

# Exploring the Organizational Factors and employee performance of government Uganda organs: Empirical evidence and Lessons from Parliamentary Commission

Mark Kiiza, Joseph Baleke Yiga Lubega, Mwesigya Peter, Abassi Mansour

Corresponding Author: [buceiuganda@gmail.com](mailto:buceiuganda@gmail.com)

<sup>1</sup>Department of Education St. John Baptist Teachers Institute Ggaba- Kampala-Uganda

<sup>1</sup>Faculty of Business Administration Cavendish University- Kampala- Uganda

<sup>2</sup>Faculty of Business and Media at Selinus University of Science and Literature, Rome-Italy

**ABSTRACT** Over the years there has been a growing on organization factors and performance of the government of Uganda organs. The study examined how organizational factors influence employee performance at the Parliamentary Commission of Uganda. It focused on three key areas: leadership style, reward management systems, and the working environment. Using questionnaires and a few interviews, data were collected from 89 respondents selected through simple random and purposive sampling. Pearson's correlation analysis revealed that leadership style had a positive relationship with employee performance ( $r = 0.256$ ,  $sig = 0.016$ ), while the reward management system showed a negative correlation ( $r = -0.209$ ,  $sig = 0.05$ ). The working environment demonstrated a strong positive correlation with performance ( $r = 0.535$ ,  $sig = 0.02$ ). These findings indicate that leadership style and a conducive working environment enhance employee performance, whereas weaknesses in the reward management system negatively affect staff output. The study recommends strengthening democratic leadership, improving transparency in promotions and rewards, and creating a supportive working environment to enhance organisational and employee effectiveness in Uganda

**Keyword:** Leadership environment, parliamentary commission, employee performance,

## Introduction

This article study investigates comprehensively into organisational factors influence employee performance at the Parliamentary Commission of Uganda. The independent variable organisational factors were examined through leadership styles, reward management systems, and the working environment. The dependent variable employee performance was assessed through productivity, effectiveness, efficiency, and quality of work. The Parliamentary Commission was established under Article 87(a) of the 1995 Constitution and operationalised through the Administration of Parliament Act (1997). As an autonomous body, it is responsible for the appointment, discipline, and determination of terms and conditions of service for Members of Parliament and Parliamentary Service staff (Leston-Bandeira, 2025). The Commission chaired by the Speaker of Parliament and supported by seven key members including the Leader of Government Business, Leader of Opposition, Minister of Finance, and four elected backbench Commissioners, provides strategic leadership and ensures institutional functionality. Its vision is to build an independent and people-centred Parliamentary Service, while its mission focuses on promoting accountability, representation, democracy, and good governance (Experts, 2025).

Despite its strategic mandate and longstanding existence dating back to Uganda's first Parliament in 1962, the Commission continues to face persistent challenges related to employee performance. Increasing national and global demands on governance have amplified expectations for efficiency and service delivery (OECD, 2024). However, reports indicate ongoing issues such as unmet performance targets, staff dissatisfaction, perceived lack of transparency in managerial decisions, and communication gaps within departments. These challenges have contributed to frustration, reduced morale, and stagnation in employee performance, as highlighted in the Annual Commission Report (2013/2014).

Although the Commission is mandated to recruit competent staff and support them through training, promotions, mentorship, and career development, there were gaps that hindered effective performance of organs, translating these initiatives into tangible performance outcomes (Anazodo et al., 2025). The resulting decline in productivity, service delivery, and staff retention threatens the Commission's credibility and its capacity to meet both organisational objectives and public expectations.

It was therefore necessary for the researcher to conduct an in-depth examination of how organisational factors influence employee performance at the Parliamentary Commission (Jumanne, 2023). Understanding these relationships is essential for identifying strategic interventions that can enhance institutional effectiveness, strengthen staff motivation, and improve overall performance.

### Methodology

The study adopted a description mixed methodology that enabled the collection of qualitative and quantitative data. The study further used a case research design, which is widely used in social sciences to enable a comprehensive analysis and have a deeper understanding of the variables under investigation (Omodan, 2024). This design was chosen for its efficiency, cost-effectiveness, and suitability for examining multiple variables simultaneously. The study engaged the members of parliament of Uganda and a total population consisted of 431 individuals were sampled from this government organ. The study used the different sampling techniques to draw representatives from the accessible population of 110 staff members was purposively identified across different departments. A sample of 100 respondents was selected based on stratified experience, age, and knowledge (Ganesan et al., 2025). The rest 221 were selected using simple random sampling was used for officers and support staff to ensure equal selection chances. Data were collected using survey whereby questionnaires were used, interviews that engaged senior official and documentary reviews (Johnson & Vindrola-Padros, 2023). Self-administered questionnaires enabled efficient collection of large data volumes, while interviews facilitated probing for in-depth information. Documentary reviews provided supplementary organisational evidence.

