



ASSESSMENT OF REWARDS THAT MOTIVATE EMPLOYEES IN ORGANISATIONS: THE CASE OF CAPE COAST TECHNICAL UNIVERSITY

Lanidune, E.¹ and Boampong, G. N.²

¹*Office of the Pro Vice-Chancellor, Cape Coast Technical University, Cape Coast, Ghana.*

²*Institute for Oil and Gas Studies, University of Cape Coast, Cape Coast, Ghana.*

¹*ernestinalanidune@gmail.com*

²*ginatomoriginal@gmail.com*

ABSTRACT

Purpose: The purpose of this study is to investigate the rewards that motivate employees in organisations in universities, and to identify the most effective types of rewards that can improve employee motivation and organisational success.

Methodology: This study utilizes a mixed-method approach, incorporating both qualitative and quantitative data collection methods. The target population for the study consisted of senior members, senior staff and junior staff of the University with a sample size of 196. A stratified random sampling method was used in selecting staff from the three categories. The qualitative data will be collected through in-depth interviews with employees from various positions in universities, while the quantitative data will be collected through a survey. The data was analysed descriptively using mean scores to identify the factors that influence the effectiveness of rewards in motivating employees.

Research Limitation: This study is limited by its sample size, which may not fully capture the diverse range of employees in universities. Additionally, the study's findings may be limited by the specific context in which the study is conducted.

Findings: An association between reward and productivity in the workplace was found in the study. Yet, the data also revealed that Cape Coast Technical University does not have a well-defined strategy for reward systems. As a result, workers felt that the institution did not treat them fairly.

Practical Implications: The study's findings are expected to have significant practical implications for universities, as they can use the insights gained from this study to develop more effective reward systems that can motivate their employees.

Social Implications: The social implications of this research are essential, as motivated employees are more likely to engage with students and provide better educational experiences, which can benefit society as a whole. By improving employee motivation and job satisfaction, universities can provide a better learning environment for their students and contribute to social welfare.

Originality/Value/Novelty: The novelty of this study lies in its focus on rewards that motivate employees in organisations in the higher education sector. While previous studies have explored employee motivation in various sectors, this study's specific focus on universities adds to the existing body of knowledge.

Keywords: *Extrinsic. intrinsic. motivation. performance. rewards*

ISSN: 2408-7920

Copyright © African Journal of Applied Research

Arca Academic Publisher



INTRODUCTION

Rewards play a crucial role in motivating employees in organisations. They are seen as tangible incentives that encourage employees to put in their best effort towards achieving organisational goals (Ali, & Anwar, 2021). Choi and Presslee, (2023) argued that monetary rewards are seen as tangible incentives that motivate employees to put in their best effort towards achieving organisational goals. Studies have shown that monetary rewards are effective in motivating employees, especially when they are linked to performance. While non-monetary rewards are seen as intangible incentives that motivate employees to put in their best effort towards achieving organisational goals. Studies have again shown that non-monetary rewards are effective in motivating employees, especially when they are linked to job satisfaction (Tarigan, Cahya, Valentine, Hatane, & Jie, 2022).

Rewards that provide employees with a sense of control over their work environment can be effective in motivating employees (Basalamah, & As'ad, 2021). This includes flexible work schedules, telecommuting, and autonomy in decision-making. Employees who have control over their work environment are more likely to be motivated and satisfied with their jobs (Jabagi, Croteau, Audebrand, & Marsan, 2019).

Kuczarski and Kuczarski, (2019) noted that rewards that provide employees with a sense of purpose and meaning can be effective in motivating employees. This includes opportunities for community service, volunteer work, and social responsibility initiatives. Employees who feel that their work has a positive impact on society are more likely to be motivated and satisfied with their jobs (Davidescu, Apostu, Paul, & Casuneanu, 2020).

Rewards that are tailored towards employees' needs, provide a sense of control, and provide a sense of purpose and meaning are effective in motivating employees. Both monetary and non-monetary rewards can be effective in motivating employees when linked to performance and job satisfaction. Organisations that provide these types of rewards are more likely to have motivated and satisfied employees, which ultimately leads to higher productivity and profitability.

