

MOTIVATION TOOLS AS A DETERMINANT OF EFFECTIVENESS ON ACADEMIC STAFF IN SELECTED PRIVATE UNIVERSITIES IN CENTRAL UGANDA

PAUL EDABU & IJEOMA BLESSINGS ANUMAKA

College of Higher Degrees and Research, Kampala International University, Kampala, Uganda

ABSTRACT

This study was to investigate the way motivation tools are applied in private universities in central Uganda as a mechanism for encouraging academic staff to conduct assigned work, to establish the difference caused by gender in the way motivation tools are applied among private universities in central Uganda. The descriptive comparative survey designs involving ex-post facto design. 665 respondents participated in the study. They included professors, associate professors, senior lecturers, lecturers, assistant lecturers and teaching assistants. The respondents were selected using Sloven's formula. The proportional stratified sampling technique was employed. While universities were selected using simple random sampling. Data was collected from four private universities which included: 215 academic staff of Kampala International University, 77 academic staff from Nkumba University, 65 academic staff from Uganda Christian University, and 37 academic staff from Cavendish University. Using 2 sets of non-standardized and research devised questionnaires. Data were analyzed using descriptive analysis and Independent t- sample test. The way motivation tools were applied was disagreed which alludes to unmotivated. There was no significant difference caused by sex in the way motivation tools are applied in private universities in central Uganda. In conclusion, academic staffs were unmotivated leading to low productivity. The researcher recommended that salary offered should be based on labor market conditions, cost of living, and performance in order to retain and avoid high labor turnover of the staff.

KEYWORDS: Motivation Tools, Financial Rewards, Employee Benefit, Recognition, Promotion Practices, Training, Working Conditions, Academic Staff, Private University

INTRODUCTION

In recent years, emphasis has been placed on the role motivation tools play in getting employees to put in their best efforts to work. Various findings have shown that people work hard if their needs are met (Aluko, 1998 and 2001; Mullins, 1999; Lussier, 2000). They assert that management in institutions must be aware that employees have their values, attitudes and sentiments that affect their performance to a large extent, and that these values, attitudes and sentiments differ from one employee to another. Since their emergence in the 1990's, private universities have been dogged by challenges like government policies, curriculum innovations, religion, limited resources, the limitations of state universities, the prevalence of human immuno virus/ autoimmune diseases (HIV/AIDS), maintenance of quality, and the increasing demand for higher education.

Actually in Africa, as Senteza Kajubi (1999) points out, those private universities were very few, and totaling about 30 and their role are still insignificant in the case of Uganda. It was possible for private universities to emerge in the 1990's because of the liberalization policy instituted by the government of Uganda. Prior to this policy all university education was a monopoly of the state. It was only theological institutions like Bishop Tucker Theological

College and Ggaba Seminary which offered higher education. Even then their academic qualifications were validated by foreign universities.

Over time, many of the private universities contracted and continue to contract loans to enable them fund especially their infrastructure and other facilities. However, some have had a very difficult time with such debts since some were established by funds, somehow collapsed and even placed on auction in mid 2001 (Mugeere, 2001). Further, Mugeere observed that, most of the private universities in Uganda have meager resources to sustain the staff, whereby most of the universities entertain part time staff (2001). The staff complained of the unattractive general terms of service and other conditions of work. The levels of remuneration and terms of service were not very competitive in the job market leading to inadequate motivation and poor retention of staff. There was poor pay. For instance professors earn 1.5 million Ugandan shillings, while associate professors earn 1.2 million Ugandan shillings.

According to the Daily Monitor issue, Thursday, December 16, 2006, lecturers were working abnormally under skewed conditions amidst poor pay, for instance lecturers were involved on normal workload, research supervision, community service and publication to mention but a few. The report also mentioned that in some faculties, a lecturer is at work from 7:00am to 10:00pm each working day and the weekend lecturers engage in extra-load, not because they like it but because of poor remuneration. As for paying for marking, setting exams and invigilation, it is true that some faculties and schools pay some money for these activities, however, what was paid was not commensurate to the input. It was simply an incentive and it was taxed. Most universities require their academic staff to engage in teaching, carrying out research, publish and render community service. They have defined level of performance on which every staff is judged for employment and promotion. However, the level of productivity of the academic staff in many private universities is far below. Employee productivity does not seem to have improved overtime (Wangoli, 2010). Armstrong observes that when employees are unhappy, frustrated, uninspired and not motivated, their level of production is low (2007).

