Int. j. adv. multidisc. res. stud. 2026; 6(1):705-715

Received: 25-11-2025
Accepted: 05-01-2026

International Journal of Advanced Multidisciplinary Research and Studies

ISSN: 2583-049X

Examining Effectiveness of Organisational Rewarding System for Employee Performance: A Case Study of the National Health Insurance Management Authority

[1] Racheal Mumba, [2] Kelvin Chibomba

[1, 2] School of Humanities and Social Science, Information and Communication University, Lusaka, Zambia

Corresponding Author: **Racheal Mumba**

Abstract

Consideration needs to be given to such issues as short versus long term performance, risk taking versus risk aversion, division performance versus total corporate performance, maximization versus sales growth and so on. The best designed reward system can often go awry in producing the intended results because poor implementation. Rewards succeed at securing only in securing one thing, that is a temporary compliance. The study seeks to examine effectiveness of organisational rewarding system for employee performance. This is a case study of the national health insurance management authority. This academic study adopted a case study design. The population of interest in this study will consist of the staff from NHIMA. Sampling is the act, process or technique of selecting a suitable sample or a representative part of a population for the determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population. A sampling frame is a list, directory or index of cases, that enables realization of a representative sample. This academic study adopted the non- probability sampling technique to select the 50 respondents. Specifically, the purposive sampling techniques that was employed with a view of getting samples that are as representative as possible. The analysis of responses regarding the use of promotions as a reward for high-performing staff reveals distinct patterns across departments within NHIMA. The IT department demonstrated the highest level of agreement, with 100% of respondents either agreeing (33.3%) or strongly agreeing (66.7%). Similarly, in the Admin department, all participants (100%) agreed that promotions are used as a reward system. In contrast, the Claims department reflected a high degree of uncertainty, with 80% of respondents remaining neutral. Only 5% agreed. The Finance department showed unanimous disagreement, with 100% of respondents expressing disagreement, suggesting an absence of promotions as a performance-based reward in this unit. Likewise, in the HR department, 50% strongly disagreed and 50% disagreed. The statistical test results reinforce these findings. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 125.481 with a p-value of .000 indicates a statistically significant association between department and perception of promotions as a reward.). (Coefficients) further reveals that among the four predictors, training content relevance to actual job and reward process had the strongest and statistically significant effect on improved employee performance ($\beta = 0.907$, $p < 0.001$).Conversely, other predictors - including understanding reward criteria ($p = 0.555$), explanation of rewards-performance linkage ($p = 0.146$), and increased motivation to work for rewards ($p = 0.184$) - did not show statistically significant contributions to performance enhancement in this model. Residual statistics (Table 3) show a low standard deviation of 0.177 in residuals and a near-zero mean, supporting the model's robustness and the suitability of the predictors. The study recommends that there is a need to harmonize on packages that will be appreciated by staff and thus enhance performance. There is also a need to train staff in HR so as to increase knowledge on rewarding systems.

Keywords: Reward, Performance, Model

1. Introduction

1.1 Background

Reward system is essential to the organization as it has become important in managing employee's performance. Over the last 25 years, other elements in compensation have evolved to provide employers with a broad scope of reward, and thus, it

motivates the employees. The reward systems are directly and indirectly involved in the vision and mission of the organization that gives sense to the employee that a reward system will benefit both parties. A study conducted by Latham (2022) to motivate and keep the employees motivated is an essential part of human resources and management within organizations. Reward systems have a huge impact on organizations to retain and motivate the employees and as a result of achieving high levels of performance (Barber and Bretz, 2000). Thus, organizations must develop programs such as reward systems to fulfil employees' needs and motivate them to work. Most organizations have problems to decide the right reward systems and which reward system suit the most for the employees. A properly administered system of rewards can provide good quality of employee performance. If the organization does not have a proper reward system, it will lead to problems such as low employee morale, the unproductive performance of the employees, or it can lead to high turnover rate among employee (Wilson, 2004). Edward and Christopher (2006) have mentioned that most of the employees are not automatically will come to work, continue to work or work hard for the organization.