Data quality was ensured through validity checks by experts and pre-testing, while reliability was confirmed using Cronbach's Alpha (0.784), indicating strong internal consistency. Data collection followed formal authorization procedures, and respondents were assured of confidentiality (Gowreesunkar et al., 2022). The data was scientifically analyzed using the right instruments in data analysis. Quantitative data were coded and analysed using SPSS, employing descriptive and relational statistics such as means, correlations, and regression. Qualitative data were analysed through content analysis, summarized into thematic narratives to support interpretation of statistical findings. The Author observed ethical consideration as recommended in a scientific study which entailed seeking for permission, consent and validating the instruments of data collection before the commencement of the study (Gowreesunkar et al., 2022).

### Results

The study reveals that Organisation leadership style influences employee performance at the Parliamentary Commission of Uganda. The researcher used a total of eleven dimensions on the questionnaire, to which the respondents were required to show the level of agreement or disagreement

**Table1: Descriptive Statistics of the Leadership Style at the Parliamentary Commission**

S/N	Parameters	SD (1)	D (2)	UD (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	Mean
1	Decisions regarding the parliamentary commission activities are made by the management team	8 (9.0%)	5 (5.6%)	2 (2.2%)	56 (62.9%)	18 (20.2%)	3.80
2	The system of administration is top-bottom	1 (1.1%)	19 (21.3%)	8 (9.0%)	33 (37.1%)	28 (31.5%)	3.76
3	Most powers are centralized to the clerk to parliament	15 (16.9%)	15 (16.9%)	8 (9.0%)	39 (43.8%)	12 (13.5%)	3.11
4	The supervisor acts with empathy	12 (13.5%)	22 (24.7%)	20 (22.5%)	27 (30.3%)	8 (9.0%)	2.97
5	The Supervisor expects a lot from me and insist on best performance	9 (10.1%)	8 (9.0%)	7 (7.9%)	51 (57.3%)	14 (15.7%)	3.84

6	There is open communication between supervisors and staff at Parliamentary Commission	16 (18.0%)	0 (0.0%)	6 (6.7%)	10 (11.2%)	57 (64.0%)	3.46
7	Managers at all levels work together as a team to achieve organization's goal	11 (12.2%)	13 (14.6%)	16 (18.0%)	29 (32.6%)	20 (22.5%)	3.38
8	Staff are delegated work by their immediate supervisor	8 (9.0%)	5 (5.6%)	2 (2.2%)	56 (62.9%)	18 (20.2%)	3.80
9	Staff participate in determining resource allocation and utilization in my department	20 (22.5%)	44 (49.4%)	12 (13.5%)	10 (11.2%)	3 (3.4%)	2.24
10	There is respect for fellow staff opinions regarding organizational improvement	8 (9.0%)	15 (16.9%)	13 (14.6%)	36 (40.4%)	17 (19.1%)	3.44
11	Staff are involved in making organizational policies for the parliamentary commission	9 (10.1%)	11 (12.4%)	15 (16.9%)	35 (39.3%)	19 (21.3%)	3.49
Mean Aggregates		3.36					

(Source: Primary data (2025)

For interpretation purposes, opinions are grouped for instance respondents who agreed and strongly agreed represent respondents who agreed and those who strongly disagreed and disagreed represent the respondents who disagreed. In addition, the mean scores above 2.97 reveal respondents who agreed and those below 2.97 represents respondents who disagreed respectively.

The study findings as presented in table 8 reveal that the leadership styles at Parliamentary Commission is moderately positive (aggregate Mean=3.36). Majority of the 83.1% of the study respondents with mean score of 3.80 agreed that decisions regarding the Parliamentary Commission activities are made by the management team and 14.6% disagreed respectively. Meaning that the staff at the Parliamentary Commission follows the decision of the administrative hierarchy. This is likely to enhance the flow of administrative mandate of the top management which will lead to improved organisational performance (Board, 2024).

The majority of the 68.6% of respondents with mean score of 3.76 agreed that the system of administration in Parliamentary Commission is top bottom and 20% disagreed respectively. Meaning that the administrative system is not fully participatory where the staff members are rarely consulted in some matters of the Commission. This is likely to build confidence and trust among the staff in the Parliamentary Commission (OECD, 2022).

