American International Journal of Business Management (AIJBM)
ISSN- 2379-106X, www.aijbm.com Volume 9, Issue 07 (July - 2026), PP 28-34

Team-Based Pay Systems and Organizational Performance In Modern Workplaces: A Conceptual And Evidence-Based Review

Kasawuli Faik Bawonga[1], Mwenyi Reshima[2], Khainza Sharon[3], Muzungu Ibrahim[4]
[1](*Public Administration, Islamic University In Uganda, Uganda*)
[2](*Business Administration, Islamic University In Uganda, Uganda*)
[3](*Business Administration, Islamic University In Uganda, Uganda*)
[4](*Business Administration, Islamic University In Uganda, Uganda*)
**Corresponding Author: Kasawuli Faik Bawonga[1]*

ABSTRACT :- *Modern workplaces increasingly depend on teams to solve complex problems, deliver services, and adapt to technological and market changes. Consequently, organizations are moving from purely individual pay arrangements toward team-based pay systems that reward collective performance, shared responsibility, and collaborative effort. This article examines the effect of team-based pay systems on organizational performance in modern workplaces by synthesizing recent empirical and theoretical literature on performance-based compensation, incentive alignment, compensation fairness, team dynamics, and organizational-performance pay. The article adopts a conceptual review design, using evidence from recent journal articles and a model manuscript to develop an integrated framework linking team-based pay to employee collaboration, productivity, shared responsibility, and organizational performance. The review shows that team-based pay is able to improve organizational performance when rewards are transparent, clearly linked to measurable team outcomes, supported by strong team dynamics, and perceived as fair. However, poorly designed team-based pay may create free-riding, social comparison, unequal reward concerns, and conflict, particularly where individual contributions are difficult to observe. The article concludes that team-based pay should not be treated as a stand-alone financial tool but as part of a broader human resource strategy combining fair reward design, performance analytics, recognition, communication, and team development.*

KEYWORDS:- *Team-based pay, organizational performance, employee collaboration, productivity, shared responsibility, performance-based compensation*

I. INTRODUCTION

Organizations operate in environments characterized by competition, technological disruption, flexible work arrangements, and pressure for continuous productivity improvement. These conditions have made teamwork central to organizational survival because employees increasingly perform interdependent tasks that require coordination, information sharing, and joint problem-solving. As observed by Mdhlalose and Mtshali [1], traditional compensation systems, which mainly reward individual output, may be insufficient in such settings because they can encourage individualism, internal competition, and fragmented effort. Team-based pay systems have therefore emerged as a strategic human resource mechanism for rewarding collective outcomes and aligning employee effort with shared organizational goals.

Team-based pay, according to Mun and Hur [2], are compensation arrangements in which employees receive rewards based on team, group, departmental, or organizational performance rather than solely on individual achievements. The reward may take the form of team bonuses, gain-sharing, profit-sharing, collective productivity incentives, pooled performance rewards, or recognition attached to team achievement. The central assumption is that when employees understand that their reward depends partly on collective performance, they are more likely to collaborate, support one another, share knowledge, and take responsibility for group outcomes.

Oyedele [3] observed that there are three major mechanisms through which team-based pay may influence organizational performance: employee collaboration, employee productivity, and shared responsibility. Bangura [4] supports the importance of these mechanisms but also introduces important qualifications. Evidence on performance-based compensation indicates that financial incentives alone may not be sufficient to motivate employees unless they are supported by fairness, transparency, clear performance criteria, and positive team dynamics. Recent findings further show that team dynamics can be a stronger predictor of motivation than performance-based compensation or perceived fairness considered separately (Bangura, 2026).

The debate is therefore not whether compensation matters, but how team-based compensation should be designed and implemented. Team-based pay can improve performance where work is genuinely interdependent and performance targets are clearly measurable. However, it can weaken motivation where employees perceive reward distribution as unfair, where high-performing individuals feel under-recognized, or where low-contributing members benefit from the effort of others. Bao et al. [5] show that dispersion in organizational-performance pay may reduce aggregate performance when equality concerns and social comparison become salient. This suggests that team-based pay must balance cooperation with fairness and must avoid reward designs that produce destructive comparisons among employees.

This study therefore develops a thorough journal-style review of team-based pay systems and organizational performance in modern workplaces. It is structured according to the standard format used by business and management journals: introduction, literature review and hypothesis development, research methodology, findings and discussion, conclusion, implications, limitations, and references. The article is intended as a polished manuscript that can be refined with author details and, where necessary, empirical data before submission.