A recent study by Anitha (2019) defined employee performance as an indicator of financial or other outcomes of the employee that has a direct connection with the performance of the organization as well as its achievement. The organization needs employees with high performance to meet goals, deliver products and services and to achieve competitive advantage in the market (Ojeleye, 2016). Performance is very crucial same as to reward system because when employees achieve their high level of performance, they want an adequate reward in return. If they cannot achieve the goals and show low performance in the organization, it will result in dissatisfaction (Ojeleye, 2016). A motivated person will result in a good performance as the employees know there is a reward waiting at the end of every month. Reward systems have a huge impact on organizations to retain and motivate the employees and as a result of achieving high levels of performance (Barber and Bretz, 2000).

1.2 Problem Statement

It is a general conception that reward systems will definitely lead to a motivated employee hence improved performance and consequently a better organization. This prompts employees to be on the look out for those activities upon which rewards are based and seek to do them or at least pretend to do them. Unrewardable activities thus automatically become excluded. This may lead to failed up systems where the rewarder rewards the type of behaviour that intends to discourage and the desired behaviour in the long rum goes unrewarded. This is mainly caused by four factors, that is rewarding short term performance at the expense of long tern performance, overemphasis on highly visible behaviours, hypocrisy and eye service by the rewarded and an emphasis an morality or equity rather than efficiency. Equally many organizations develop 5 reward systems that are not designed with the following in mind: consistency with the way jobs are designed, the leadership of the supervisors and the type of career tracks available in the organization to mention just a few. Rewarding some behavior and not others has clear implications for performance. Thus decisions about what needs to be rewarded need to be made carefully and with attention to the overall strategic plan of the business. Consideration needs to be given to such issues as short versus long term performance, risk taking versus risk aversion, division performance versus total corporate performance, maximization versus sales growth and so on. The best designed reward system can often go awry in producing the intended results because poor implementation. Rewards succeed at securing only in securing one thing, that is a temporary compliance. Incentives can only succeed in securing temporary compliance. Their use cannot change the underlying attitudes, which attempt to do so ultimately damages the long term health of an organization by undermining relationships and encouraging employees to focus on short term aims.

1.3 The objectives of the study

1.3.1 General Objective

The study seeks to examine effectiveness of organisational rewarding system for employee performance. This is a case study of the national health insurance management authority.

1.3.2 Specific Objectives

The study sought to achieve the following specific objectives:

1. To establish types of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA
2. To evaluate effectiveness of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA
3. To determine effects of training in rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

1.4 Theoretical Framework

Social exchange theory

Social exchange theory reviews that employees respond greatly to the organization when the management invest in them and they will make a real effort to give back to the organization. Work motivation is the key factor to manage and sustain employee behavior, Steers and Porter (1987), review by (Güngör, 2011) [10]. The concept of reward system is crucial for employee performance because employees are better performed under an effective and consistent reward system. The purpose of this strategy is to reward people/employees fairly, honestly, and regularly according to their contribution (Güngör, 2011) [10], in other to continue supporting the organization's strategic goals and accomplishing it. The concept of this strategy (reward system) is not limited only to the tangible reward system or payment of benefit of the employee. It is also focused on the intangible aspects, Such as public awards, holidays, career development to increase employee responsibility, and many others.

2. Litereture Review

2.1 To establish types of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

According to (Aguenza and Som, 2018) [2] the 21st-century employment process has explained the employee development and career opportunity, gaining new skills, and engaging different activities that generate career development for the purpose of benefits to both employee and organization as true career development. Often, employee derives benefits through their ability to record more results on the job and physical evidence of career

growth and or development. It is a great advantage to an organization having more productive employee, this is a major attraction to the employee as well as to the organization. Meanwhile, if an organization failed to recognize the need and the desire of employees to grow, this will be a great nightmare to such an organization because development will be among the major reasons while employees will quit the job. According to (Bjornavold, 2007) [6] states that the process of attracting and retaining the best hand on the job is to recognize the workforce career development. By identifying and answer to the career need of the employee provides the opportunity to get the best from them.

