

CONCEPT OF REWARD MANAGEMENT, REWARD SYSTEM AND CORPORATE EFFICIENCY

Joycelyn Samatha Anku 

Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business and Management Studies,
Ho Technical University, Ho, Ghana
samathaanku@gmail.com

Bless Kojo Amewugah

Department of Marketing, Faculty of Business and Management Studies,
Ho Technical University, Ho, Ghana

Mawutor K. Glover

Department of Agro Enterprise Development, Faculty of Applied Sciences,
Ho Technical University, Ho, Ghana

Abstract

Employees who make up a company remain the organization's unique and biggest asset - whilst they provide performance, organizations aim to reward them in an equitable manner - fairly, unbiased and consistently in accordance with the value they create in the organization. Reward system exists with a specific end goal to motivate employees to work towards accomplishing vital objectives which are set by entities. This study clarified the phenomenon of reward systems and corporate efficiency. It additionally reviewed other research findings in the range of reward systems. It assessed emerging and critical issues that inform reward decision-making. It again raised issues for example, the issue of measuring comparability and the concern of recognition programmes. This study concludes that the reward system plays an essential role in motivating workers to perform innovatively.

Keywords: Corporate Efficiency, Motivation, Organisation, Reward Management, Reward System

INTRODUCTION

Reward is generally understood as the total amount of financial and non-financial compensation or total remuneration provided to an employee in return for labour or service rendered at work. Reward, which is at times been described as compensation or remuneration, is possibly the most critical contract term in each paid-work. Brown (2001) points out some positive association that exist between rewards and business strategy in the widest sense. This is consistent with the findings of Rhoades et al. (2001) who argue that the reward strategy is important in terms of motivating employees to perform innovatively. While, Cox and Purcell (1995), and Nyandoro and Goremusandu, (2016) report that the actual advantages of a very much planned organisational reward strategy lies in its intricate linkages with the business strategy.

The influence of reward on employee's performance is in most occasion significantly misconstrued. The comprehension of this term is critical; this is on account of the incentive scheme given to an employee will impact the conduct and level of engagement to the organization. Beer (1984), Armstrong (2003), and Nyandoro and Goremusandu, (2016) observe that the coordination of reward systems underpins the accomplishment of competitiveness. According to Babakus et al. (2003), positive employee perceptions on the reward strategy impacts their disposition towards the organization. This is consistent with the findings of Rhoades et al. (2001) who argue that the reward system assumes a basic part in spurring workers to perform innovatively. Thus, Nguwi (2013:2), and Nyandoro and Goremusandu, (2016).attest that the best way to ensure the continued viability of companies amidst challenging economic environments is to emphasis reward management and organizational performance.

This review draws on a broad range of sources in explaining the phenomenon of reward systems and corporate efficiency. The study additionally highlights evidence that relates specifically to other research findings in the range of reward systems. It assesses emerging and critical issues that inform reward decision-making. The review again discusses issues for example, the issue of measuring comparability and the concern of recognition programmes.

THE CONCEPT AND DEFINITION OF REWARD MANAGEMENT AND REWARD SYSTEM

The concept and definition of reward management

Reward management is defined as *"the strategies, policies and processes required to ensure that the value of people and the contribution they make to achieving organization, departmental and team goals is recognized and rewarded"* (Armstrong 2010:267).According to Armstrong and Murlis, reward management refers to *"the process of formulating and implementation of strategies and policies that aim to reward people fairly, equitably and constantly in accordance with their value to the organization. It also deals with the design, implementation and*

maintenance of reward processes and practices that are geared towards the improvement of organizational, team and individual performance" (Armstrong and Murlis (2004:3)). On the basis of the foregoing definitions reward management could be characterized as a motivational tool employed in recognizing employees on the endeavours added to the organisation. It therefore implies reward could be traded as compensation or remuneration or unequivocal cost of labour. Schneider (1987) argued that reward management is focused on employee and the value they create in the organization.