The higher education sector is faced with the challenge of motivating employees to achieve organisational goals. This sector is characterized by a highly competitive job market, a diverse workforce, and a demanding work environment, which makes it essential for universities to identify and implement effective rewards that motivate employees (Holdsworth, Turner, & Scott-Young, 2018). The problem is, however, that there is limited research on the assessment of rewards that motivate employees in organisations, particularly in the higher education sector.

Research has shown that monetary rewards are effective in motivating employees in organisations (Tumi, Hasan, & Khalid, 2022). However, the higher education sector has limited resources to provide significant monetary rewards, making non-monetary rewards a more viable option. Non-monetary rewards such as recognition, promotion, and training



opportunities have been found to be effective in motivating employees, especially when they are linked to job satisfaction (Mani, & Mishra, 2020).

Furthermore, the higher education sector is characterized by a diverse workforce, including academic and non-academic staff, which may have different needs and preferences when it comes to rewards (Szromek, & Wolniak, 2020).

Finally, the effectiveness of rewards in motivating employees may be influenced by various factors such as cultural differences, job characteristics, and leadership style (Johari, Mohd Shamsudin, Fee Yean, Yahya, & Adnan, 2019). Therefore, there is a need to investigate the factors that influence the effectiveness of rewards in motivating employees in universities.

The problem of motivating employees in the higher education sector is a persistent challenge faced by universities across the world. The limited research on the assessment of rewards that motivate employees in organisations, particularly in the higher education sector, highlights the need for further research. There is a need to investigate the types of rewards that are most effective in motivating employees in universities, as well as the factors that influence their effectiveness. This research can provide valuable insights for universities looking to improve employee motivation and performance in the higher education sector.

THEORIES UNDERPINNING THE STUDY

Several theories underpin the concept of rewards that motivate employees in organisations in higher education. These theories include:

Self-Determination Theory: This theory suggests that people are motivated when they feel a sense of autonomy, competence, and relatedness (Forner, Jones, Berry, & Eidenfalk, 2020). In the context of higher education, this means that employees are motivated when they feel that they have control over their work, are competent in their jobs, and have positive relationships with colleagues and students.

Expectancy Theory: This theory suggests that people are motivated when they believe that their effort will lead to performance, performance will lead to rewards, and rewards are valued (Pieper, Greenwald, & Schlachter, 2018). In the context of higher education, this means that employees are motivated when they believe that their effort will lead to good performance, and good performance will lead to rewards such as recognition and promotion, and these rewards are valued (Koo, Yu, Chua, Lee, & Han, 2020).

Goal-Setting Theory: Clements and Kamau, (2018) revealed that the theory suggests that people are motivated when they have clear, specific, and challenging goals to work towards. In the context of higher education, this means that employees are motivated when they have clear goals such as research targets, teaching objectives, or student engagement goals (Xerri, Radford, & Shacklock, 2018).

ISSN: 2408-7920

Copyright © African Journal of Applied Research
Arca Academic Publisher



Social Exchange Theory: This theory suggests that people are motivated when they receive rewards in exchange for their efforts (Zoller, & Muldoon, 2018). In the context of higher education, this means that employees are motivated when they receive rewards such as recognition, promotion, or training opportunities in exchange for their work.

A combination of Self-Determination Theory and Goal-Setting Theory were adopted to investigate the types of rewards that are most effective in motivating different types of employees in universities. These theories provide a framework for understanding the factors that influence employee motivation and can guide the identification of the most effective rewards for different types of employees in universities.

METHODOLOGY

Descriptive research methods were used to examine how different incentive programmes at Cape Coast Technical University affected worker productivity. The study used a mixed method design, collecting both qualitative and quantitative data (questionnaire and interview) to investigate the impact of incentive programmes on organisational performance from a number of different angles. There was a total of 196 staff members across all categories included in the study's quantitative sample (junior staff, senior staff and senior members). For the qualitative portion of the research, three high-ranking members were specifically chosen who were in charge of designing and implementing the technical university's reward systems. Participants for the quantitative portion of the study were selected using a stratified sampling strategy and a simple random sampling strategy. Statistical Product and Service Solution (SPSS) version 21 was used for the descriptive analysis of the quantitative data, while a thematic analysis procedure was utilised for the qualitative data. Charts, graphs, and tables were used to break down the data. The final product was a summary of how respondents generally characterise the impact of incentive programmes on organisational performance.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

Demographic information

This section provides demographic information on individual respondents. The analyzed results for the descriptive data were the respondents' background information including their individual information.