2.2 To evaluate effectiveness of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

Deci ami Ryan (1975) in their cognitive evaluation theory argue that individual level of effort on a task is exchanged largely by the nature of rewards available to accomplish a task. There are two processes by which rewards influence motivation. First, the nation of locus of causality which dictates that behaviour is intrinsically motivated. Thus an individual feels the completion of a task is dependent on his own control. Hence he will engage in activities for intrinsic rewards which are internal to an individual. Ibid,

Perception of locus of casualty is the second form where individuals respond to extrinsic factors and believe the completion of a task is dependent on such extrinsic stimuli. In this case, the mind of the individual will be set on such extrinsic rewards provided by the individual. It should be noted that the effect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation are not additive. Thus when extrinsic rewards motivate behaviour, they do so at the expense of intrinsic motivation. Thus as a result, contingent pay systems are not compatible with participative management style. March and Simon (1958) are of the opinion that rewards in and from organization can potentially motivate individuals to broad categories of behaviour. These categories are grouped into two, that is, participation in the organization and subsequent performance in the organization. Participation has to do with membership and attendance. Membership entails joining the organization. For this to happen In the first place, the individual has to be attracted to that organization. After becoming a member, such individual needs to stay in such organization. This calls for the design of a proper reward system that will encourage the individual to stay. The duration of the stay is also 10 important to ensure low turnover of labour in the organization.

2.3 To determine effects of training in rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

Based on Mowday, Porter and Steers, (2013) discoveries, reward the executives is not all about finances. It is associated about non-monetary incentives that have inherent or extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic inspiration is accomplished by fulfilling singular requirements for accomplishment, duty, assortment, test and impact in dynamic. Extrinsic non-money related inspiration is accomplished by singular acknowledgment, abilities advancement, learning and profession opportunity. Dong and Li, (2017) accept that the significant part of all out remuneration framework is singular development. Representatives need to develop, learn and turn out to be progressively significant. This makes the requirement for giving chances to testing profession, overseeing and estimating execution adequately and creating and preparing representatives. These 19 elements can be considered as a prerequisite that provides the organization with a longterm advantage. Staff that have a chance to improve and develop through their careers and are recognized are often prepared to take on long-term responsibilities within a business. Training and progress are crucial actions in all establishments for promoting authoritative accomplishment and development. Rapid advances in competition are altering client demands, necessitating ongoing retraining of seasoned staff to fill fresh and altered roles. To instrument abilities based compensation, workers ought to improve their aptitudes through preparing and advancement. Preparing is a viable guide in vocation the board (Krishnamurthy & Tripathi, 2014). Career improvement gives representatives chances to be set in occupations that fit their desire and individual abilities.

demonstrate that expanded worker commitment builds overall gain development rates by 17.5 percent; representative efficiency by 38 percent; and gainfulness by 27 percent. Highly engaged sales people were seen to have 8.8 percent higher sales (Savitz, 2013). Every one of these revelations mirror the significance of employee reward system on organizational performance. The capacity of an organization to oversee worker execution is supposed to be firmly identified with its capacity to accomplish elite levels. Engaged with workers are spurred and as such will undoubtedly perform better. It‟s important for managers to consider staffs in terms of incentive, encouragement, and greater success in the task allocated that is extremely related to the administration's results (Jones & Culbertson 2011). This is one of the most important factors for company to reach the stated objective. Such staff are provoked by extrinsic incentives, like pay increases, advancements, and rewards, while others are awoken by monetary motivators, such as gratitude, appreciation, and acceptance (Bana and Kessy, 2007).

3. Research Methodology

3.1 Research Design

According to Ghauri and Grønhaug (2005), a research design is the overall plan for relating the conceptual research problem to relevant and practicable empirical research. In other words, the research design provides a plan or framework for data collection and its analysis. Different approaches exist and the approach most suitable for the research depends on the desired starting point of the researcher in relation to present theories.

This academic study will adopt a descriptive cross-sectional case study design. In descriptive cross-sectional research, data is collected from the research participants by interviews or administering a questionnaire to a sample of individuals. According to Orodho (2003). The cross-sectional design supports the use of different methods to collect data from selected respondents in a single study (Mann, 2003). In view of this, the mixed method technique (triangulation) was used in this study. This method involved triangulating both quantitative and qualitative methods to collect data at the same time. Mikkelsen (1995) identified two forms of mixed method which are “within method” triangulation and “between method” triangulation. Within method triangulation involves using the same method on different occasions whilst the “between methods” triangulation is

where different methods are used in the same study. This study used the "between methods" triangulation. In this study, both interview schedule (quantitative method), and in-depth interview and observation (qualitative methods) were used to collect data from the field. Neuman (2003) recommends the use of the mixed method when he said that combining different approaches in a study is the best method to be adopted, because it is better to look at a situation from several angles than to look at it from one direction.