1.1 Statement of the Problem

Modern organizations increasingly depend on teamwork, yet many compensation systems continue to emphasize individual performance. This mismatch may reduce collaboration, discourage knowledge sharing, and weaken collective accountability. In response, organizations adopt team-based pay systems to encourage employees to pursue shared goals. However, the effectiveness of such systems remains contested. Some studies associate teamwork and team-based incentives with improved productivity, service quality, and organizational effectiveness, while others warn that collective pay may create free-riding, perceived inequity, social comparison, and reduced individual accountability.

The problem is more serious in contemporary workplaces where teams are diverse, hybrid, technology-enabled, and often composed of employees with different skills, responsibilities, and effort levels. When reward sharing is not transparent, employees may question whether team rewards fairly reflect individual contributions. Similarly, where performance measurement is weak, team-based pay may reward membership rather than contribution. This can generate dissatisfaction and reduce motivation among stronger performers. Therefore, there is a need for a structured review that explains how team-based pay affects collaboration, productivity, shared responsibility, and overall organizational performance, while identifying the conditions under which it succeeds or fails.

1.2 Objectives of the study

The general objective of this study is to examine how team-based pay systems influence organizational performance in modern workplaces.

The specific objectives are to: (i) examine the effect of team-based pay systems on employee collaboration; (ii) assess the effect of team-based pay systems on employee productivity; (iii) evaluate the effect of team-based pay systems on shared responsibility; and (iv) develop an integrated framework explaining how fairness, transparency, team dynamics, and incentive alignment condition the relationship between team-based pay and organizational performance.

II. LITERATURE REVIEW AND HYPOTHESIS DEVELOPMENT

2.1 Theoretical Foundation

This study is anchored in Agency Theory, Expectancy Theory, Equity Theory, and Social Exchange Theory. Agency Theory explains that organizations face difficulty when principals cannot fully monitor agents, Mumuni and Akurugu [6] . Incentive systems are therefore used to align employee behavior with organizational objectives and reduce agency costs. In team-based pay, the agency problem is addressed by linking rewards to collective outcomes, thereby encouraging employees to monitor and support one another.

Expectancy Theory explains motivation through the belief that effort leads to performance and performance leads to valued rewards McLean and Acharya [7], Piyasena [8]. Team-based pay is therefore effective when employees understand the performance targets, believe the team can achieve them, and value the reward attached to achievement. If team targets are vague or perceived as unattainable, the motivational power of the reward declines.

Equity Theory is particularly important because team-based pay requires employees to compare their inputs and rewards with those of colleagues. Employees are more likely to accept team-based compensation when reward criteria are transparent and when distribution rules are perceived as fair. Where employees believe that some members receive equal rewards despite lower effort, perceptions of inequity may reduce motivation and cooperation.

Social Exchange Theory adds that employees reciprocate fair and supportive organizational practices with commitment, cooperation, and discretionary effort. Thus, team-based pay may strengthen organizational performance not only by paying employees for results, but by signalling that the organization values collective contribution and shared success.

2.2 Team-Based Pay and Employee Collaboration

Employee collaboration is the willingness of employees to share information, coordinate tasks, support colleagues, and work toward shared goals. Team-based pay usually strengthens collaboration, because it shifts attention from isolated individual achievement to collective results. When employees know that rewards depend on team outcomes, they have stronger incentives to assist weaker members, exchange knowledge, reduce internal competition, and resolve conflicts that threaten group performance.

Evidence from teamwork literature supports this argument. Ajayi [9] found that team structure, team change, and team effectiveness significantly influenced organizational performance in selected financial institutions in Abuja. The study concluded that organizational success depends on interdependence within teams and on the ability of team members to understand their roles and work toward corporate goals. Similarly, incentive alignment literature shows that employees perform better when rewards are clearly communicated, fairly implemented, and linked to organizational goals, Apo et al. [10].

However, collaboration does not automatically emerge from team-based pay. The quality of team dynamics matters. Bangura [4] found that team dynamics was the only statistically significant predictor of employee motivation among performance-based compensation, fairness perception, and team dynamics. This finding suggests that team-based pay is most effective where teams already have trust, open communication, and supportive relationships. Therefore, the first proposition is stated as follows:

Proposition 1: Team-based pay systems positively influence employee collaboration when reward criteria are transparent, team goals are clear, and team dynamics are supportive.