There is however, a growing concern about poor performance in many organizations in Uganda within the context of rewarding employees (Uganda Private Organization Association, 2003). In Kampala International university, the situation at hand characterized by low commitment and morale, dissatisfaction among the employees, and high turnover rates has indicated that employee motivation has been taken for granted (Staff association report, 07/03/2011). It has been observed however, that teacher performance in Uganda in general, and at university level in particular is low, which poor performance at university, is reflected in irregular attendance, failure to meet deadlines, and not doing full day's work (Uganda Government, 2008). According to Maicibi (2005), a personnel who has consistently and continuously put up good behavior needs to be rewarded as and when due. Promotions should be as regular as expected. These have positive correlation to the workers in terms of commitment and productivity. The problems of promotion are common among the private universities under study. This is discouraging the educators across different ages from going on with further studies, because promotions are not straightforward. Part of the problem has also been attributed to brain drain. Lecturers are looking for greener pastures (Lindner, 1998; Sutherland & Canwell, 2004; Wangoli, 2010).

The above scenario seemed to be the same among private universities in Central Uganda. However, all these studies left gaps to be explored which this study has attempted to investigate. Further, to investigate whether motivation tools are the main cause of the matter in the selected private universities in Uganda.

STATEMENT OF THE PROBLEM

The level of application of motivation tools to the academic staff in many private universities in Uganda is far below (Kasozi, 2008; Nambassa 2003). This failure to fully improve on level of application of motivation tools in the private University may lead to several undesirable outcomes; promotion not straightforward, brain drain due to lack of commitment, unclear policies in remuneration, lack of qualified staff, high labour turnover, unattractive general terms of service and working conditions. Many universities have few professors, senior lecturers, lecturers which imply that the university may not achieve their goals and contribute to national development the way they are expected to do due to lack of qualified teaching staff and inefficient management.

This situation was also revealed by Aacha, (2010), Sangaire, (2007), Kagubaire, (2006), Nyuakiiza, (2005) Mugeere, (2001); Farrant, (1997), Carron, (1996), Kasaija, (1991), that where teachers pay is very low, there is normally de facto recognition that the labour process in schools has to be organized in such a way that enables teachers, the autonomy to generate additional income. It is persistence is a threat to the survival of the universities, since unproductive staff members cannot enable the universities to pursue their objectives effectively. It is however, not clear whether the cause of the problem is related to the level application of motivational tools to academic staff, with a view of suggesting ways of remedying the situation.

Thus, the assumed decline in employee motivation and in commitment to high-quality work performance may have a tremendous effect on work productivity as well as overall efficiency. Such scenario has created a major impact in private universities in central Uganda and conceived as leading to poor quality service delivery in terms of low commitment of teachers. Hence the need for this study investigating the importance of the motivation tools as a determinant of academic staff commitment to work in private Universities. The question therefore, what is the level of use of motivation tools? Is there a difference caused by gender in the way motivation tools is applied among academic staff in private universities in central Uganda?

PURPOSE OF THE STUDY

The purpose of this study was to analyze the way motivation tools are applied to academic staff members and to establish gender difference in level of application of motivation tools of the academic staff in private universities in central Uganda.

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

The specific objectives of the study were;

- To investigate the level of application of motivation tools in private universities in central Uganda as a mechanism for encouraging academic staff to conduct assigned work.
- To establish the gender difference in level of application of motivation tools of the academic staff of private universities in central Uganda.

HYPOTHESIS

The study tested the following null hypothesis at 0.05 level of significance:

H₀₁: There is no significant difference caused by gender in the way motivation tools are applied in private universities in central Uganda.

METHODOLOGY

The study design was a descriptive comparative survey design involving ex- post facto design. Descriptive survey was used to discover differences (descriptive comparative) and to provide precise quantitative description and to observe behavior (Treece and Treece, 1973). Utilizing the Sloven's formula the actual number of respondents (665) was computed. The purposive sampling technique was employed, data was collected from four private universities which included: 215 academic staff of Kampala International University, 77 academic staff from Nkumba University, 65 academic staff from Uganda Christian University, and 37 academic staff from Canvendish University using 2 sets of non-standardized and research devised questionnaires. Data were analyzed using the percentages, mean, t-test and One-Way Analysis of Variance (ANOVA) at 0.05 level of significance. This questionnaire consists of 31 items categorized into the following elements of motivation tools: financial rewards (items 1-7); non-financial rewards, employee benefits (items 8-11); recognition (items 12-13); promotion practices (items 14-20); training (items 21-25) and working conditions (items 26-31). The scoring system and response modes consist of the following: strongly agree (4); agree (3); disagree (2); strongly disagree (1).