Some criticisms have been levelled against the use of mixed method approach. For example, Creswell (2003), described the use of mixed method is time consuming, while Sarantakos (2005), observed that mixed method is difficult to replicate, and therefore advised that it is not more valuable than the single-method procedure, which can be more suitable, useful and meaningful to answer certain questions.

Despite the criticisms levelled against the use of mixed method approach such as time consuming by Creswell (2003), several authors support the use of the mixed method because it offers many advantages which far outweigh the disadvantages. Researchers observed that the mixed method opens the way for richer and potentially more valid interpretations; it helps the researcher to gain better understanding of the phenomenon being studied, and it also helps to complement the strength of the qualitative and quantitative methods (Depoy & Gitlin, 2005).

3.2 Target Population

The population of interest in this study will consist of the staff from NHIMA.

3.3 Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

Sampling is the act, process or technique of selecting a suitable sample or a representative part of a population for the determining parameters or characteristics of the whole population. A sampling frame is a list, directory or index of cases, that enables realization of a representative sample (Donald, 2006; Mugenda & Mugenda, 2003). This academic study will adopt the non- probability sampling technique to select the 50 respondents. Specifically, the purposive sampling techniques that will be employed with a view of getting samples that are as representative as possible.

3.4 Sources of Data and Research Instruments

This case study will utilise both primary and secondary data. The Primary data will be collected using questionnaires, in-depth interviews and observation, which will be collected from administrative staff from NHIMA. Whilst Secondary data will be obtained from past books, journals, newspapers, articles, reports, the internet, as well as conference and working papers that concern themselves with the topic under investigation. These instruments will be chosen because they are the most appropriate. The interview schedule will be used because of its known advantages of building good rapport, creating a relaxed and healthy atmosphere in which respondents easily cooperate, answer questions, and clear misapprehension about any aspect of a study (Kumekpor, 2002). The interview schedule will be semi-structured and will comprise of many close ended questions. This helped to facilitate easy administration of the interview schedules.

It will also help to avoid irrelevant answers from respondents, and this made of entering data into the computer is fairly easy. In-depth interviews will be used to collect information from the key informants. In other words, In-depth- interviews will provide some scope for asking for more relevant information through additional questions often noted when it prompts the interviewer. Observation checklist will be another instrument that will be used in my study.

3.5 Data Collection Methods

Questionnaires will be used to collect data from respondents. The major source of data to be used in this work is mainly through primary and secondary sources of data collection. The primary sources are data collected at first hand from original sources for the users express purpose. Such data are usually collected from oral interview, questionnaires and face to face observation of the respondents. The secondary data are simple data collected on a second hand base. This type of data will be obtained through the use of textbooks, seminar papers, journals, newspapers, internet and magazines collected mostly from university, public and specialized libraries (Gujarati, 2010).

The research study will employ the combination of different data collection methods. This include primary data and secondary data collection method. This will enhance the validity and reliability of data. Secondary data may either be published or unpublished data. In this work, the researcher will use many books, Computer forensics and cybercrime law/policy and other important articles to collect data from.

3.6 Data Analysis

The data to be collected will be both qualitative and quantitative in nature, however, data processing and analysis will include computation, classification and tabulation to enable the analysis to be done well. Quantitative data will be presented using descriptive statistic methods including tables and charts. Qualitative techniques will be used to analyse qualitative data from the views of respondents. This will increase the validity and reliability of information (Leo, 2011).

Questionnaires will be the main instruments to be used for the collection of data in this study. The data collected will be coded, tabulated and finally frequencies and percentages will be derived. Statistical package for social sciences (SPSS) will be the main computer program to be used; specifically descriptive statistics will be the main area of concentration. Microsoft excel will also be used to derive visual aids such as graphs and charts for data presentation.