Armstrong (2010) points out that reward management is concerned with the design, implementation and maintenance of reward systems (interrelated reward processes, practices and procedures) which focus on satisfying the necessities of both the organisation and its stakeholders, and to operate fairly, equitably and consistently. These systems cover measures for evaluating the importance of jobs through job evaluation and market pricing, the design and management of grade and pay structures, performance management processes, schemes for rewarding and recognising people according to their individual performance or contribution and/or team or organisational performance, and the provision of employee benefits. It must be emphasised that reward management is not only about pay and employee benefits. It is equally concerned with non-financial rewards such as recognition, learning and development opportunities and increased job responsibility.

Thus reward management comprises of examining and controlling worker compensation, remuneration and all other benefits for the employees. Reward management intends to make and proficiently work a reward structure for an organisation. Reward structure for the most part comprises of pay policy and practices, salary and payroll administration, total reward, minimum wage, executive pay and team reward. Reward framework exists with a specific end goal to motivate employees to work towards accomplishing strategic goals which are set by entities (Armstrong and Murlis 2007). Armstrong (2010:8) points out that in order for an organisation to accomplish an exceptionally committed business condition and its overall business objective, a reward strategy must be created to guarantee that the commitment individuals make to accomplishing organisational or group objectives are valued, recognised and rewarded .

The concept and definition of reward systems

According to Armstrong (2010: 268), *"reward systems consist of the interrelated processes and practices which combine to ensure that reward management is carried out effectively to the benefit of the organization and the people who work there."* Reward systems are based on the reward strategy; which runs from the business strategy, for instance to gain competitive

advantage, and the human resource (HR) strategy, which is impacted by the business strategy yet in addition impacts it. The HR strategy may, for instance, focus on resourcing however it ought to be likewise concerned with fulfilling the necessities of employees as well as those of the business. All parts of strategy are influenced by the environment. Reward strategies coordinate the advancement and operation of reward practices and processes, and furthermore shape the reward policies, which in turn influence reward practices, processes and procedures (Armstrong 2010: 270).

Nelson and Peter (2005) expressed "You get what you reward". They added that, a reward system is the world's most noteworthy management principle. According to Svensson, (2001) in the event that the organization rewards a specific sort of employee behaviour good or bad that is the thing that the organization will get a greater amount of. Jaghult, (2005) points out that each current organization has some type of reward system, regardless of whether it is outspoken or not, it exists. Kaplan and Atkinson, (1998) point out rewards come in two distinct types. It can either be in a type of incentive motivation or personal growth motivation. The previous is the kind that originates from within the individual, an inclination, being glad over something, feeling content and happy about something that you have done. The last is the type that is conveyed to you by someone else or an organization and is the one that will hold our focus through this study. Besides, extraneous rewards can be fiscal or non-fiscal.

Jaghult,(2005) points out that the monetary aspect is typically a variable remuneration, isolated from the salary, it is received as a result for exceptional performance or as an encouragement and it can either be independently based or group based. The conditions to acquire this reward ought to be set ahead of time and the execution should be quantifiable. According to Ax et al.(2005) there exists a number of reason for a reward system, one extremely basic is to motivate employees to perform better, yet additionally to keep the employees. Merchant (2007) points out for a reward system to be ideally motivational, the reward ought to fulfill a number of criteria; have esteem, be large enough to have effect, be reasonable, be timely, the effect should be durable and lastly the rewards ought to be cost efficient.

Purpose of reward system

A study by Svensson,(2001) points out that a reward system puts together employees' real self-interests with the organization's objectives and gives three kinds of management control benefits, informational, motivational and personnel related. To begin with rewards should catch the employee's attention and at the same time brings up to date update for the individual in charge of what results should be completed in different working areas. Organizations use

reward systems to emphasize which parameters their employees should apply the additional effort on by incorporating them in their reward programme. Merchant, (2007) stresses that individuals in some cases require an incentive to perform tasks well.

Organizations give rewards for a wide range of reasons e.g. to enhance recruitment and retention by offering a compensation package that is competitive on the market. According to Svensson, (2001) reward systems refer essentially to things that employees value. It is essential to remember that a reward system can contain both positive and negative rewards. The negative rewards frequently observed as punishments. Cases of positive rewards would be autonomy, power, salary increases, bonuses and some negative rewards would be obstruction in work from superiors, zero salary increase, and no promotion.