FINDINGS, DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Table 1: Summary Table on Mean Score on Use of Motivation Tools by Academic Staff in Private Universities

Category	Mean	Std. Dev	Interpretation
Training	2.69	0.551	Low
Working condition	2.64	0.535	Low
Promotion practices	2.60	0.517	Low
Recognition	2.46	0.738	Unmotivated
Financial Rewards	2.31	0.663	Unmotivated
Employee Benefits	2.14	0.751	Unmotivated

Mean Range	Response Mode	Interpretation
3.5 - 4.00	Strongly Agree	High motivation/productivity
2.5 - 3.49	Agree	Low motivation/productivity
1.5 - 2.49	Disagree	Unmotivated/unproductive
1.00 -1.49	Strongly Disagree	Unmotivated/unproductive

Table 1 shows the summary of mean scores on the way motivation tools are applied in private universities in central Uganda as a mechanism for encouraging academic staff to conduct assigned work. A perusal through the means reveals that respondents agreed on training, working condition and promotion practices (all the means were above 2.5 as per the mean ranges). This implied that provision of training, conducive working condition and promotion practices were low. While recognition, financial rewards and employee benefits respondents disagreed (all the means were below 2.5 as per the mean ranges). This implied that respondents were unmotivated by the financial reward, employee benefit and recognition applied to them. This further show that all the four universities offered inadequate recognition, financial rewards and employee benefits hence leading to high labour turn over and staff yearning for greener pastures.

This was further revealed on one occasion during the interviews it was gathered that most private universities today do not pay salary to academic staff based on rank and qualification, but rather on individual bargaining power.

The findings of the interview agree with the earlier findings that respondents were unmotivated by the recognition, financial rewards and employee benefits applied to them. The findings further conclude that level of work productivity of academic staff depended on the way motivation tools are applied in private universities in central Uganda as a mechanism for encouraging academic staff to conduct assigned work. Vroom's (1964) Expectancy theory explains why people such as academic staff work and behave in the way they do in terms of efforts and direction they take.

Objective Two: to Establish the Gender Difference in Level of Application of Motivation Tools to the Academic Staff of Private Universities in Central Uganda

In objective two of the study was addressed, starting with description of respective differences means between male and female in terms of extent tools motivate and bivariate tests of their significance to level of work productivity using Independent Samples t-test, ending with testing of the pertinent hypothesis using Independent Samples t-test;

Table 2: Independent Sample T-test Results on Difference between Motivation Tools of Male and Female Academic Staff

Categories of Motivation Tools	Sex	Mean	t-value	Sig	Interpretation	Decision on Ho
Financial Reward	Male	2.29	-.813	.417	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.35				
Employee Benefits	Male	2.11	-1.23	.216	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.20				
Recognition	Male	2.48	.879	.380	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.41				
Promotion Practices	Male	2.61	.632	.527	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.58				
Training	Male	2.69	.333	.739	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.67				
Working Conditions	Male	2.63	-.448	.654	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.66				

(Level of Significance = 0.05).

The results on (Table 2), show that since the ($t = -.813$, $sig. = .417$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in financial rewards for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 2.35) were better than males (mean = 2.29) at financial rewards.

Regarding results on (Table 2), show that since the ($t = -1.23$, $sig. = .216$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in Employee Benefits for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 2.20) were better than males (mean = 2.11) at employee benefits.

Regarding results on (Table 2), show that since the ($t = .879$, $sig. = .380$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in Recognition for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.48) were better than females (mean = 2.41) at Recognition.

Regarding results on (Table 2), show that since the ($t = .632$, $sig. = .527$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis.

Infer that mean scores in Promotion Practices for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.61) were better than females (mean = 2.58) at Promotion Practices.

Regarding results on (Table 2), show that since the ($t = .333$, $sig. = .739$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in Training for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.69) were better than females (mean = 2.67) at Training.