Interviews with Key staff also affirmed that decisions were mainly made by top management and then passed on to lower departments for implementation. They cited a top down model of decision making in the Parliamentary Commission (Mania et al., 2018). One interviewee indicated:

“The decisions are made by top management team who engage other staff in their implementation. We are rarely involved in making decisions concerning day to day operations of the Commission. Sometimes we just see new directives to implement by our immediate supervisors who also reportedly receive them from top management”.

The above facts present the fact that major decisions are made by top management to lower level employees which is likely to negatively affect their performance.

The respondents to the study were having different opinions when asked regarding supervisor's empathy, 39.3% agreed, 38.2% disagreed and 22.5% undecided with the statement that the Supervisor acts without empathy (mean score of 2.97). This was reinforced by key informant who revealed that “*at Parliamentary Commission, most supervisors act without empathy to their staff*”. The results indicated that some of the supervisors at the Parliamentary Commission act empathetically towards their subordinates and they also empower them (Marreiros et al., 2022). This is likely to improve working condition between supervisors and subordinates hence improving employee performance.

Majority of the respondents (73.0%) with mean score of 3.84 agreed with the statement that the supervisor does expect much from the staff members whereas 19.1% disagreed, and 7.9 were not sure. One of the key informant supported this finding when she confirmed that; “*supervisors at different departments of the Parliamentary Commission always expect and insist on best*

performance of work". This means that the management at the Parliamentary Commission aspires to work towards achieving organisational goals and objectives (Committee, 2011).

Majority (75.2%) of the respondents with the mean score (3.46) agree with the statement that there is open communication between the supervisor and the staff, whereas (18%) disagree with the statement and (6.7%) were not sure. This means that there is open communication at the Parliamentary Commission. This was reinforced by one key informant who noted that

*Communication in the Parliamentary Commission is open through formal meetings and one on one discussion.*

Open communication in an organisation improves employee performance. This is because communication builds trust and confidence among the staff and creates a good relation between organisation and staff.

The study respondents moderately (53.1%) with the mean score (3.38) agree with the statement that Managers at all levels work together as a team to achieve organisation goals whereas (26.8%) disagree with the statement and (18%) were not sure. This means that the managers at the Parliamentary Commission believed in team work (Claudia et al., 2022). The belief in team work among manager helps in raising the level of work efficiency to achieve organisational goals in turn enhance employee performance in the said government organ of Uganda.

Majority of the (83.1%) of the respondents with mean score of 3.80 agreed that they are delegated work by their immediate supervisors whereas 14.6% disagreed saying that the supervisors do not delegate work to the staff. This was reinforced by one key informant that; *"the supervisors do not expect their subordinates to receive orders without receiving explanation"*. The result indicates that the leadership style practiced by the supervisors at the Parliamentary Commission is democratic (Shillabeer et al., 2015). Democratic leadership style is likely to enhance employee performance because staff feels valued.

Majority of the respondents, (71.9%) with mean score of 2.24 disagreed that staff do participate in determining resource allocation and utilization in their respective departments whereas 14.6% agreed and 13.5% were not sure respectively. In an interview with one of the key staff in the Department, he was quoted saying;

We experience a challenge in the department because the management don't take the views of staff in regard to the determination of resource allocation during the budget preparations. This implies that the policy of resource allocation does not favour the staff.

The above fact shows that at the Parliamentary Commission, staffs do not participate in making decisions in resource allocation and utilization. This is likely to demotivate employees and impact negatively on employee performance (Banya, 2024).

Majority (59.5%) of the respondents with mean score of 3.44 agreed with the statement that there is respect for fellow staff opinions regarding organizational improvement in different departments whereas 25.9% disagreed with the statement and (14.6) were not sure. This means that at the Parliamentary Commission, staff respects each other's opinions and views on how to improve work. This is likely to enhance team work and cooperation at the workplace which may result into improved employee performance (Al-Hroub et al., 2024).

Lastly, the study respondents noted that, (60.6%) of respondents with mean score of 3.49 agreed that staff are involved in making organizational policies for the Parliamentary Commission whereas 22.5% disagreed and (16.9%) were not sure. This means that at the Parliamentary Commission staff are involved in making organizational policies (Gauja, 2015). This is likely to enhance the employees' trust, sense of control and ego involvement with the organization which then leads to improved performance.