2.3 Team-Based Pay and Employee Productivity

Employee productivity concerns the quantity, quality, timeliness, and efficiency of employee output. Team-based pay usually improve productivity by aligning team effort with measurable organizational targets. Where collective rewards are tied to productivity indicators such as output volume, service delivery time, quality improvement, customer satisfaction, or cost reduction, employees are encouraged to coordinate their effort and eliminate inefficiencies that affect the team.

Recent compensation literature emphasizes that well-designed compensation systems influence productivity by connecting employee effort to valued outcomes. Akuffo-Aduamah [11] argues that compensation management shapes employee motivation, retention, and productivity when it combines direct rewards, indirect benefits, and development opportunities. Sunku [12] further demonstrates that workforce analytics and compensation modeling can help organizations optimize payroll, resource allocation, and team productivity. The use of analytics is important because team-based pay requires accurate measurement of team performance and fair allocation of rewards.

Nevertheless, Mabaso [13] highlights that productivity gains depend on the accuracy of measurement and the fit between reward design and work structure. Where tasks are highly interdependent, team-based incentives may reduce duplication and improve coordination. Where tasks are independent, individual incentives may be more appropriate. Poor measurement may also encourage teams to focus on rewarded indicators while neglecting quality, innovation, or ethical standards. Therefore, team-based pay is supposed to be supported by balanced performance measures rather than narrow output targets.

Proposition 2: Team-based pay systems positively influence employee productivity when collective rewards are linked to balanced, measurable, and controllable team performance indicators.

2.4 Team-Based Pay and shared responsibility

Shared responsibility refers to the extent to which employees feel jointly accountable for team results. Team-based pay can strengthen shared responsibility because it makes organizational outcomes a collective concern. Employees become more likely to monitor group progress, encourage compliance with standards, and participate in solving performance problems. This is consistent with agency theory, which suggests that incentives can align individual behavior with organizational goals.

However, shared responsibility can become diluted when reward systems fail to distinguish between contribution and membership. A common criticism of team-based pay is free-riding, where some employees reduce effort while benefiting from the work of others. Free-riding is more likely where individual contributions are not visible, where team leadership is weak, or where the team reward is distributed equally without mechanisms for peer accountability. To address this, organizations may combine team rewards with individual performance feedback, peer evaluation, role clarity, and transparent communication.

Bao et al. [13] provide an important caution by showing that organizational-performance pay sometimes triggers equality concerns because members share a reward based on collective performance. When reward shares are dispersed or perceived as unequal without clear justification, low-share individuals may reduce contribution, leading to lower aggregate performance. This finding is directly relevant to team-based pay because it shows that employees' perceptions of fairness and social comparison can determine whether collective rewards encourage or discourage responsibility.

Proposition 3: Team-based pay systems enhance shared responsibility when reward sharing is perceived as fair and when teams have clear roles, peer accountability, and mechanisms for recognizing differential contribution.

2.5 Team-Based Pay and organizational performance

Organizational performance, is a multidimensional construct that includes productivity, efficiency, effectiveness, service quality, innovation, employee commitment, customer satisfaction, and financial outcomes, Pham et al. [14]. Team-based pay affects organizational performance indirectly through employee collaboration, productivity, and shared responsibility. The stronger these mediating mechanisms, the stronger the likely effect of team-based pay on organizational performance.

Li [15], and Yu and Santos [16] suggests that compensation is most effective when it is integrated with broader human resource systems. Najam et al. [17], although focusing on green human resource practices, show that HR practices influence organizational performance through employee citizenship behavior. This reinforces the idea that performance outcomes are not produced by pay alone, but by employee behaviors that connect HR practices to organizational goals. In the same way, team-based pay should be understood as a behavioral and relational system rather than a simple financial instrument.

The overall relationship can therefore be summarized as follows: team-based pay provides the structural incentive; fairness and transparency create legitimacy; team dynamics create the social conditions for cooperation; performance analytics support accurate measurement; and employee collaboration, productivity, and shared responsibility translate the incentive into organizational performance.

Proposition 4: Team-based pay systems improve organizational performance through the combined effects of collaboration, productivity, and shared responsibility, provided that fairness, transparency, team dynamics, and measurement quality are present.

III. CONCEPTUAL FRAMEWORK

The proposed framework positions team-based pay systems as the independent variable and organizational performance as the dependent variable. Employee collaboration, productivity, and shared responsibility serve as mediating mechanisms. Fairness perception, transparency, team dynamics, leadership support, and performance measurement quality serve as moderating conditions that strengthen or weaken the relationship. The framework suggests that team-based pay is not automatically effective; its success depends on whether employees perceive the system as fair, understand the reward criteria, trust the team process, and believe that team performance indicators are controllable and meaningful.