Regarding results on (Table 2), show that since the ($t = -.448$, $sig. = .654$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in working conditions for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 2.66) were better than males (mean = 2.63) at working conditions.

The results on Table 2 conclude that there was no significant difference between motivation tools and the two sexes. The findings conclude that, there was no significant difference between male and female academic staff in terms of motivation tools in the four private universities.

Testing Hypothesis

Table 3: Independent t-sample Test Results For No Significance Difference Caused by Sex in the Way Motivation Tools are Applied in Private Universities in Central Uganda

Measures	Sex	Mean	t-value	Sig	Interpretation	Decision on Ho
Motivation Tools	Male	2.49	.188	.851	No significant difference	Accepted
	Female	2.48				

Level of Sig. = 0.05.

The results on (Table 3) show that ($t = .188$, $sig. = .851$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in motivation tools for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 3, suggest that males (mean = 2.49) were better than females (mean = 2.48) at motivation tools.

Results on Table 3 conclude that, the t-values of motivation tools ($t = .188$, $sig. = .851$) and work productivity ($t = 1.267$, $sig. = .206$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in motivation tools and work productivity for the two sexes did not differ significantly.

DISCUSSIONS

The study found that, the way motivation tools were applied in private universities as a mechanism for encouraging academic staff to conduct assigned work strongly disagreed for unmotivated (Table 2: mean = 2.47). This therefore, shows that motivation tools such as recognition, financial rewards and employee benefits offered in the private universities was unmotivated. Then motivation tools such as training, working conditions and promotion practices were fair. The use of these motivation tools by private universities needs to be improved, so that there is no high labour turn over and yearn for greener pastures. This findings were in agreement with researchers (e.g. Lawal, Awolaye and Akinsola, (2007); Ayeni (2005); Akintoye (2000); Kazeem, (1999); Perry et al. (1989); Amadi (1983), accepting the assertion that most universities offer low financial rewards upon performance.

Contextually, the finding was in line with the premise on which this study started. Bender and Heywood (2004) found that university professors who receive high income in comparison with other jobs have low job satisfaction because they think that PhD holders who work in industry earn more than them. Such comparison may affect job satisfaction because of the feelings of injustice. However, the findings do not agree with earlier researchers like (e.g. Elton Mayo Hawthorne Studies from 1924 to 1932). The study found employees were not motivated solely by money and employee behavior is linked to their attitudes (Dickson, 1973). Reio and Callahon (2004) concludes that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards motivates the employee resulted in higher productivity.

In a similar scenario, the study brought out the fact that, (Table 2: Mean = 2.47) though there were variations in mean, the overall mean was unmotivated. Table 4.9.2 further suggests that employee benefits applied to academic staff in these private universities were unmotivated. It further indicates why there is high labor turnover in the private universities.

The study further reveals that recognition had an overall (Table 2: mean = 2.45), suggesting that recognition in the universities were interpreted as unmotivated, meaning that recognition policy in private universities is still lacking. Using a multiple linear regression analysis of all statistically significant motivation and productivity factors, the top ten factors that influence the productivity of a Seabee are: (a) Type of work; (b) recognition; (c) safety; (d) personal problems; (e) training received; (f) supervisor motivation; (g) rewards; (h) inspections, (i) morale; (j) supervisor relations (Burns, Timothy.1990).

In reference to promotion practices, the study reveals the overall (Table 2: mean = 2.59; interpretation unmotivated). This shows that though the promotion practice was not based on job description, staff was promoted. Theory-wise, the study concludes that promotion practices were important in promoting work productivity among the academic staff. Contextually, the study concludes that academic staffs were promoted without salary attached to the position in the four private universities.

Table 2 reveals that training was interpreted as agreed which alludes to low motivation with an overall mean = 2.68, suggesting that, all the four private universities under study had no policy on training its staff. It further showed that there is equitable access to job related training opportunities to all the staff. The findings were in agreement with earlier researchers Apospori, et al. (2008); Guidetti and Mazzanti, (2007); Gabriella, (2005); Mullins, (1999); Mincer, (1998); Bartel, (1994) who found that training activities are positively associated with high performance practices, innovative labour demand features, work force skill level, firm size, and are affected by labour flexibility in various directions. In terms of theory, the study concludes that training activities are positively correlated with work productivity of academic staff. The study concludes that training is important for academic staff in order to improve their performance.