### **Leadership Style and Employee Performance.**

A Pearson correlation product was used for the study to establish whether relationship exist between the study variables highlighted and the findings are presented in the table 9 below:

**Table2: Correlation analysis showing Leadership Style and Employee Performance**

		Leadership style	Employee Performance
Leadership style	Pearson Correlation	1	.256*
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.016
	N	89	89
Employee performance	Pearson Correlation	.256*	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.016	
	N	89	89
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

According to the results in table 9, leadership style and employee performance were found to have a significant positive relationship ( $r = 0.256$ ,  $p < 0.05$ ), thus, these results implies that leadership style enhances the performance of the employees by a considerable magnitude. The significance value of 0.016 which is below the critical significance value of 0.05 affirms that there is a variant relationship between the two variables. Therefore, the hypothesis *leadership style enhances employee performance* was accepted (Kettl, 2025). The implication of these findings is that any increase in the enforcement of leadership style at Parliamentary Commission of Uganda improves employee performance by 25.6% and vice versa.

#### **Reward management system influence Employee Performance at Parliamentary Commission.**

The second Objective of the study was, to find out how reward management system influence employee performance in the Parliamentary Commission of Uganda (Ginbar, 2021). The researcher used a total of eleven (6) dimensions on the questionnaire, to which the respondents were required to answer as shown in Table 10 listed below.

**Table 3: Descriptive Statistics of Reward Management System at Parliamentary Commission**

S/N	Parameters	SD (1)	D (2)	UD (3)	A (4)	SA (5)	Mean
1	Staff are satisfied with salary	9(10.1%)	11(12.4%)	15(16.9%)	35(39.3%)	19(21.3%)	3.4
2	Staff get an allowance whenever they work on public holidays	20 (22.5%)	44 (49.4%)	12 (13.5%)	10 (11.2%)	3 (3.4%)	2.24
3	Staff get overtime allowance for extra work	33 (37.1%)	38 (42.7%)	11 (12.4%)	5 (5.6%)	2 (2.2%)	1.93

4	It is easy to get promoted at the parliamentary commission	27 (30.3%)	43 (48.3%)	8 (9.0%)	7 (7.9%)	4 (4.5%)	2.08
5	Promotions are regular at the parliamentary commission	5 (5.6%)	18 (20.2%)	43 (48.3%)	23 (25.8%)	0 (0.0%)	2.94
6	Staff are thanked and appreciated for the good work done	10 (11.2%)	8 (9.0%)	3 (3.4%)	41 (46.1%)	27 (30.3%)	3.75

(Source: Primary Source 2025)

For interpretation purposes, opinions are grouped for instance respondents who agreed and strongly agreed represent respondents who agreed and those who strongly disagreed and disagreed represent the respondents who disagreed (Mubarak, 2025). In addition, the mean scores above 2.94 reveal respondents who agreed and those below 2.94 represent respondents who disagreed respectively (Janson, 2024).

As clearly indicated in Table 10, the study findings show that the reward management system at Parliamentary Commission is moderately positive (Aggregate Mean=2.72). The majority of the 77.5% of study respondents with mean score of 3.81 agreed that they were satisfied with the salary that they received and 19.1% disagreed respectively. This means that at the Parliamentary Commission, most staffs are satisfied with the salary that they get.

Similarly, the results of the findings show that 71.9% respondents with mean score 2.24 disagreed that staff get allowances whenever they work on public holidays and 14.6% agreed respectively. Also majority of the 79.8% respondents with mean score of 1.93 disagreed that they receive overtime payments for extra work and 7.8% agreed respectively. To support the findings was a key informant, who observed that,

'The staff at the Parliamentary Commission is not adequately compensated.' This is likely to impact negatively on employee motivation and subsequently effects employee performance in the government of organ Uganda (Bell et al., 2022).

The study respondents in the table above however noted that 78.6% with mean score of 2.08 disagreed that it is easy for staff to be promoted at Parliamentary Commission and 12.4% agreed respectively (Shillabeer et al., 2015). The study respondents in the above table also show that 48% respondents with mean score of 2.94 were undecided whether promotions are regular at Parliamentary Commission or not. This suggests that staff at the Parliamentary Commission is not satisfied with the promotion system (Chattopadhyay, 2021). This is likely to have a negative effect on employee performance because staff members who stay in the same position for a long time lose the motivation to work.