Table 1: Respondents' profile

<i>Item</i>	<i>Representative</i>	<i>Frequency</i>	<i>Percentage</i>
Gender	Male	118	36.22
	Female	67	63.78
Experience	1-5	30	16.20
	6-20years	59	31.90
	11-15 years	43	23.20
	16-20 years	45	24.30
	Above 21 years	8	4.30
Category of staff	Senior Member	71	38.38
	Senior Staff	42	22.70
	Junior Staff	72	38.92

Out of a total of 196 respondents, 118 (63.8%) were male and 67 (36.2%) were female, therefore the gender distribution was approximately even. This suggests that males made up a disproportionate share of the responders. One possible explanation is that fewer women enroll in and complete higher education, where the gender gap is already rather large (33% of all college students are female). This trend suggests that universities may be failing to recruit enough qualified women for their faculty and administrative ranks.

The respondents' length of service at Cape Coast Technical University was also analysed. The Table 1 reveals that 31.9%, or 59 respondents, had worked for Cape Coast Technical University for 6-10 years, and 24.3%, or 45 respondents, had worked for Cape Coast Technical University for 16-20 years. Also, 8 participants (4.3%) had professional experience spanning over two decades. This investigation was crucial because employees' views on the university's compensation and benefits are likely to change depending on how long they've been there.

From the total of 196 respondents, 72 were entry-level workers (representing 38.9%), 42 were middle managers (representing 22.7%), and 71 were upper management (representing 38.4%). This suggests that the majority of responses were entry-level employees. The number of employees in each category was taken into account while selecting the respondent groups.



Clear Definition of Reward Systems at Cape Coast Technical University

The purpose of Table 2 was to analyse how respondents felt about the university's reward systems, particularly if they felt the university had established well-defined compensation systems for its employees.

Table 2: Clear definition of reward systems at Cape Coast Technical University

Category of Staff	No. Agreement	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Senior Member	31	43.7.	3.15	1.69
Senior Staff	9	21.4	2.52	1.42
Junior Staff	31	43.1	3.13	1.67
Total	71	38.4	3.00	1.64

It shows that 38% of respondents think that there were well-defined reward mechanisms in place for staff at Cape Coast Technical University. A mean agreement score of 3.00 was reported, with a corresponding standard deviation of 1.64. There was a mean of 3.15 and a standard deviation of 1.69 amongst senior members and a mean of 2.52 and a standard deviation of 1.42 amongst senior employees. The junior staff group averaged 3.13, with a spread of 1.67. This demonstrates that senior members are more likely to agree with the university's decision to implement clearly defined reward schemes for staff than other categories of university employees.

The three (3) most senior members of management at Cape Coast Technical University were interviewed to get their thoughts on how the university decides which reward system to use for rewarding employees. They said that the majority of decisions regarding promotions and awards were made during congregation. The respondent added that during this time period, all departments and section heads are handed appraisal forms to use in evaluating the performance of their subordinates and making recommendations for promotions and awards. When it comes for upper management to decide who should be promoted or given an award, they look to the recommendations of the various department heads for guidance.

The second interviewee agreed that management typically considers the contents of the service document's plan. A committee is then formed to deliberate on whether or not to reward the workers. Nevertheless, the third interviewee was unable to say which form of incentive the university used to motivate its employees because she was only familiar with one type of reward (extrinsic). Based on the responses, the interviewer concluded that the administration at Cape Coast Technical University did not have a well-defined mechanism for rewarding



employees. This result is consistent with the opinion of Martela (2019), who argued that the most common approach to the issue of rewarding university staff when it is explicitly established as part of the institutional policy is to implement a reward structure.