Concerning working conditions, shows evidently that adequate safety policies were not provided as agreed by the respondents and alludes to low motivation (Table 2: mean = 2.64). The results further reveal that staff safety is lacking and the university management need to work out the clear policies regarding staff insurance policy, health insurance and other insurance amenities need to be implemented. The study further revealed that the results showed low motivation, office related facilities (computer, internet services and intercom telephone network) was ranked fifth, improvement on this facilities is vital for the smooth running of the office and performance. This finding concur with earlier researchers Muheeb, (2004); Kazeem, (1999) who confirmed that greater attention should be given to improving work-related

conditions of teachers to improve the quality of education. While studies like that of (Bhaga, 2010) disagree with the findings.

The findings were in agreement with earlier researchers e.g. Apospori, et al. (2008); Guidetti and Mazzanti, (2007); Gabriella, (2005); Mullins, (1999); Mincer, (1998); Bartel, (1994) who found that training activities are positively associated with high performance practices, innovative labour demand features, work force skill level, firm size, and are affected by labour flexibility in various directions. In terms of theory, the study concludes that training activities are positively correlated with work productivity of academic staff. The study concludes that training is important for academic staff in order to improve their performance.

Significant Difference Caused by Gender in the Way Motivation Tools are Applied to Academic Staff

The study found out that there was no significant difference in Motivation tools for the two sexes (Table 2; $t = -.813$, sig. = .417). Infer that mean scores in financial rewards for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 2.35) were better than males (mean = 2.29) at financial rewards. Employee benefits for the two sexes (Table 2; $t = -1.23$, sig. = .216). Infer that mean scores in Employee Benefits for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 2.20) were better than males (mean = 2.11) at employee benefits. Recognition for the two sexes (Table 2; $t = .879$, sig. = .380). Infer that mean scores in Recognition for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.48) were better than females (mean = 2.41) at Recognition. Promotion Practices for the two sexes (Table 2; $t = .632$, sig. = .527). Infer that mean scores in Promotion Practices for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 4.13.1, suggest that males (mean = 2.61) were better than females (mean = 2.58) at Promotion Practices. Training for the two sexes (Table 2; $t = .333$, sig. = .739). Infer that mean scores in Training for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that males (mean = 2.69) were better than females (mean = 2.67) at Training. Working conditions for the two sexes (Table 2; $t = -.448$, sig. = .654). Infer that mean scores in working conditions for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means in Table 2, suggest that females (mean = 2.66) were better than males (mean = 2.63) at working conditions.

The results on Table 2 conclude that there was no significant difference caused by gender in the way motivation tools are applied to the academic staff. The findings conclude that, there was no significant difference between male and female academic staff in terms of motivation tools in the four private universities. The study collaborates with other scholars on the issue of gender, Nelson, (2001); Wiley, (1997); Harpaz, (1990); Mathieu and Zajac (1990); Kovach, (1987) reported its relationship to organizational commitment. Kovach (1987) also found no significant differences between men and women, but however reported that, women placed full appreciation of work done in first place, while men put it in second place. Huddleston et al. (2002) found that female employees showed a stronger preference for aspects of their jobs that relate to security, such as pay and job security.

Kovach (1995) found that women in the workplace attached considerably more importance to interpersonal relationships and communication than men, and related the finding to women's continuing endeavours to cope with their dual role of homemaker and employee, where both these aspects demand attention.

Wiley (1997) concluded that, women placed greater importance on appreciation of work done, interesting work and more importance on good working conditions, whereas, males on the other hand placed more emphasis on interesting

work. Similarly, it was found by Irving, et al. (1997) that the men in their sample had higher level of commitment than the women.

Furthermore some studies have shown that job satisfaction is influenced by gender and age Gazioglu, Tansel, (2006); Mesh'al, (2001). Reif et al. (1976) examined significance of 33 particular rewards for men and women and found that gender was the determining factor of appreciation of the value of reward. Gooderman et al. (2004) have also discovered that men prove to be much more financially motivated than women do. A study by Miner (1974a) of business managers (44 females and 26 males) and educational administrators (25 females and 194 men) found that managerial motivation was “significantly related to the success of female managers” (p. 197), but there were no consistent differences between men and women in managerial motivation.