Majority of the 76.4% respondents with the mean score of 3.75 agreed that staff are thanked and appreciated for the good work that they do and 20.2% respondents disagreed. This means that staffs are recognized for good performance. The results are proved by the interviewee, who said that,

*"The Parliamentary Commission has a policy of recognizing and appreciating best performing staff on annual basis. These workers are chosen basing on those who have completed their assignments and set targets. It's done as a way of motivating workers."*

#### Reward systems and Employee Performance at Parliamentary Commission.

In order to determine the effect of reward management system on employee performance, correlation analysis was conducted. The results are summarized in Table 4

**Table 4: Reward Management System and Employee Performance**

		Reward system	Employee Performance
	Pearson Correlation	1	-.209**

Reward management system	Sig. (2-tailed)		.051	
	N	89	89	
Employee Performance	Pearson Correlation	-.209**	1	
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.051		
	N	89	89	

(Source: Primary Data, 2025)

The findings present the obtained significant value (p-0.051) and (-0.209) has negative relationship between reward management system and employee performance at the Parliamentary Commission of Uganda. Therefore the hypothesis is accepted that, “*reward management systems greatly contributes to employee performance at Parliamentary Commission of Uganda*”. Hence this implies that Employee Performance at Parliamentary Commission is negatively affected by the reward management system as advanced (Akbar et al., 2023).

### Working Environment Affects Employee Performance at the Parliamentary Commission

The third objective of the study was to find out how working environment affects employee performance from which a number of responses were obtained as presented in Table five bellow

**Table 5: Working Environment at Parliamentary Commission**

S/N	Parameters	SD	D	UD	A	SA	Mean
1	Staff have opportunity to take mini-breaks while at work to allow relaxation	3 (3.4%)	9 (10.1%)	1 (1.1%)	47 (52.8%)	29 (32.6%)	3.99
2	Work environment is hazard free and safe	6 (6.7%)	20 (22.5%)	15 (16.9%)	43 (48.3%)	5 (5.6%)	3.24
3	Staff are comfortable working while seated whole day long	30 (33.7%)	34 (38.2%)	10 (11.2%)	12 (13.5%)	3 (3.4%)	1.15
4	The supervisor gives consideration and flexibility for staff to schedule their work	23 (25.8%)	36 (40.4%)	12 (13.5%)	10 (11.2%)	8 (9.0%)	2.37
5	Staff adjust their work schedule to accommodate their day's personal programmes	30 (33.7%)	31 (34.8%)	7 (7.9%)	10 (11.2%)	11 (12.4%)	2.34
6	Supervisors acknowledges good work done	5 (5.6%)	9 (10.1%)	4 (4.5%)	42 (47.2%)	29 (32.6%)	4.01
7	Staff get feedback of work performance	1 (1.1%)	12 (13.3%)	4 (4.5%)	47 (52.8%)	25 (28.1%)	3.08
8	It is easy to consult a supervisor on issues concerning work	0	5	4	59	21	4.03

		(0.0%)	(5.6%)	(4.5%)	(66.3%)	(23.6%)	
9	The supervisor tolerates staff behavior, including willingness to let them learn from their mistakes without fear of reprisal	9 (10.1%)	4 (4.5%)	15 (16.9%)	51 (57.3%)	10 (11.2%)	3.55
10	The supervisor is competent and treats staff with respect	1 (1.1%)	4 (4.5%)	9 (10.1%)	48 (53.9%)	27 (30.3%)	4.01

(Source: Primary data 2025)

For interpretation purposes, opinions are grouped for instance respondents who agreed and strongly agreed represent respondents who agreed and those who strongly disagreed and disagreed represent the respondents who disagreed (Shillabeer et al., 2015). In addition, the mean scores above 2.40 reveal respondents who agreed and those below 2.40 represent respondents who disagreed respectively.

As indicated in the findings study in table.12 above, it show that the working environment at Parliamentary Commission is moderately positive (**aggregate mean=3.16**). The study respondents were asked to respond to statement on whether staff do have opportunity to take mini-breaks while at work to allow relaxation 85.4% of the respondents with mean score of 3.99 agreed with the statement but 13.5% disagreed respectively. In addition to the above, also 53.9% of the respondents with mean score of 3.24 agreed that the working environment is hazard free and safe but 29.2% disagreed. The result also show that 71.9% of the respondents with mean score of 1.15 disagreed with the statement that staff at Parliamentary Commission are comfortable working while seated whole day long but 16.9% disagreed (Balin et al., 2024). This means that the working environment in the Parliamentary Commission is hazard free and safe which allows the personal stress relieve to the employees. This is likely to enhance the employee performance as a result of free work-life balance. A key informant supplemented this finding by stating:

*“The Parliamentary Commission provides a conducive working environment to the staff that is to say, availability of working equipment, enough office space well ventilated and also there is a good working relationship between the staff and the supervisors”*

Furthermore as indicated in the results, 66.2% of the respondents with mean score of 2.37 disagreed that the supervisor gives considerable and flexibility for staff to schedule their work while 20.2% of respondents agreed with the statement. Also 68.5% of respondents with score mean 2.34 disagreed with the statement that staff adjust their work schedule to accommodate their day's personal programmes while 23.(Shillabeer et al., 2015) 6% agreed with the statement. This means that the working environment at the Parliamentary Commission is not flexible enough to accommodate the personal needs of the employees. This is likely to hamper employee performance as a result of limited work-life balance.

Majority of 79.8% of respondents with score mean 4.01 they agreed that supervisors acknowledge the good work done by staff and 15.7% disagreed. The study respondents of 80.9% with score mean 3.08 noted that staff gets feedback for work performance from their supervisors. This means that staffs at the Parliamentary Commission are satisfied with the cordial relationship that they have with their supervisors and the feedback that they get about work as well as the availability of working equipment (Meredith & Shafer, 2019).

According to the study respondents, the majority of 89.9% of the respondents with score mean 4.03 mentioned that it was easy to consult a supervisor on issues concerning work while 5.6% respondents disagreed with the statement. The study respondents also mentioned that 68.5% of respondents with score mean of 3.55 agreed that supervisors tolerate staff behaviour, including willingness to let them learn from their mistakes without fear of reprisal while 14.6% of respondents disagreed with the statement. This means that the supervisors at the Parliamentary Commission are tolerant and easy to consult on issues concerning work. This is likely to have a positive effect on employee performance (Shillabeer et al., 2015). Lastly, according to the study results, majority of 84.2% of the respondents with score mean of 4.01 noted that supervisors treat their staff with respect but 5.6% of the respondents disagreed with the statement. This means that staff in the Parliamentary Commission is satisfied with the working conditions as well as the respect that is accorded them by their supervisors. This is likely to have a positive effect on staff performance.

## Working Environment and Employee Performance at Parliamentary Commission

In order to assess how working environment affects employee performance at the parliamentary Commission, Correlation analysis was conducted. The results are summarized in Table 6 below.

**Table 6: Correlation Analysis results for the Working Environment and Employee Performance**

		Work Environment	Employee Performance
Work Environment	Pearson Correlation	1	.535**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.002
	N	89	89
Employee Performance	Pearson Correlation	.535**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.002	
	N	89	89

**(Source: Primary Data 2025)**

According to the results in Table 13, the working environment and employee performance were found to have a significant positive relationship ( $r= 0.535$ , at 0.05). Hence the hypothesis that “working environment has significant influence on employee performance is partially accepted”. This implies that working environment enhance employee performance at the Parliamentary Commission.

## Discussion

The study established that leadership style has a significant positive effect on employee performance at the Parliamentary Commission of Uganda. Consequently, the first hypothesis was confirmed. The results suggest that when employees are satisfied with the leadership approach demonstrated by their supervisors, their performance improves (Jumanne, 2023). Mean score analysis indicated that democratic leadership is the most dominant style within the Commission. This finding reinforces the view that democratic leadership characterised by consultation, participation, and shared decision-making enhances employee performance. Tetteh, (2010) contends that democratic leaders inspire effectiveness by fostering attachment, trust, and appreciation among employees. similarly argues that democratic leadership creates a platform for team involvement, strengthening emotional commitment and encouraging discretionary effort. Tyagi et al., (2025) adds that such a human-relations approach enhances job satisfaction, cohesion, and overall performance.

## Reward Management System and Employee Performance

The second hypothesis—indicating a negative relationship between reward management systems and employee performance—was also accepted. This suggests gaps in the reward system, reflected in incomplete or insufficient incentive structures and moderate staff satisfaction levels. Garcia-Perez & Simkin, (2021) emphasises that employees direct their effort toward areas where rewards are meaningful. Inducements such as promotions, recognition, housing allowances, medical insurance, and paid leave shape positive employee behaviour. Their absence, however, leads to compromised performance. These findings highlight a critical implication for the Parliamentary Commission: strengthening compensation and reward structures is essential for improving staff motivation and reducing performance deficiencies (Griffin et al., 2023).