Level of agreement on the existence of both financial (extrinsic) and non-financial (intrinsic) rewards at Cape Coast Technical University

This part aimed to gauge how respondents felt about the various forms of incentives offered to university employees. The percentage of respondents who think that financial and non-financial incentives exist at universities is shown in Table 3.

Table 3: Level of agreement on the existence of both financial (extrinsic) and non-financial (intrinsic) rewards at Cape Coast Technical University

Category of Staff	No. Agreement	% Agreement	Mean	Standard Deviation
Senior Member	46	64.8	3.93	1.52
Senior Staff	10	23.8	2.67	1.39
Junior Staff	27	37.5	3.11	1.57
Total	83	44.9	3.32	1.59

It shows that nearly half of the respondents (44%) agree that the institution provides both financial (extrinsic) and non-financial (intrinsic) benefits to employees. As a result, the average degree of agreement is 3.32, with a standard deviation of 1.59. The senior member group averaged 3.93, with a standard deviation of 1.52, and the senior staff group averaged 2.67, with a standard deviation of 1.39. Moreover, the junior staff group averaged 3.11 with a standard deviation of 1.57. This indicates that senior members are more likely to agree with the statement that the institution provides both financial (extrinsic) and non-financial (intrinsic) rewards.

Even after asking three top administrators further questions regarding the various compensation plans at Cape Coast Technical University, it became clear that there was no such dedicated document for the institution. It was mentioned that the university staff's scheme of service included embedded issues about rewards. These results corroborate those of Mercer-Mapstone, Islam, and Reid (2021), who found that staff motivation increased when proper recognition and reward mechanisms were built into the university's overall structure.



Views of respondents on the most important rewards that motivate employees at Cape Coast Technical University.

This part sought to assess the respondents' views on the kind of rewards that really motivate employees at Cape Coast Technical University. Table 4 presents the views of respondents on the various types of rewards that motivate employees in the university.



Table 4: Views of Respondents on the types of Rewards of Cape Coast Technical University

	Senior Member		Senior Staff		Junior Staff		Total	
	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%	Freq.	%
Salary	42	59.2	22	52.4	18	25.0	82	44.3
Health and Medical Benefits	33	46.5	15	35.7	18	25.0	66	35.7
Promotion	33	46.5	13	31.0	14	19.4	60	32.4
Overtime	33	46.5	10	23.8	13	18.1	56	30.3
Leave (Sabbatical, Study Leave, Casual And Annual) leave benefits	32	45.1	18	42.9	5	6.9	55	29.7
Transportation and Death Benefits	26	36.6	10	23.8	18	25.0	54	29.2
Accommodation Benefits	23	32.4	9	21.4	18	25.0	50	27.0
Retirement and Pension Benefits	23	32.4	10	23.8	16	22.2	49	26.5
Bonuses	21	29.6	10	23.8	9	12.5	40	21.6
Contract of Service	21	29.6	5	11.9	12	16.7	38	20.5
Fringe Benefit	17	23.9	5	11.9	13	18.1	35	18.9
Others	4	5.6	1	2.4	23	31.9	28	15.1
Formal Recognition	36	50.7	21	50.0	42	58.3	99	53.5
End of Year Get-Together /Hampers	28	39.4	18	42.9	38	52.8	84	45.4
Informal Recognition	37	52.1	16	38.1	29	40.3	82	44.3



Praises from Management/ Boss for Excellent Work Done	14	19.7	6	14.3	20	27.8	40	21.6
Opportunity to Attend	29	40.8	3	7.1	8	11.1	40	21.6
Others	2	2.8	0	0.0	3	4.2	5	2.7
Total	71	100.0	42	100.0	72	100.0	185	100.0



Table 4 shows that 96.4% of the 196 respondents made their living from salary. The vast majority of those who participated agreed with this. Then, 35.7% (66/185) of responders emphasise the positive effects on health and medicine. Again, 60 people out of 185 (32.4%) say they were promoted, 56 people out of 185 (30.3%) say they worked overtime, 55 people out of 185 (29.7%) say they received paid time off, 54 people out of 185 (29.2%) say they received transportation and death benefits, 50 people out of 185 (27.0%) say they received housing benefits, and 49 people out of 185 (26.5%) said they retired. The salary was found to be the most important reward for employees at Cape Coast Technical University, and it is a component of the financial (extrinsic) type of reward systems common in businesses.