In the studies of motivation, money has always been and is still an important motivator, but not the only one (Anon, 2004:2). Most employees today want to feel that their work makes a difference, but for some people money can still be a very important motivator (Anon., 2004:2). Companies attempt to increase employee motivation by linking pay and work productivity (DuBrin, 2000:307). If the pay system is well designed, money can still be a motivator for employees. Theoretically, the findings concurred that, wages of academic staff is important to improve work productivity in university. The findings conclude that, there was significant difference between male and female academic staff in terms of motivation tools in the four private universities.

Although there was no significant difference between the good working conditions and sex, it is interesting to note that having good working conditions was ranked as the fifth most important motivator in Lindner's survey at the Ohio State University (Lindner, 1998:3). Working conditions are a primary concern of management, as the working environment can determine the employees' performance and productivity (Sutherland & Canwell, 2004:244). However, evidence shows that the settings in the workplace do not have a serious impact on employee performance, but they can definitely soften or harden certain employee behaviors. So improving working conditions can motivate employees to perform better (Robbins, 2000:574).

Discussion on Hypothesis One

The study found out that there was no significant difference caused by sex in the way motivation tools are applied in private universities in central Uganda. Results on Table 4.14 conclude that, the t-values of motivation tools ($t = .188$, $sig. = .851$) is greater than $\alpha = 0.05$, then at the 5 % level of significance, accept the null hypothesis and reject the research or alternative hypothesis. Infer that mean scores in motivation tools for the two sexes did not differ significantly; and the sample means of motivation tools in Table 3, suggest that males (mean = 2.49) were better than females (mean = 2.48) and males (mean = 2.91) were better than females (mean = 2.87) at motivation tools.

CONCLUSIONS

Based on the findings presented, the following conclusions were drawn:

- The academic staffs were un motivated the way motivation tools were applied in private universities in central Uganda.
- There was no significant difference caused by sex in the way motivation tools are applied in private universities in

central Uganda.

Recommendations

The study recommended that the university council through human resource office should revisit and implement the staff manual policies concerning staff remuneration, welfare and other financial benefits. The salary offered should be based on labor market conditions, cost of living, and performance in order to retain and avoid high labor turnover of the staff.

Organizational learning and employee personal growth are impacted by the incentives offered in the work environment. It is recommended, implementing a variety of awards such as team awards, individual recognition based on extraordinary performance, and rewards for all employees for their achieved goals. In order to strengthen teamwork, praise employees for performance that benefits the team. Awarding only a few people with rewards might be counterproductive.

REFERENCES

1. Aacha, M. (2010). Effects of motivation on the performance of primary school teachers in Kimaanya-Kyabakuza division, Masaka district. Unpublished (Masters of education) dissertation, Kampala, Uganda, Makerere University.
2. Adams, J. S., (1963). Towards Understanding of Inequity. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 67, pp. 422-436.
3. Adams, K. A. (2004). *How to organize and generate school business*. London: Pitman Publishing Ltd.
4. Adams, U. S. and Jacobson, P. R. (1964). Effect of wage inequalities on work quality. *Journal of Abnormal and Social Psychology*, 3(4), 12-25
5. Akintoye, I. R. (2000). The place of financial management in personnel psychology. A Paper Presented as Part of Personnel Psychology Guest Lecture Series. Department of Guidance and Counselling, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
6. Akintayo DI (2002). Assessment of determinants of organizational productivity: An holistic approach. *J. Soc. Sci. Manage.*, 12(2), 52-60.
7. Akintayo MO (2006). The influence of working environment on job performance among the workers in private sector. *J. Manage.*, 5(2), 45-54.
8. Akintoye, I. R. (2000). The place of financial management in personnel psychology. A Paper Presented as Part of Personnel Psychology Guest Lecture Series. Department of Guidance and Counselling, University of Ibadan, Nigeria.
9. Aluko, M. A. O. (1998). Factors that Motivate the Nigerian Workers. *Ife Social Sciences*.
10. Aluko, M. A. O. (2001). The Impact of Culture on Organizational Performance in Selected Textile Firms in Nigeria. (Unpublished PhD Thesis, Department of Sociology and Anthropology), Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.