Different parts of a reward system

While developing a reward system there are certain criteria to consider, and generally these are considered in most outspoken reward systems. A reward can be either an "add-on", implying that the employee has a typical compensation, and the reward. Organizations have, similarly as people, diverse life-stages, and depending on where the company is right now it has distinctive necessities and this influences the reward system, expecting to create goal.

What goals the organization have in respects of gainfulness and development, are the parameters you measure to check whether a reward ought to be paid or not. This more often than not requires a break-down of the goals, making them less demanding to quantify and more reasonable for the employees, and there you additionally need to demonstrate to them how their behaviour influences the measured goals and parameters.

Here the incentive system turns into a tool for management control and the choice of which goals you measure is imperative, since these are the ones the employees will put their emphasis on. Once in a while a fiscal reward is given in view of individual or on departmental performance, despite the fact that the organization has losses. According to Jaghult, (2005) this can be avoided by including a limit prerequisite for the entire organization, which at that point should be satisfied before a bonus can be paid out in any departments. Factors, for example, when and how the reward ought to be paid out and if there ought to be a roof (a higher point of confinement of the reward-sum) are things that dependably ought to be determined while planning the system.

Monetary

Merchant,(2007) points out that money related reward systems is not the only type of reward, and it is not really the best one, yet its use is common to the point that it merits special mention.

According to Svensson, (2001), generally speaking individuals value cash and in this way making money essential type of reward. Money related reward systems can be put into three fundamental classes: performance-based salary increases, short-term incentive plans, and long term incentive plans. The last two rewards are basic on managerial levels and are frequently connected to performance during a specific time period. Samuelsson,(1999) points out the first is regularly thought to be the best motivational factor of all.

According to Merchant, (2007) every organisation gives pay increment to employees at all organisational levels. This is ordinarily a little bit of an employee's salary, but has a noteworthy value because of its long term perspective .Short-term incentives in some form are however usually utilized as a part of organisation. A cash bonus is normally based on performance measured on a time period of one year or less. An organisation basically utilizes a variable pay in order to differentiate it among the employees, with the goal that the best employees will be remunerated.

Svensson,(2001) argues that by perceiving the worker's commitments to the organisation makes it less demanding for the organisation to support brilliant performance. The employees welcome the likelihood of getting a reward for their performance. Utilizing a variable pay can likewise be a benefit for the organisation regarding risk-sharing. This implies the expense for remuneration fluctuates more with organisation performance when the total compensation is partly variable, influencing the cost to be lower when no benefit is made and when there is a benefit this can be shared with the employees.

Merchant, (2007) points out that rewards based on performance measures over time periods above one year are long-term incentive rewards. By utilizing this, an organisation can reward employees for their remarkable work performance to boost the organisation's long-term value. According to Samuelsson, (1999) examples of these can be stock-option programmes, restricted stock plans or a reward that is placed in a 'bonus-bank' that changes based on result and keeps running over several years.

A research conducted by Kaplan and Atkinson, (1998) found that a stock-option programme generally allows one to purchase stocks in the future, however at the present price. This is an attractive method for rewarding a manager in view of the fact that the manager would want the value of the stock to increase and in this manner work harder on the long-term goals and commitments as opposed to concentrating on short-term profits. Another preferred standpoint with this type of reward is, since the manager does not yet own the stock, he or she will in any case be taking risks with higher payoffs than they might had in the event that they officially possessed them. There does, notwithstanding, exist one awesome weakness however with the stock-option programme. A manager does not have enough control over the value.

Excessively, a number of external and non-responsive components impact the value, making it less appealing as an incentive.

According to Merchant, (2007) an exceptionally well known sort of long-term incentive is some type of a confined stock plan. This reward refers to shares given as a bonus to employee, in any case, they can only be sold after a time period. After for example one year, the employee will have the capacity to offer one fifth of the offers, following two years he or she will have the capacity to offer two-fifths and following three years, three-fifths and so forth this is an approach to retain competence within the organization, not to motivate employees, since if they decide to end their work before the fifth year, they will lose the rest of the parts. A few firms take this much further by pulling back the shares one already received.