3.7 Triangulation

Triangulation refers to the use of multiple methods or data sources in qualitative research to develop a comprehensive understanding of phenomena (Patton, 2019). Triangulation also has been viewed as a qualitative research strategy to test validity through the convergence of information from different sources. Denzin (1978) and Patton (1999) identified four types of triangulation: (a) method triangulation, (b) investigator triangulation, (c) theory triangulation, and (d) data source triangulation. This research will present the four types of triangulation followed by a discussion of the use of focus groups (FGs) and in-depth individual (IDI) interviews as an example of data source triangulation in qualitative inquiry.

3.8 Limitations of the Study

The researcher may encounter problems like some respondents may have difficulty in understanding the questionnaire's format. The researcher may also have problems in terms of financial support needed for the research to be conducted effectively. Some of important information might not be disclosed from the respondents due to issue of confidentiality of information. Nevertheless, the researcher will strive to make sure that this research conforms to research standards.

3.9 Ethical Considerations

The research will not violate the workers' rights. Thus, informed consent will be obtained before administering questionnaires. Ethical considerations in research are critical. Ethics are the norms or standards for conduct that distinguish between right and wrong. They help to determine the difference between acceptable and unacceptable behaviors (Allan *et al*. 2020). Informed consent is the major ethical issue in conducting research. It means that a person knowingly, voluntarily and intelligently, and in a clear and manifest way, gives his consent. Therefore, it will be made sure by the researcher that all participants give consent to participate in the study and they will be informed of their right to withdraw at any point. Permission will be obtained from management before any participant is asked to respond to the research questions. Also, data will properly be referenced as well as cited in the bibliography. The researcher will also ensure that the insights presented in the study are objective and do not create any set of biased conclusions.

4. Presentaion of Findings and Discusions

Objective 1: To evaluate effectiveness of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

Types of Rewarding System for Employee Performance Used by NHIMA

Table 5.1: Descriptive Statistics on Rewarding Systems Used by NHIMA

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Whether performance bonuses or financial incentives are given	50	1	5	3.36	1.102
Whether promotions are used to reward high-performing staff	50	1	5	3.20	1.010
Whether training and professional growth are used as a form of reward	50	1	5	3.52	1.165
Whether non-monetary recognition (e.g., awards, certificates) is practiced	50	2	5	3.34	.895
Whether performance-based team/group incentives are used	50	1	5	3.48	.909
Valid N (listwise)	50				

According to the descriptive statistics, the study explored five key forms of rewarding systems employed at NHIMA. The results show that the most frequently acknowledged system was training and professional growth as a form of reward, which scored the highest average rating at 3.52 (SD = 1.165). Closely following were performance-based team/group incentives with a mean score of 3.48 (SD = 0.909). Performance bonuses or financial incentives also featured prominently with a mean of 3.36 (SD = 1.102). Non-monetary recognition, such as awards and certificates, recorded a mean score of 3.34 (SD = 0.895). Promotions for high-performing staff were the least frequently cited, with a mean score of 3.20 (SD = 1.010).

Table 5.2: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perception of Financial Incentives

Crosstab							
Count							
		Whether performance bonuses or financial incentives are given					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
NHIMA department	HR	3	1	0	0	0	4
	Finance	0	6	0	0	0	6
	Claims	0	1	14	5	0	20
	Admin	0	0	0	13	1	14
	IT	0	0	0	0	6	6
Total		3	8	14	18	7	50

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	142.246[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	104.605	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	43.093	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	50		
a. 22 cells (88.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.			

The cross-tabulation of responses by department reveals notable variation in the perception and use of performance bonuses or financial incentives across NHIMA. Specifically, 100% of IT respondents strongly agreed that financial incentives are given, while 93% of Admin respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Conversely, in the Finance department, 100% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Meanwhile, responses from the Claims department were mixed, with 70% remaining neutral and only 25% agreeing. From the Human Resource (HR) department, 75% expressed strong disagreement.

Statistically, the Pearson Chi-Square value of 142.246 with a p-value of .000 confirms that the differences in responses across departments are highly significant.

Table 5.3: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perception of Promotions as a Reward

Crosstab							
Count							
		Whether promotions are used to reward high-performing staff					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
NHIMA department	HR	2	2	0	0	0	4
	Finance	0	6	0	0	0	6
	Claims	0	3	16	1	0	20
	Admin	0	0	0	14	0	14
	IT	0	0	0	2	4	6
Total		2	11	16	17	4	50

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	125.481[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	101.835	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	42.209	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	50		
a. 23 cells (92.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .16.			