11. Amadi, P. (1983). The dilemma of the Nigerian teacher. *The Fountain* Vol. 20. 14.
12. Amar, A. (2004). Motivating knowledge workers to innovate: A model integrating motivation dynamics and antecedents. *European Journal of Innovation Management*, 7(2), 89-101.
13. Amin, M. E. (2003). Over-viewing methodology of research. Paper presented at a seminar on the overview of research in Education for teachers of the School of Education, organized by Department of Higher Education, Makerere University, held March 5th, 2003, Kampala, Uganda.
14. Amin, M. E. (2005). *Social Science Research: Conception, Methodology & Analysis*. Makerere University Printery. Kampala. Uganda.
15. Anon. L. (2004). Five strategies for turning stress into productive energy. *Accounting office management and administration report*, 4(2).
16. Armstrong, M. (2010). *Essential Human Resource Management.*, London: Kogan.
17. Armstrong, M. (1996). *Employee Reward*, Institution of Personnel and Development, London.
18. Armstrong, M. (1997). *A Hand book of HRM Practice*, 10th ed., London & Philadelphia.
19. Armstrong, M. (2007). *A Hand book of HRM Practice*, 10th ed., London & Philadelphia.
20. Aswathappa, K. (2008). *Human Resource Management*, 5th Ed, Tata McGraw-Hill Publishing co. Ltd, New Delhi.
21. Assam, A. P. 1982. *Motivation and Job Satisfaction* Unpublished MSc Dissertation University of Lagos, Nigeria.
22. Apospori, E., Nikandrou, I., Brewster, C., and Papalexandris, N. (2008), 'HRM and Organizational Performance in Northern and Southern Europe, ' *International Journal of Human Resource Management* 19, 7, 1187–1207.
23. Bartel, A. P. (1994). Productivity gains from the implementation of employee training programs. *Industrial Relations*, 33(4), 411-425.
24. Bhaga, T. (2010). The impact of working conditions on the productivity of nursing staff in the Midwife and Obstetrical Unit of Pretoria West Hospital, MSW dissertation, University of Pretoria, Pretoria.
25. Carron, G. (1996). The quality of primary schools in different development context. UNESCO, Paris, International institute of educational planning.
26. Dickson, W. J. (1973). Hawthorn experiments. In C. Heyel (ed.), *The encyclopedia of management*, 2nd ed. (pp. 298-302). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold. *Dissertation Abstract International* Volume 2 No. 1.
27. DuBrin, A. J. (2000). *Essentials of Management*. 5thed. Melbourne: South-Western College Publishing.
28. Farrant, J. S. (1997). *Principles and practice of Education*. Longman: Singapore publishers Pte Ltd. Feb. 1: 4
29. Gabriella, C. (2005). Training, wage and labour productivity in Italy. *Labour Economics*, 12(4), 557-576.
30. Gooderman, P., Nordhaug, O., Ringdal, K. and Birkelund, E. (2004). Job values among future business leaders: the impact of gender and social background. *Scandinavian Journal of Management*, 20, 3, 277-95.

31. Guidetti, G., & Massimiliano, M. (2007). Firm level training in local economic systems complementarities in production and firm innovation strategies. *The Journal of Socio-Economics*, 36(6), 875-894.
32. Hackett, (1979). *Success in Management Personnel*; (2nd Ed) John Murray Publishers Ltd.
33. Hackett, R. D., Bycio, P., & Hausdorf, P. A. (1994). Further assessment of Meyer and Allen's 1991 three components model of organizational commitment. *Journal of Applied Psychology* 79, 340-350.
34. Harpaz, I (1990). The importance of work goals: An international perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21.75-93
35. Harpaz, I. (1990), The importance of work goals: An international perspective, *Journal of International Business Studies*, Vol. 21, Issue 1, pp. 75-100.
36. Kasaija, I. (1991). Effects of monetary and non-monetary rewards on motivation among post primary institutions in Hoima and Masindi districts. Unpublished (Masters of education) dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
37. Kasozi, A. B. K. (2008). National Council for Higher Education Charter accreditation report on Kampala International University. Kampala: Ministry of Education and sports Press.
38. Kazeem, S. O. (1999). Correlates of job motivation of workers in selected public and private secondary schools in Ife-Ijesa Zone, sun State, Nigeria. Masters of Arts in Education thesis. Department of Educational Foundations and Counseling, Faculty of Education. Obafemi Awolowo University, Ile-Ife, Nigeria.
39. Kovach, K. A. (1987) "What motivates Employees? Workers and Supervisors give different answers", *Business Horizons*, Sept/Oct, Vol. 30, No. 6, pp. 58-65
40. Kovach, K. A. (1987). What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Business Horizon*, 30.58-65.
41. Lindner, J. R. (1998) "Understanding employee Motivation", *Journal of Extension*, June, Vol. No3, pp. 1-8
42. Locke, E. Parkin, A. B., Tutesigensi, A. and Buyukalp, A. I. (2009). Motivation among Construction Workers in Turkey. In: Dainty, A. R. J., (ed.) UK. Arcom, Reading.
43. London, C & Higgot, K (1997). An Employee Reward and Recognition Process. *The TQM, Magazine* 9(5) MCB University Press.
44. London, M., & Stumpf, S. A. (1983). "Effects of Candidate Characteristics on Management Promotion Decisions: An Experimental Study." *Personnel Psychology*.
45. Lublin, J. S. (1991). "Rights Laws to Spur Shifts in Promotions." *Wall Street Journal*. December 30, p. B1.
46. Lussier, R. N. (2000). *Management Fundamentals: Concepts, Applications, Skill Development*. New York. South Western College Publishing.
47. Maicibi N. A. (2007). *Human Resource Management Success, The tips for HRM Theorists and Practitioners*, Makerere Printery, Kampala.