TABLE 1: Conceptual linkages in the Article

Variable/Mechanism	Meaning	Expected Effect	Design Requirement
Team-based pay	Rewards tied to team or group outcomes	Aligns employee effort with collective goals	Clear targets and transparent reward formula
Collaboration	Information sharing, mutual help and coordination	Improves service quality and reduces conflict	Trust, communication and supportive leadership
Productivity	Quantity, quality and efficiency of output	Improves team and organizational results	Balanced and measurable indicators
Shared responsibility	Joint accountability for results	Strengthens ownership and peer monitoring	Role clarity and peer accountability
Fairness perception	Belief that rewards are equitable	Strengthens acceptance of team pay	Procedural and distributive justice
Team dynamics	Cohesion, trust and communication	Amplifies motivation and commitment	Team-building and conflict management

IV. METHODOLOGY

This study adopts a conceptual and evidence-based review methodology. The approach is appropriate because the objective is to synthesize recent evidence and develop a refined framework for understanding team-based pay systems and organizational performance. The review draws on the existing studies dealing with teamwork, performance-based compensation, organizational-performance pay, incentive alignment, compensation management, workforce analytics, and organizational performance.

The inclusion criteria were: (i) relevance to compensation, incentives, teamwork, employee motivation, or organizational performance; (ii) publication or manuscript focus within business, management, human resource management, or organizational behavior; and (iii) usefulness for explaining the mechanisms linking team-based pay to performance. The review prioritized recent studies from 2025 and 2026 while retaining foundational theories such as Agency Theory, Expectancy Theory, Equity Theory, and Social Exchange Theory.

Because no primary field data were collected for this study, the findings are presented as a synthesized discussion rather than statistical results. This approach avoids unsupported claims while still producing a manuscript suitable for development into an empirical paper. Future researchers may test the proposed framework using a cross-sectional survey, structural equation modelling, or multiple regression analysis among employees working in team-based organizations.

V. FINDINGS AND DISCUSSION

5.1 Team-Based Pay encourages collaboration when supported by strong team dynamics

The reviewed literature indicates that team-based pay can encourage collaboration by rewarding employees for collective outcomes. Employees become more likely to share knowledge and support colleagues when the achievement of team goals affects their rewards. However, the strongest evidence points to team dynamics as the central condition for success. Bangura [4] reported that team dynamics significantly predicted employee motivation, while performance-based compensation and fairness perception did not independently predict motivation. This finding challenges a purely economic view of compensation and suggests that team-based pay must be embedded in a healthy social environment.

The implication is that organizations should not introduce team-based pay into weak, conflict-prone, or poorly led teams and expect immediate performance improvement. Compensation reform should be accompanied by team-building, leadership support, conflict management, and communication systems. A team reward can only motivate collective effort when members trust one another and believe that colleagues will also contribute.

5.2 Productivity gains depend on measurement quality and reward clarity

Team-based pay improves productivity by creating a direct link between team effort and reward. However, this depends on the quality of performance measurement. Inaccurate or unclear indicators can create confusion, resentment, or gaming of the system. Workforce analytics, such as payroll modelling and resource optimization, can support fairer compensation decisions by linking hours worked, skill levels, overtime, shift types, and performance indicators to pay outcomes Sunku [12].

For productivity to improve, team-based pay is supposed to rely on balanced measures that capture both quantity and quality. For example, a customer service team may be rewarded not only for number of cases handled, but also for customer satisfaction, response time, error reduction, and teamwork quality. This prevents teams from pursuing output at the expense of service quality or ethical standards.

5.3 Fairness and Transparency determine acceptance of team rewards

A recurring theme across the literature is fairness. Employees are more likely to accept team-based pay when the rules are clear, the performance criteria are known, and the distribution method is perceived as legitimate. Incentive alignment literature emphasizes that fair, transparent, and performance-linked incentives reduce principal-agent conflicts and improve task, contextual, and adaptive performance (Apo et al., 2025).

Fairness has both procedural and distributive dimensions. Procedural fairness concerns the process used to set targets, measure performance, and allocate rewards. Distributive fairness concerns the perceived fairness of the reward outcome. A team reward system may fail when employees believe that the process is unclear or that the outcome does not reflect real contribution. Therefore, organizations should communicate reward formulas, allow feedback, and periodically review whether team pay reflects actual team effort.