## Working Environment and Employee Performance

The third hypothesis was confirmed, showing a significant positive relationship between the working environment and employee performance. The results indicate that employees who perceive their work environment as safe, supportive, and conducive perform better (Wuttke et al., 2022). Respondents noted that their working environment was hazard-free and that they received constructive feedback. Thill, (2024) supports this, asserting that timely and positive feedback is crucial, as employees inherently wish to understand how they are performing. The study further revealed high levels of satisfaction with workplace respect and supervisor conduct. Stone et al., (2020) similarly observes that job satisfaction is maximised when employees believe their supervisors are competent, respectful, and genuinely concerned about their well-being attributes that also strengthen communication and organisational commitment.

## Conclusions

The study established that among the organisational factors examined, leadership style and employee performance demonstrated a significant and positive relationship. This indicates that leadership at the Parliamentary Commission plays a central role in shaping staff performance. Evidence suggests that decision-making is largely directed by top management, communication channels are open through formal meetings and one-to-one discussions, and employees participate in the formulation of organisational policies. Consequently, when employees are satisfied with the prevailing leadership style, their performance improves.

Regarding reward management systems, the findings revealed a negative relationship with employee performance. Although staff expressed satisfaction with their basic salary, they reported inadequate compensation and limited recognition for good performance. Without addressing these gaps, the reward system will continue to undermine motivation and overall productivity within the Commission.

The study further established a significant positive relationship between the working environment and employee performance. The Parliamentary Commission provides a generally safe and hazard-free work environment, with cordial staff-supervisor relations. However, certain aspects remain inflexible to employees' personal needs. Overall, employee satisfaction with the working environment contributes to improved performance.

## Recommendations

The study recommends that Parliamentary Commission should assess good leadership practice and governance to underpin performance gaps within departments to minimize negative effects and foster staff productivity in this particular said organ. Government Employees in these organs at all levels should be provided with platforms to express concerns related to leadership practices. Strengthening democratic leadership approaches will enhance employee performance.

Management should hold regular consultative meetings with staff to gather feedback. Organisational policies should remain flexible and adaptive to employee needs and organisational growth in Uganda.

The Human Resource Department should establish clear, transparent, and merit-based promotion guidelines to motivate qualified and experienced staff in the given sector of the government of Uganda.

The Commission should ensure the performance-based reward system is transparent, fair, and supported by clear communication. Employees must understand how assessments are conducted and should have the right to appeal when necessary.

Staff should be recognised both privately and publicly through commendations, appreciation letters, and opportunities for career advancement in their sector of operation in the government parliamentary commission organ.

Management should invest in a work environment that supports both organisational goals and employee well-being in their organ. This includes promoting quality of work life, providing opportunities for personal growth, and ensuring safe, motivating, and flexible working conditions.

## Reference

Akbar, A., Poulova, P., Mohelska, H., & Akbar, M. (2023). *Understanding Leadership and Organizational Psychology in Higher Education Institutions*. Frontiers Media SA.

Al-Hroub, A., Reis, S., Madaus, J., & Shuayb, I. (2024). *Serving Vulnerable and Marginalized Populations in Social and Educational Contexts*. Frontiers Media SA.

Anazodo, U., Akash, N., Fuchs, M., Cintas, C., Crimi, A., Mutsvangwa, T., Dako, F., & Ogallo, W. (2025). *Medical Information Computing: First MICCAI Meets Africa Workshop, MImA 2024, and First MICCAI Student Board Workshop on Empowering Medical Information Computing and Research through Early-Career Expertise, EMERGE 2024, Held in Conjunction with MICCAI 2024, Marrakesh, Morocco, October 6, 2024, Revised Selected Papers*. Springer Nature.

Balın, B. E., Akan, H. D. M., Özenc, F. K., & Garan, Ö. (2024). *Pursuing Sustainable Development Goals: The Performance of Türkiye in the Centennial of the Republic*. İstanbul University Press.

Banya, B. (2024). *Practices, Challenges, and Deterrents in Workplace Wellbeing: Strategies for Building Resilient and Thriving Workplaces*. IGI Global.

Bell, E., Harley, B., & Bryman, A. (2022). *Business Research Methods*. Oxford University Press.

Board, O. E. (2024). *Oswaal Karnataka 2nd PUC Question Bank Class 12 Business Studies / Chapterwise & Topicwise Previous Solved Papers (2017-2024) / For Board Exams 2025*. Oswaal Books.

Chattopadhyay, B. (2021). *Between the Headphones: Listening to the Practitioner*. Cambridge Scholars Publishing.

