *British Journal of Psychology*, Vol. 97, Issue 3, pg. 281-298.

Saleem, S. (2011). The Impact of Financial Incentives on Employees. *European Journal of Business and Management*, Vol. 3, Issue 4, pg.15-23.

Sanjay, k., Bradley, E. (2008). Public service motivation and interpersonal citizenship behavior in public organizations. *International Public Management Journal*, 11 (1),89-108.

Smith, K. G. & Hitt, M. A. (2005). *Great minds in management: the process of theory development*. New York, NY: Oxford University Press.

Sekaran U. (2003), *Research Methods for Business – A skill Building Approach*, Fourth Edition, New Jersey: John Wiley & Sons Inc.

Stanley, T. L. (2012). Motivation in today's workplace. *Human Resource Journal*, Vol. 55, Issue 7, pages 1-9.

Steers, R. M. & Porter, L. W. (2011). *Motivation and work performance*. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill.

Van-Dijk, D. & Kluger, A. N. (2004). Feedback sign effect on motivation: Is it moderated by regulatory focus? *Applied Psychology: An international Review*, Vol. 53, Issue 1, Pages 113-135.