Non-monetary

According to Jagult, (2005) when one receives a thank you from one's manager or gets appreciation from one's colleagues are the two cases of non-monetary rewards. Armstrong, 1993 points out that monetary rewards are often considered to be short-termed, and not leading to a long-term commitment which is typically what you need from your employees. To accomplish enduring motivation for the employees the organization must focus on both the monetary as well as the non-monetary motivators, with a specific end goal to give the best blend.

Individual-based vs. group-based rewards

According to Merchant, (2007), for a group reward to give direct incentive impact, the employee to whom the rewards are promised needs to trust that they can impact the performance on which the rewards depend on to a significant extent. Accomplishing something as a component of the group normally strengthens the ties between colleagues. In any case, in the event that somebody has been part of the group without contributing in the same way as the rest, normally leads to great dissatisfaction among the rest, and informs employees that they get rewards without input. In many projects and organizations, it is not possible to carry out a task without anyone else however the task completing process is a process through the organisation, drawing in a wide range of individuals. In these cases a group based reward is best since everybody has "pulled their weight", in spite of the fact that it is difficult to see the individual effect.

Individual-based rewards normally leads to sub-optimization (Jaghult 2005). When presenting an individual-based reward system employees, tend to focus on their own performance rather than the organization's performance as a whole. Approaching colleagues and managers for help is suddenly something you think twice about as you may need to share a

future reward if you do. This prompts tasks fulfilled with an alright result, rather than a better result that might had sprung from a cooperation with colleagues more competent to the task or parts of the task, thus suboptimization. In any case, an individual-based reward makes the best motivation and greater incentives for the individual.

According to Jaghult, (2005) increasing the responsibility regarding an employee normally has a tendency to also increase motivation. This in light of the fact that increased responsibility makes the employee feel more valued and skillful. At the point when in a group, individuals gain from each other, making increasingly positive actions, and furthermore gets more effective. Compensating a group suing a monetary reward, frequently makes an intrinsic reward for the group-members, as they feel fulfilled having a place with a group that has performed something phenomenal. Samuelsson (1999) points out there is additionally a plausibility to consolidate these two sorts of rewards. According to Kaplan and Atkinson (1998) this should be possible by basing the total reward on group performance, and the individuals' shares of this reward on individual performance.

Performance measures and goal setting

The connection between performance and rewards are the goals set and the performance measured as opposed to these goals. There are two types of measures, financial and nonfinancial, although both are normally used, the financial reward is the most well-known. An organization needs to comprehend what runs their returns in order to deal with the factors responsible for their creation. Monetary measures, for example, return on investment, have a tendency to be short-term which makes them partially suboptimized.

According to Kaplan and Atkinson (1998), the nonfinancial measures, for example, quality on the other hand, could be utilized by the organization for long-run financial performance. Financial measures are still nonetheless, vital since they connect with the essential goal of organisations' profit. A performance measures purpose is to both influence the employees focus on what is vital, yet additionally to have the capacity to see and respond when something is not right: One method for associating the non-monetary measures and goals with the monetary.

THE CONCEPT OF MOTIVATION

Alongside perception, personality, attitudes and learning, motivation is critical in understanding behaviour. Luthans (1998) declares that motivation ought not be thought of as the main clarification of behavior, since it associates with and acts in conjunction with other mediating processes and with the environment. Luthans contends that, similar to the other cognitive

process, motivation cannot be seen. All that can be seen is behaviour, and this should not be likened with causes of behavior. While perceiving the key role of motivation, Evans (1986) states that many recent theories of organizational behaviour find it imperative for the field to reemphasize behavior.

Definitions of motivation abound. One thing these definitions have in common is the incorporation of words, for example, "want", "wishes", "point", "goals", "needs", and "incentives". Luthans (1998) defines motivation as, "a process that starts with a physiological deficiency or need that activates a behaviour or a drive that is aimed at a goal incentive".