The monetary component of the incentive system is more valuable to personnel in the university than the non-financial benefits, according to interviews with senior members of management conducted to investigate this question. This is a quote from one of the interviewees *“taking study leave and promotion, for instance, the staff here appreciates that the most as it really makes them put up their best at work”*. Another quote from the other interviewee *“things are difficult these days so just saying a simple thank you to an employee for excellent work done without giving money does not really motivate the employee very much”*. Yet, one participant argued that both sorts are beneficial since they reinforce one another. This idea is consistent with the findings of Pappas, Papavlasopoulou, Mikalef, and Giannakos (2020), who found that people have varying needs that must be met to ensure their happiness. Financial advantages outside of work, such as a wage, often satisfy employees' physiological demands, but employees also have psychological needs that must be addressed for them to feel driven to enhance their performance on the job (Pappas et al., 2020).

In addition, the viewpoint of Chinyio, Suresh, and Salisu (2018) is reflected by the respondents who believe that just the financial part of the reward system is more effective. They advocate for salaries, wages, and conditions of service as incentives for employees in organisations. Managers need to consider the following four aspects of a salary structure in order to use salary as an effective rewarding system: the payment system (i.e., how employees are compensated), the job rate (i.e., how much value the organisation places on each position), special allowances (such as medical reimbursement), and fringe benefits such as a pension fund.

CONCLUSION

In conclusion, employee motivation is a critical aspect of organisational performance, especially in the higher education sector. While there is limited research on the assessment of rewards that motivate employees in organisations in universities, previous studies have shown that both monetary and non-monetary rewards can be effective in motivating employees when linked to performance and job satisfaction. However, there are several gaps in the current research, including limited research on non-monetary rewards, the effectiveness of rewards for different types of employees, and the factors that influence the effectiveness of rewards.

ISSN: 2408-7920

Copyright © African Journal of Applied Research

Arca Academic Publisher



To address these gaps, future research can adopt a combination of theories such as Self-Determination Theory, Expectancy Theory, Goal-Setting Theory, and Social Exchange Theory to investigate the types of rewards that are most effective in motivating different types of employees in universities. Additionally, research can explore the relationship between rewards and organisational outcomes such as productivity, profitability, and student satisfaction in the higher education sector.

The practical implications of this research are significant, as universities can use the insights gained from this study to develop more effective reward systems that can motivate their employees. By providing employees with the right incentives, universities can improve employee motivation and job satisfaction, which can ultimately lead to higher productivity and organisational success.

Moreover, the social implications of this research are essential as motivated employees are more likely to engage with students and provide better educational experiences, which can benefit society as a whole.

The novelty of this study lies in its focus on rewards that motivate employees in organisations in the higher education sector. While previous studies have explored employee motivation in various sectors, this study's specific focus on universities adds to the literature on this topic. By investigating the factors that influence the effectiveness of rewards in motivating employees in universities, this study can provide valuable insights into developing more effective reward systems in the higher education sector.

Understanding the types of rewards that motivate employees in organisations in universities is critical for improving employee motivation and organisational success in the higher education sector. By addressing the gaps in the current research and adopting a theoretical framework, this study can provide valuable insights for universities looking to improve their reward systems and employee motivation.

REFERENCES

- Ali, B.J., & Anwar, G. (2021). An Empirical Study of Employees' Motivation and its Influence on Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Engineering, Business and Management*, 5(2), 21-30.
- Basalamah, M. S. A., & As'ad, A. (2021). The Role of Work Motivation and Work Environment in Improving Job Satisfaction. *Golden Ratio of Human Resource Management*, 1(2), 94-103.
- Chinyio, E., Suresh, S., & Salisu, J. B. (2018). The impacts of monetary rewards on public sector employees in construction: A case of Jigawa state in Nigeria. *Journal of Engineering, Design and Technology*, 16(1), 125-142.
- Choi, J. W., & Presslee, A. (2023). When and why tangible rewards can motivate greater effort than cash rewards: An analysis of four attribute differences. *Accounting, Organizations and Society*, 104, 101389.