The analysis of responses regarding the use of promotions as a reward for high-performing staff reveals distinct patterns across departments within NHIMA. The IT department demonstrated the highest level of agreement, with 100% of respondents either agreeing (33.3%) or strongly agreeing (66.7%). Similarly, in the Admin department, all participants (100%) agreed that promotions are used as a reward system. In contrast, the Claims department reflected a high degree of uncertainty, with 80% of respondents remaining neutral. Only 5% agreed. The Finance department showed unanimous disagreement, with 100% of respondents expressing disagreement, suggesting an absence of promotions as a performance-based reward in this unit. Likewise, in the HR department, 50% strongly disagreed and 50% disagreed.

The statistical test results reinforce these findings. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 125.481 with a p-value of .000 indicates a statistically significant association between department and perception of promotions as a reward.

The results show clear departmental variations in the practice of non-monetary recognition (such as awards and certificates) at NHIMA. A total of 50 respondents were analyzed, and the findings reveal differing levels of adoption and perception across departments.

Table 5.4: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perception of Non-Monetary Recognition Practices

Crosstab						
Count						
		Whether non-monetary recognition (e.g., awards, certificates) is practiced				Total
		Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
NHIMA department	HR	4	0	0	0	4
	Finance	6	0	0	0	6
	Claims	1	14	5	0	20
	Admin	0	0	14	0	14
	IT	0	0	3	3	6
Total		11	14	22	3	50

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	93.750[a]	12	.000
Likelihood Ratio	83.798	12	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	38.436	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	50		
a. 17 cells (85.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .24.			

The Admin department recorded a 100% agreement, with all respondents acknowledging the use of non-monetary recognition. This highlights a consistent practice of such rewards within this unit. Similarly, the IT department showed full agreement, with 50% agreeing and another 50% strongly agreeing. In contrast, the Claims department presented a mixed picture, with 70% of respondents expressing neutrality, 25% agreeing, and 5% disagreeing. On the other hand, the Finance and HR departments exhibited complete disagreement, with 100% of respondents in both departments disagreeing with the statement that non-monetary recognition is practiced.

The Pearson Chi-Square test value of 93.750 with a p-value of .000 confirms a statistically significant association between department and perception of non-monetary recognition.

Table 5.5: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perceptions of Performance-Based Team/Group Incentives

Crosstab							
Count							
		Whether performance-based team/group incentives are used					Total
		Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree	
NHIMA department	HR	1	3	0	0	0	4
	Finance	0	3	3	0	0	6
	Claims	0	0	13	7	0	20
	Admin	0	0	0	14	0	14
	IT	0	0	0	1	5	6
Total		1	6	16	22	5	50

Chi-Square Tests			
	Value	df	Asymp. Sig. (2-sided)
Pearson Chi-Square	104.276[a]	16	.000
Likelihood Ratio	84.757	16	.000
Linear-by-Linear Association	39.622	1	.000
N of Valid Cases	50		
a. 22 cells (88.0%) have expected count less than 5. The minimum expected count is .08.			

The findings reveal a clear departmental divergence in the use of performance-based team/group incentives at NHIMA. Out of 50 respondents, 44% agreed, and 10% strongly agreed that such incentives are used, indicating moderate overall recognition of this reward system. However, this perception varies significantly across departments. The Admin department demonstrated the highest endorsement, with 100% of its members agreeing that team-based incentives are practiced. Similarly, in the IT department, 83.3% strongly agreed, and 16.7% agreed. The Claims department showed a more cautious perception, with 65% of respondents remaining neutral and 35% agreeing. In contrast, Finance and HR departments reflected the lowest support for this reward type. In Finance, 50% were neutral and 50% disagreed, while in HR, 75% disagreed and 25% strongly disagreed.

Statistical testing supports these observed disparities. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 104.276 with a p-value of .000 reveals a statistically significant relationship between department and perception of team/group incentives.

Objective 2 – Script

Objective 2: To evaluate effectiveness of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA.