Claudia, R. de A., Carlos, M., Joao, R. G., Alexandra, Silvia, Q., & Laura, G., Maria. (2022). *Handbook of Research on Cultural Tourism and Sustainability*. IGI Global.

Committee, G. B. P. H. of C. H. (2011). *Commissioning: Further issues, fifth report of session 2010-11, Vol. 2: Oral and written evidence*. The Stationery Office.

Experts, D. (2025). *Disha 13 Year-wise UPSC Civil Services IAS Mains General Studies Previous Year Solved Papers 1—4 (2013—2025) 7th Edition / PYQs Question Bank / For 2026 Exam*. Disha Publication Inc.

Ganesan, V., Vadhani, S. I., Chowdhury, S., Pal, S., & Pendyala, V. S. (2025). *Cognitive Fairness-Aware Techniques for Human-Machine Interface*. CRC Press.

Garcia-Perez, D. A., & Simkin, P. L. (2021). *ECKM 2021 22nd European Conference on Knowledge Management*. Academic Conferences limited.

Gauja, A. (2015). *The Politics of Party Policy: From Members to Legislators*. Springer.

Ginbar, E. (2021). *The Effect of Reward Management System on Employee Performance. The Case of IE Network Solutions Plc*. GRIN Verlag.

Gowreesunkar, V. G. B., Maingi, S. W., & Ming'ate, F. L. M. (2022). *Management of Tourism Ecosystem Services in a Post Pandemic Context: Global Perspectives*. Taylor & Francis.

Griffin, R. W., Phillips, J. M., Gully, S. M., Creed, A., Gribble, L., & Watson, M. (2023). *Organisational Behaviour: Engaging People and Organisations*. Cengage AU.

Janson, S. (2024). *Earning Respect as a Boss – Build Trust & Recognition as a Leader: AI-optimized expert knowledge on Respectful Leadership & Winning Recognition*. Best of HR - Berufsbilder.de®.

Johnson, G. A., & Vindrola-Padros, C. (2023). *Rapid research in action: Lessons from the field*. Frontiers Media SA.

Jumanne, C. N. O., Andrew Njiraini Njiinu, Benta Wandede Anyiko-Awori, Andrew Shangarai. (2023). *Effect of Intellectual Stimulation*. AJPO Journals USA LLC.

Kettl, D. F. (2025). *The Government Performance and Results Act at Age 30*. Taylor & Francis.

Leston-Bandeira, C. (2025). *Exploring Parliament*. Oxford University Press.

Mania, I., Delgado, A. M., Barone, C., & Parisi, S. (2018). *Traceability in the Dairy Industry in Europe: Theory and Practice*. Springer.

Marreiros, G., Martins, B., Paiva, A., Ribeiro, B., & Sardinha, A. (2022). *Progress in Artificial Intelligence: 21st EPIA Conference on Artificial Intelligence, EPIA 2022, Lisbon, Portugal, August 31–September 2, 2022, Proceedings*. Springer Nature.

Meredith, J. R., & Shafer, S. M. (2019). *Operations and Supply Chain Management for MBAs*. John Wiley & Sons.

Mubarak, M. A. (2025). *Sustainable Digital Technology and Ethics in an Ever-Changing Environment: Volume 2*. Springer Nature.

OECD. (2022). *Building Trust in Public Institutions Drivers of Trust in Public Institutions in Norway*. OECD Publishing.

OECD. (2024). *Strategic Review of the Egyptian Goodwill Committee Advancing child-friendly justice in Egypt: Advancing child-friendly justice in Egypt*. OECD Publishing.

Omodan, B. I. (2024). *Research Paradigms and Their Methodological Alignment in Social Sciences: A Practical Guide for Researchers*. Taylor & Francis.

Shillabeer, A., Buss, T. F., & Rousseau, D. M. (2015). *Evidence-Based Public Management: Practices, Issues and Prospects*. Routledge.

Stone, R. J., Cox, A., & Gavin, M. (2020). *Human Resource Management, 10th Edition*. John Wiley & Sons.

Tetteh, R. (2010). *Daily Graphic: Issue 1,8321 September 3 2010*. Graphic Communications Group.

Thill, K.-D. (2024). *Effective Feedback Strategies for Managers: Boosting Efficiency, Engagement and Success*. neobooks.

Tyagi, V., Aggarwal, S., & Tyagi, P. (2025). *The Future of Human Resource Management in a Multigenerational Workforce*. Emerald Group Publishing.

Wuttke, E., Schmitz, B., & Hou, W. K. (2022). *Well-being in Organizations*. Frontiers Media SA.