5.4 Collective Rewards can create social comparison and free-riding risks

Team-based pay is not risk-free. Collective rewards may create free-riding if employees receive similar benefits regardless of effort. This can demotivate high-performing employees and create resentment toward low-contributing members. Bao et al. [5]s further show that unequal reward shares under organizational-performance pay can reduce aggregate performance where equality concerns are strong. Their evidence suggests that low-share individuals may reduce contribution more strongly than high-share individuals increase contribution, producing a negative net effect on performance.

This finding is important because it warns managers against assuming that any collective incentive will improve performance. Team-based pay should include safeguards such as individual performance feedback, peer evaluation, role clarity, team charters, and managerial monitoring. Organizations may also use a hybrid model in which part of the reward is based on team performance and part on individual contribution. Such a design preserves collaboration while reducing free-riding.

5.5 Team-Based Pay should be integrated with broader HR practices

The evidence suggests that compensation systems work best when integrated with broader HR practices. Compensation affects motivation, retention, and productivity, but employees also respond to recognition, growth opportunities, leadership quality, and organizational culture. Akuffo-Aduamah [11] emphasizes the multidimensional nature of compensation, including direct rewards, indirect benefits, workplace perks, and professional development. Najam et al. [17] similarly demonstrate that HR practices affect organizational performance through employee citizenship behavior.

Therefore, team-based pay is supposed to be implemented as part of a wider performance management system. Organizations should train team leaders, clarify team goals, support employee development, recognize non-financial contributions, and ensure that employees participate in the design of reward systems. This integrated approach is more likely to produce sustainable organizational performance than reliance on financial incentives alone.

VI. MANAGERIAL IMPLICATIONS

First, managers are supposed to introduce team-based pay only where work is genuinely interdependent. Where employees work independently, individual performance pay may be more appropriate.

Second, managers should define measurable team outcomes before attaching rewards. Indicators should capture quality, productivity, customer outcomes, innovation, and compliance rather than output alone.

Third, organizations should communicate the reward formula clearly and explain how team performance will be assessed. Transparency reduces suspicion and increases acceptance.

Fourth, team-based pay should be supported by team development. Leaders should build trust, encourage communication, manage conflict, and ensure role clarity. Fifth, organizations should consider hybrid reward systems that combine team rewards with individual recognition. This reduces free-riding while preserving cooperation. Finally, HR departments should use analytics carefully to improve fairness, detect performance patterns, and ensure that reward systems align with organizational strategy.

VII. THEORETICAL IMPLICATIONS

This study contributes to the literature by integrating compensation theory, teamwork literature, and organizational-performance pay research into a single framework. It shows that the effect of team-based pay on organizational performance is mediated by collaboration, productivity, and shared responsibility and moderated by fairness, transparency, team dynamics, and measurement quality. The study also extends Agency Theory by showing that incentive alignment in teams requires not only financial rewards but also social and relational conditions. It extends Equity Theory by emphasizing that team reward acceptance depends on both equality and contribution-based fairness. It also supports Social Exchange Theory by showing that fair team-based pay can signal organizational support and encourage cooperative behaviour.

VIII. LIMITATIONS AND DIRECTIONS FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

This study is limited by its conceptual review design. It synthesizes existing literature but does not present new primary data. Future studies should empirically test the proposed framework using survey data from employees working under team-based pay systems. Researchers may examine whether collaboration, productivity, and shared responsibility mediate the relationship between team-based pay and organizational performance. Future studies may also test the moderating effect of fairness perception, team dynamics, leadership support, and performance measurement quality. Comparative studies across sectors, countries, and organizational sizes would also help determine whether team-based pay works differently in collectivist and individualist cultures.

IX. CONCLUSION

Team-based pay systems are increasingly relevant in modern workplaces where organizational performance depends on collaboration, shared responsibility, and collective problem-solving. The evidence reviewed in this article suggests that team-based pay can improve organizational performance, but only when designed and implemented carefully. Financial rewards alone are insufficient. The effectiveness of team-based pay depends on transparent reward criteria, fair distribution, strong team dynamics, accurate performance measurement, and supportive leadership. Poorly designed team-based pay can produce free-riding, social comparison, perceived unfairness, and reduced motivation. Organizations should therefore treat team-based pay as part of an integrated human resource strategy that combines incentives with recognition, communication, analytics, team development, and fair performance management. When implemented under these conditions, team-based pay can promote collaboration, productivity, shared responsibility, and sustainable organizational performance.