Consequently, the way to understanding the process of motivation lies in the significance of, and relationship among, needs, drives, and incentives. With respect to this, Minner, Ebrahimi and Watchel (1995) express that in a system sense, motivation comprises of these three interacting and interdependent elements, i.e., needs, drives, and incentives. A motive is a reason for accomplishing something. Motivation is concerned with the factors that influence individuals to behave in certain ways. The three components of motivation as recorded by Arnold et al. (1991) are:

Direction: What a person is trying to do.

Effort: How hard a person is trying

Persistence: How long a person keeps on trying

Types of motivation

The types of motivation as originally identified by Herzberg et al. (1957) include the following:

Intrinsic Motivation:- The self-generated factors that impact individuals to behave in a specific way or to move in a specific direction. These factors include responsibility (feeling that the work is imperative and having control over one's own resources), autonomy (flexibility to act), scope to use and develop skills and abilities, interesting and challenging work and opportunities for progression. **Extrinsic Motivation:-** What is done to or for individuals to motivate them? This incorporates rewards, for example, increased pay, verbal appreciation or promotion and punishment, for example, disciplinary action, withholding pay, or criticism. Extrinsic motivators can have an immediate and powerful impact, yet it may not really last long.

Motivation Theories

Instrumentality theory

This theory expresses that rewards or punishments serve as the means for guaranteeing that individuals behave or act in desired ways. 'Instrumentality' is the believe that in the event that we do one thing it will prompt another. It assumes that an individual will be motivated to work if

rewards and punishments are tied directly to his or her performance, hence the awards are dependent upon effective performance. Instrumentality theory has its roots in Taylorism, i.e. the scientific management methods of Taylor (1911).

Taylor noted that it is incomprehensible, through any long period of time, to get labourers to work substantially harder than the average men around them unless they are guaranteed a large and permanent increase in their pay. Motivation utilizing this approach has been, and still is, generally embraced and can be successful in a few conditions. However, it is based exclusively on a system of external control and fails to perceive various other human needs.

Content theory

This theory focuses on the substance of motivation. It expresses that motivation is basically about making a move to fulfill needs and distinguishes the primary needs that impact behaviour. Maslow (1954) discussed Needs theory, and in his two-factor model, Herzberg (1957) recorded needs which he termed 'satisfiers'. These theories are explained as follows: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs in which Maslow (1957) recommended that there are five noteworthy need categories which apply to individuals, beginning from the fundamental physiological needs and leading through a hierarchy of safety, social and esteem needs to the need for self-fulfillment, the most elevated need of all. Maslow's hierarchy is as follows:

Physiological: The need for oxygen, food, water and sex.

Safety: The need for protection against danger and the deprivation of physiological needs.

Social: The need for love, affection and acceptance as belonging to a group.

Esteem: The need to have a stable, firmly based, high evaluation of oneself (self-esteem) and to have the respect of others (prestige).

Self-fulfillment (self-actualization): The need to develop potentialities and skills, to become what one believes one is capable of becoming. Maslow's theory of motivation states that when a lower need is satisfied, the next highest becomes dormant and the individual's attention is turned to satisfying this higher need.

The lower need still exist, regardless of whether temporarily dormant as motivators, and people constantly come back to already fulfilled needs. One of the implications of Maslow's theory is that the higher-order needs for esteem and self-fulfillment give the best impetus to motivation - they grow in strength when they are fulfilled, while the lower needs decline in strength on fulfillment.

In any case, the employments individuals do will not really fulfill their needs, particularly when they are routine or de-skilled. The basis of this theory is the belief that an unsatisfied need

creates pressure and a condition of disequilibrium. To reestablish the balance, a goal that will fulfill the need is identified and a behaviour is subsequently motivated by unsatisfied needs.

Herzberg's two-factor model

The two-factor model of satisfiers and dissatisfiers was developed by Herzberg et al. (1957) after an investigation into the sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction of accountants and engineers. The key implications of this research, according to Herzberg are that the needs of employees are put into two groups. One group revolves around the need to develop in one's occupation as a source of personal growth.