48. Maicibi, N. A. (2003). Pertinent Issues in Employees Management. MPK Graphics (U) Ltd.
49. Maicibi, N. A. (2005). Pertinent Issues in Management; Human Resource & Educational Management. Kampala Net Media. Publisher Ltd.
50. Makerere University Graduate School, MUG, (2001).
51. Makerere University. (2000). Makerere University strategic plan 2000/01 – 2004/05. Kampala.
52. Makerere University. (2004). Annual/ report 2003. Kampala: Author.
53. Maslow, A. (1970), Motivation and Personality (3rd ed) New York. McGraw Hill.
54. Mathauer. I & Imhoff. I (2006). Health worker motivation in Africa; the role of non-financial incentives & Human Resource Management tools. HR for Health, 4: 24.
55. Milne. P. (2007). Motivation, incentives and organizational culture. Journal of Knowledge Management, 11 (6): 28-38.
56. Miner, J. B. (1974a). Motivation to manage among women: Studies of business managers and educational administrators. Journal of Vocational Behavior, 5, 197- 208.
57. Mullins, L. J. (1999). Management and Organisational Behaviour, 5th edition, Financial Times Prentice Hall, Harlow.
58. Mullins, L. J. (1999). Management and Organizational Behavior. 5 New Visions. June 19.
59. Mumanyire, M. (2005). Factors affecting teacher motivation in secondary schools in Mukono district. Unpublished (Masters of education) dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
60. Nambassa, K. M. (2003). The impact of classroom supervision on the quality of teaching and learning in primary schools in Wakiso District, Uganda. Unpublished (Masters of education) dissertation, Makerere University, Kampala, Uganda.
61. Nyuakiiza, D. G. (2005). Rewards Management and Performance of Lecturers at Nkumba University. Unpublished Masters (of Arts in Education management) dissertation Makerere University, Kampala-Uganda.
62. Reif, W. E., Newstrom, J. W., St Louis, R. J. (1976). Sex as a discriminating variable in organizational reward decisions. Academy of Management Journal, 19, 3, 460-76.
63. Robbins, P. S & Decenzo, D. A. (2000). Fundamentals of Management 3rd ed, New Jersey, Prentice Hall.
64. Sangaire. E. M. (2007). Motivation and Performance of Teacher's in Private Secondary schools. Case study of central college. Kawempe.
65. Senteza Kajubi W (1998). From the elitist to mass higher education: the phenomenon of private universities in Uganda. In The Uganda Education Journal. Volume 1. Number 1, Kampala.
66. Staff Association Report. (07/03/2011), Kampala International University General senior staff Association Meeting, Main Hall.

67. Sutherland. & Canwell, D. (2004). Key concepts in human resource management. Hampshire: Palgrave, Macmillan.
68. Uganda Government, (2008). Government White Paper on Report of the (McGregor, 2007) Visitation Committee to public universities in Uganda. Kampala: Ministry of Education.
69. Uganda National Council for Higher Education (2006). The state of higher education and training in Uganda. A report on higher education delivery and institutions. Kampala: National Council for Higher Education Printing Office.
70. Wiley, C. (1997) "What motivates employees according to over 40 years of Motivation surveys. " International Journal of Man power, Vol. 18, No3, pp. 264-280