DECLARATIONS

Funding: No external funding was received for this conceptual review.
Conflict of Interest: The authors declare no conflict of interest.
Data Availability: No primary dataset was collected. The article is based on a review of secondary literature and cited sources.
Ethical Statement: This article did not involve biological materials.

REFERENCES

[1]. D. Mdhlalose and T. Mtshali, “Culture and compensation interaction: how do financial rewards affect public sector engagement?,” *Veredas do Direito*, vol. 23, no. 3, pp. 1–25, 2026.
[2]. E. Mun and Y. Hur, “Beyond individual performance: collective performance pay and gender wage inequality,” *Socio-Economic Rev.*, p. mwag025, 2026.
[3]. O. Oyedele, “LINKING REMUNERATION STRATEGIES TO EMPLOYEE ENGAGEMENT AND PRODUCTIVITY: EVIDENCE FROM MERIT PAY, BONUSES, AND GAIN SHARING SCHEMES,” *J-MACC J. Manag. Account.*, vol. 8, no. 1, pp. 202–217, 2025.
[4]. A. I. Bangura, “Evaluating the Effectiveness of Performance-Based Compensation Systems on Employee Motivation in Modern Workplaces,” *Int. J. Sci. Bus.*, vol. 49, no. 1, pp. 96–113, 2026.
[5]. J. Bao, A. Wu, and M. Zhang, “Organizational-performance pay and compensation dispersion,” *J. Organ. Des.*, vol. 14, no. 2, pp. 61–82, 2025.
[6]. A. I. Mumuni and A. A. Akurugu, “Application of Agency Theory on Top Management Team Towards Organisational Thinking.,” *Glob. Sci. Acad. Res. J. Econ. Bus. Manag.*, 2025.
[7]. W. McLean and T. Acharya, “Expectancy theory: Motivation, pay, incentives, and retention,” in *Public Administration and Organization Theory*, Routledge India, 2025, pp. 48–57.
[8]. K. Piyasena, “Expectancy Theory in Employee Performance Management: A Critical Analysis of Cognitive Motivational Processes and Their Applications,” *Sciences (New. York).*, vol. 9, no. 05, pp. 49–79, 2025.
[9]. S. Ajayi, “Impact of Team Work on Organizational Performance (A Case Study of Financial Institutions in Abuja Nigeria (First Bankplc; Guaranty Trust Bankplc & Zenith Bank PLC),” *Available SSRN 5349488*, 2025.
[10]. S. C. P. Apo, M. V Abante, and F. G. Vigonte, “Systematic Literature Review on Incentive Alignment and Agent Performance: An Empirical Examination of the Principal-Agent Problem in Organizations”.
[11]. C. C. N. Akuffo-Aduamah, “The impact of compensation on employees performance in organizations,” *Int. J. Multidiscip. Stud. Innov. Res.*, vol. 13, no. 1, pp. 57–69, 2025.
[12]. R. Sunku, “Data Intelligence for Workforce Management: Machine Learning Models for Payroll and Resource Optimization,” *Int. J. Artif. Intell. Mach. Learn.*, vol. 3, no. 3, pp. 1–7, 2025.
[13]. C. Mabaso, “Reward preferences to attract and retain Generation Z,” *Acta Commer. Res. J. Manag. Sci.*, vol. 25, no. 1, p. 1345, 2025.
[14]. V. K. Pham, N. T. Duong, L. L. P. Giao, and P. Le, “Organizational Innovation, Job Satisfaction, and Service Quality: HRM Practices as a Moderator in Vietnam’s Hotels,” *J. Qual. Assur. Hosp. Tour.*, pp. 1–23, 2026.
[15]. Y. Li, “Evaluating the Effectiveness of Compensation Systems on Employee Motivation and Retention in Auto Parts Enterprises in Wuhan, China: Basis For Human Resource Optimization Strategy,” *Divers. J.*, vol. 10, no. special_1, 2025.
[16]. L. Yu and A. R. Santos, “Integrating human resource management in urban workforce development: A focus on salary increments.,” *Int. J. Hum. Cap. Urban Manag.*, vol. 10, no. 1, 2025.
[17]. Z. Najam, M. Waqas, M. Naseer, H. K. U. Rehman, and A. Khan, “Impact of Green HR Practices on Organizational Performance: The Mediating Role of Organizational Citizenship Behaviour for Environment,” *Asian Bull. Big Data Manag.*, vol. 5, no. 2, pp. 42–55, 2025.

Corresponding Author: Kasawuli Faik Bawonga [1]
[1](Public Administration, Islamic University In Uganda, Uganda)