The second group works as an essential base to the first and is related with fair treatment in compensation, supervision, working conditions and managerial practices. The satisfaction of the needs of the second group does not motivate the person to high levels of job satisfaction and to additional performance on the job. Keeping in mind the end goal to fulfill this second group of needs the prevention of dissatisfaction and poor job performance must be ensured. On the other hand, Herzberg's two-factor model has been scrutinized in light of the fact that no attempt was made to measure the relationship between satisfaction and performance. Notwithstanding, Herzberg had tremendous impact on the job enrichment movement, which tried to design jobs in a way that will maximize the chances to acquire intrinsic satisfaction from work and along these lines enhance the quality of working life. His emphasis on the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is additionally imperative.

Motivation and money

Money, as pay or some other kind of compensation, is the most evident extrinsic reward. Financial incentives motivate individuals, particularly, for those individuals who are emphatically motivated by money and whose desires are that they will receive a financial reward that are high. In any case, less confident employees may not react to incentives that they do not hope to achieve. Multiplicities of factors are involved in performance improvements and many of those factors are interdependent.

Jacques (1961) emphasized the need for such systems to be seen as being fair and equitable. At the end of the day, the reward should be clearly related to effort or level of responsibility and individuals should not get less money that they deserve compared with their fellow workers.

However the use of money as a compensation package is to use it to fulfill the needs of the employee. Some employers however go beyond the mere offer of just money as a means

for remuneration and offer packages, for example, housing facility, cars, security allowances and even cell phones.

Armstrong (2001) states that individuals will probably be motivated in the event that they work in an environment in which they are esteemed for what they are and what they do. This implies focusing on the fundamental need for recognition. Organizations should encourage the development of performance management processes, which give opportunities to agree expectations and provide positive feedback on achievements. They should likewise develop reward systems, which give chances to both monetary and non-monetary rewards to recognize achievement.

Armstrong (2001) argues that lessons of expectancy, goal and equity theory should be considered in designing and operating reward systems. The cultural environment of the organisation in the shape of its values and norms will influence the effect of any attempts to motivate individuals by direct or indirect means. The human resource contribution should focus on advising with respect to the development of a culture, which supports processes of valuing and rewarding employees.

AN OVERVIEW OF CORPORATE PERFORMANCE

Organization performance has been differently defined by a wide-ranging experts and authorities with various attributes however is firmly connected to corporate efficiency. Daft (2003) defines corporate performance as the organization's ability to accomplish its goals by utilizing resources in an efficient and effective manner. Armstrong (2003) noted that performance is a multi-dimensional construct, the measurement of which changes depending on a number of factors.

Performance can be viewed as a record of outcomes accomplished and an individual's achievements. Performance can in this way be viewed as behaviour - the way in which organisation, teams and individuals get work done. Armstrong (2003) concludes that when managing the performance of teams and individuals both inputs (behaviour) and output(results) should be considered. This performance management covers competency levels and achievements and also objective setting and review.

Performance Measures

Performance measures should allow progress against objectives to be measured. It should specify what is expected and how well individuals are getting along in achieving their objectives. Performance measures ought to be clear, concise, simple to collect and interpret, and relevant

in that they ought to give information that tells you and the organizations how well you are performing.

The measures are normally related to efficiency (how rapidly you deliver) effectiveness (how good, accurate or relevant the service delivery was to the customer), cost efficiency and cost effectiveness. Performance measures normally cover information relating to:

Finance - Cost as well as income

Customers - New and lost

Market - Penetration thereof

Resources - Consumed, saved or required

Processes - How efficiently and effectively tasks and activities are accomplished

Deposits - How much money is well mobilized?

Performance measures should be agreed between job holder and his or her manager and should be reviewed regularly. There are a number of benefits to the organization and the individual in terms of personal development and corporate achievement (Business: The Ultimate Resource 2002). Some valid aspects for measuring performance in relation to reward systems include:

- Rate of customer growth and retention annually
- Annual growth in company profits
- Annual increase in the company's market share
- Rate of employee turnover over a certain number of years
- Efficient and effective product and service spin-off and growth
- Corporate expansion, opening of new branches and establishment of subsidiaries.