ISSN: 2408-7920

Copyright © African Journal of Applied Research
Arca Academic Publisher



- Clements, A. J., & Kamau, C. (2018). Understanding students' motivation towards proactive career behaviours through goal-setting theory and the job demands–resources model. *Studies in Higher Education*, 43(12), 2279-2293.
- Davidescu, A. A., Apostu, S. A., Paul, A., & Casuneanu, I. (2020). Work flexibility, job satisfaction, and job performance among Romanian employees—Implications for sustainable human resource management. *Sustainability*, 12(15), 6086.
- Forner, V. W., Jones, M., Berry, Y., & Eidenfalk, J. (2020). Motivating workers: how leaders apply self-determination theory in organizations. *Organization Management Journal*, 18(2), 76-94.
- Holdsworth, S., Turner, M., & Scott-Young, C. M. (2018). ... Not drowning, waving. Resilience and university: a student perspective. *Studies in higher education*, 43(11), 1837-1853.
- Jabagi, N., Croteau, A. M., Audebrand, L. K., & Marsan, J. (2019). Gig-workers' motivation: Thinking beyond carrots and sticks. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*.
- Johari, J., Mohd Shamsudin, F., Fee Yean, T., Yahya, K. K., & Adnan, Z. (2019). Job characteristics, employee well-being, and job performance of public sector employees in Malaysia. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, 32(1), 102-119.
- Koo, B., Yu, J., Chua, B. L., Lee, S., & Han, H. (2020). Relationships among emotional and material rewards, job satisfaction, burnout, affective commitment, job performance, and turnover intention in the hotel industry. *Journal of Quality Assurance in Hospitality & Tourism*, 21(4), 371-401.
- Kuczarski, S., & Kuczarski, T. (2019). How rewards fuel or fail innovation. *Strategic HR Review*, 18(1), 8-12.
- Mani, S., & Mishra, M. (2020). Non-monetary levers to enhance employee engagement in organizations—"GREAT" model of motivation during the Covid-19 crisis. *Strategic HR Review*, 19(4), 171-175.
- Martela, F. (2019). What makes self-managing organizations novel? Comparing how Weberian bureaucracy, Mintzberg's adhocracy, and self-organizing solve six fundamental problems of organizing. *Journal of Organization Design*, 8(1), 23.
- Mercer-Mapstone, L., Islam, M., & Reid, T. (2021). Are we just engaging 'the usual suspects'? Challenges in and practical strategies for supporting equity and diversity in student-staff partnership initiatives. *Teaching in Higher Education*, 26(2), 227-245.
- Pappas, I. O., Papavlasopoulou, S., Mikalef, P., & Giannakos, M. N. (2020). Identifying the combinations of motivations and emotions for creating satisfied users in SNSs: An fsQCA approach. *International Journal of Information Management*, 53, 102128.
- Pieper, J. R., Greenwald, J. M., & Schlachter, S. D. (2018). Motivating employee referrals: The interactive effects of the referral bonus, perceived risk in referring, and affective commitment. *Human Resource Management*, 57(5), 1159-1174.
- Szromek, A. R., & Wolniak, R. (2020). Job satisfaction and problems among academic staff in higher education. *Sustainability*, 12(12), 4865.
- Tarigan, J., Cahya, J., Valentine, A., Hatane, S., & Jie, F. (2022). Total reward system, job satisfaction and employee productivity on company financial performance: Evidence from Indonesian generation z workers. *Journal of Asia Business Studies*, 16(6), 1041-1065.

Tumi, N. S., Hasan, A. N., & Khalid, J. (2022). Impact of compensation, job enrichment and

ISSN: 2408-7920
Copyright © African Journal of Applied Research
Arca Academic Publisher



enlargement, and training on employee motivation. *Business Perspectives and Research*, 10(1), 121-139.

Xerri, M. J., Radford, K., & Shacklock, K. (2018). Student engagement in academic activities: A social support perspective. *Higher education*, 75, 589-605.

Zoller, Y. J., & Muldoon, J. (2018). Illuminating the principles of social exchange theory with Hawthorne studies. *Journal of Management History*, 25(1), 47-66.