The five facets of the performance prism

Bourne et al. (2003) relate the five aspects of the performance prism under two noteworthy branches as:

- The external facets of the performance prism:
- Stakeholder Satisfaction
- Stakeholder Contribution
- Stakeholders include: investors, customers and intermediaries, employees, regulators and communities suppliers.

The internal facets of the performance prism:

- Strategies: including corporate strategy, business unit strategy,

- Brands/products/services strategy and operating strategy.
- Processes: involves developing products and services, generating demand, fulfilling demand, planning and managing enterprises. Capabilities: encompasses people, practices, technology and infrastructure.

Bourne et al. (2003) observe further that there is a developing pattern towards managing performance improvements through focusing on the underlying drivers of performance, regardless of whether they are improvements in the processes or the underlying resources that give these processes their capability.

The past obsession with pure financial performance is diminishing and there is acknowledgment that there is currently a significant trade-off between hitting today's financial results and sustaining the capabilities and competencies that enable organizations to compete effectively in the future. Organizations are progressively being asked to clarify what their profitability is as well as how they have accomplished it.

Employees as Stakeholders

Crowther (1996) identifies the perspective dimension of corporate performance as seeking to recognize stakeholders as having more than one point of view and that different stakeholder groups may have a similar point of view.

Distinguishing employees as stakeholders, he argued further that, "this reflects both the fact that employees are interested in the performance of the organization and that the organization is concerned with the performance of its employees in helping meet its objectives". It is concerned, in this way, with the motivation of employees and the relationship between performance and rewards.

CONCLUSION

The study reviews a wide scope of sources in explaining the phenomenon of reward systems and corporate efficiency. It could be stated that, the reward system plays an essential role in motivating workers to perform innovatively. Reward systems are focused on the reward strategy; which runs from the business strategy, for example to gain competitive advantage, and the human resource strategy, which is impacted by the business strategy yet in addition influences it. The two unique sorts of reward are incentive motivation and personal growth motivation. The incentive motivation the kind that originates from within the individual, a feeling, being proud over something, feeling content and happy by something that you have done.

While personal growth motivation is the sort that is conveyed to you by someone else or an organization.

There exists multiplicity of reasons for a reward system. One exceptionally normal is to motivate employees to perform better, yet additionally to keep the employees. In order for a reward system to be ideally motivational, the reward ought to fulfill various criteria: have value, be large enough to have impact, be understandable, be timely, the effect should be durable and finally the rewards should be cost efficient. Reward system may consist of both positive and negative rewards. The negative rewards, frequently perceived as punishments, usually manifest themselves through an absence of positive rewards.

The paper furthermore confirms evidence that relates particularly to other research findings in the scope of reward systems. It assessed emerging and basic issues that inform reward decision-making. The review again discusses issues for instance, the issue of measuring comparability and the concern of recognition programmes. Performance may thus be considered as behaviour - the manner in which organizations, teams and individuals accomplish work. It is also concluded that when managing the performance of teams and individuals both inputs (behavior) and output (results) need to be considered. This performance management involves competency levels and achievements, in addition to objective setting and review. Corporate performance as the organization's capacity to achieve its objectives by utilizing assets in a productive and successful way. Performance measures usually cover data identifying with:

- Finance - cost as well as income
- Customers - new and lost
- Market - penetration thereof
- Resources - consumed, saved or required
- Processes - how efficiently and effectively tasks and activities are accomplished
- Deposits - how much money is well mobilized?

The study further argues that there is a developing pattern towards managing performance improvements through focusing on the essential drivers of performance, regardless of whether they are improvements in the processes or the fundamental assets that give these procedures their capacity.

WAY FORWARD

The study recommends that reward packages ought to be connected with work gratification. Not only should rewards make work attractive and fulfilling but they also play important roles in

providing a social status and position of power in an organization. For this, worker assessment studies ought to be conducted in outlining a decent reward bundle for the different activity classes in the organization.

The aggregate reward package ought to include to a great extent a non-monetary and less of monetary related prizes. By this, there may be dramatic expansion of intrinsic motivation and workers will have the feeling that the employer is dealing with the total need. Disappointment will be incredibly low.

The distinction in reward packages is essential to cater for diverse needs and responsibilities. This strategy ought to be brought to the level of understanding among employees and furthermore to motivate others to excel. This strategy may improve confidence of employees which will eventually create higher chances of restoring equity stands.

It is recommended that, a wider study be conducted incorporating more organisations and more indicators that will help uncover the effect of rewards on corporate performance in the Ghanaian setting. It is additionally recommended that if possible a comparative investigation between companies with remuneration packages and those without, be conducted.

REFERENCES

- Armstrong, M. (2001). *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practices*, London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Armstrong, M. (2010). *Armstrong's Essential Human Resource Management Practice: A Guide to People Management*. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Armstrong, M. & Murlis, H. (2007). *Reward Management: A Handbook of Remuneration Strategy and Practice*, 5th edition. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Arnold, J., Robertson, I. T. & Cooper, C. L. (1991). *Work Psychology*, London: Pitman.
- Ax, Christer & Kullven (2005). *Den nya Ekonomistyrningen*, Malmö: Liber Ekonomi.
- Bernstein, A. J. (1989). *Dinosauriehjarnor*, Lund: Borsens Forlag.
- Bourne M., Franco, M. & Wilkes, J. (2003), *Corporate Performance Management, Measuring Business Excellence*, 7(3):15-21.
- Crowther, D., E. A. (1996). *Corporate Performance Operates in Three Dimensions*, *Managerial Auditing Journal*, 11(8): 4-13.
- Cox, A. & Purcell, J. (1995). *Searching for leverage: Pay systems, trust, motivation and commitment in SMEs*, In S J Perkins & St John Sandringham (Eds.) *Trust, Motivation and Commitment*, Strategic Remuneration Centre, Farringdon.
- Daft, R. (2003). *Management*. Ohio: Thompson.
- Evans, M.G. (1986), *Organisational behaviour: The central role of motivation*. *Journal of Management*, 12 (2).
- Herzberg, F. W., Mauser, B. and Snyderman, B. (1957). *The Motivation to Work*, New York: Wiley.
- Jacobsen, D. I. and Thorsvik, J. (2008). *Hur moderna organisationer fungerar*, Lund: Student literature.
- Jacques, E. (1961). *Equitable payment*. Wiley.

- Jaghult, B. (2005), Management of Rewards in Organizations, Sollentuna: Non-Stop Communications.
- Kaplan, R. S. Artkinson, A.A. (1998). Advance Management Accounting, New Jersey: Prentice Hall Corporation.
- Luthans, F. (1998), Organisational Behaviour. 8th ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Maslow, A. (1954), Motivation and Personality, New York: Harper and Row.
- Merchant, V.D.S, (2007), Management Control System, performance measurement, Evaluation and Incentive, New York: Financial Times/Prentice.
- Miner, J. B., Ebrahimi, B. & Wachtel, J.M. (1995). How deficiency in management contributes to the United States' competitiveness problem and what can be done about it? Human Resource Management Journal, Fall.
- Nelson, B. and Economy, P. (2005), Management Bible, Sweden: John Wiley and Sons Incorporated.
- Nguwi, M. (2013). All Departments are important. Financial Gazette, Harare, Thursday, 8 August.
- Nyandoro, Z. F. and Goremusandu, T. (2016). Employees' Evaluation of the Relationship between Reward Management and Organisational Strategy: A Case Study of Zimbabwe National Family Planning Council (ZNFPC). International Journal of Research in Business Management.4(7): 51 – 64.
- Samuelsson, L.A., (1999).Controller handboken, Stockholm: Industrilitteratur.
- Schneider, B. (1987). The people make the place. Personnel psychology, 40(3): 437–45.
- Svensson, A. (2001), Reward System, Stockholm: KFS Foretagsservice.
- Taylor, F. W. (1911), Principles of Scientific Management, New York: Harper.