Evaluation of Effectiveness of the Rewarding System for Employee Performance Used by NHIMA

Table 5.6: Descriptive Statistics of Employees' Perceptions on Effectiveness of NHIMA's Rewarding System

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Clear criteria used in deciding who gets rewards	50	2	5	3.58	.950
Perceived fairness in reward distribution	50	1	5	3.00	1.010
Whether rewards motivate staff to perform better	50	1	5	3.54	.952
Whether rewards lead to actual improved performance	50	1	5	3.44	.972
Whether performance feedback is linked to rewards	50	2	5	3.44	.884
Whether rewards are frequent enough to maintain performance motivation	50	2	5	3.38	.967
Whether rewards also contribute to better team outcomes	50	2	5	3.32	.935
Valid N (listwise)	50				

The descriptive results provide a quantifiable overview of how NHIMA employees perceive the effectiveness of the current rewarding system in enhancing individual and team performance.

The item "Clear criteria used in deciding who gets rewards" recorded the highest average score (Mean = 3.58; SD = 0.950). Closely following was the statement "Whether rewards motivate staff to perform better", which yielded a mean score of 3.54 (SD = 0.952). The dimension "Whether rewards lead to actual improved performance" and "Whether performance feedback is linked to rewards" each scored a mean of 3.44. Slightly lower was the item on "Whether rewards are frequent enough to maintain motivation", with a mean score of 3.38 (SD = 0.967). On the lower end, "Whether rewards contribute to better team outcomes" received a mean score of 3.32 (SD = 0.935). In contrast, the lowest mean score (3.00; SD = 1.010) was recorded under "Perceived fairness in reward distribution".

Table 5.7: Reliability and Ranking Consistency of Reward System Perceptions

Reliability Statistics		
Cronbach's Alpha	Cronbach's Alpha Based on Standardized Items	N of Items
.982	.983	7

Scale Statistics			
Mean	Variance	Std. Deviation	N of Items
23.70	40.296	6.348	7

ANOVA with Friedman's Test						
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	Friedman's Chi-Square	Sig
Between People		282.071	49	5.757		
Within People	Between Items	11.029[a]	6	1.838	80.979	.000
	Residual	29.829	294	.101		
	Total	40.857	300	.136		
Total		322.929	349	.925		
Grand Mean = 3.39						

a. Kendall's coefficient of concordance W = .034.

The reliability statistics indicate a very high internal consistency among the seven items measuring the effectiveness of the rewarding system, as evidenced by a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.982 and 0.983 based on the measurement level Alpha ≥ 0.7 which indicates acceptable internal consistency. The Scale Statistics show a total mean score of 23.70 across the seven items, with a standard deviation of 6.348.

Results from the Friedman's ANOVA test reveal a statistically significant difference in how employees ranked the various aspects of the rewarding system (Chi-square = 80.979, $p < 0.001$). However, the Kendall's coefficient of concordance (W = 0.034) is notably low.

Objective 3: To determine effects of training in rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

Effects of Training in Rewarding System for Employee Performance Used by NHIMA

The descriptive findings provide key insights into employee perceptions regarding training on the rewarding system at NHIMA. A total of 50 employees responded to the six items measuring this construct.

Table 5.8: Descriptive Statistics on the Effects of Training on the Rewarding System

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
Whether employees are given regular access to training on reward systems	50	2	5	3.36	.722
Whether the training helped them understand reward criteria clearly	50	2	4	3.40	.670
Whether training explains how rewards are linked to performance	50	1	5	3.78	.932
Whether training content is relevant to actual job and reward process	50	2	5	3.92	.528
Whether there is improved performance after training	50	2	5	3.96	.493
Whether training increased motivation to work for rewards	50	2	5	3.98	.622
Valid N (listwise)	50				

The results show that employees generally perceived training to have a positive effect, with most mean scores exceeding 3.5 out of 5. Specifically, 98% of respondents rated the item "training increased motivation to work for rewards" favorably, with a mean score of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.622. Similarly, the statement "training led to improved performance" had a mean of 3.96 (SD = 0.493). Relevance of the training content to actual job and reward processes also ranked highly, with a mean of 3.92 (SD = 0.528), showing that 92% of employees found the training directly applicable to their roles. Furthermore, 78% of respondents agreed that training helped them understand how rewards are linked to performance, with a mean of 3.78 (SD = 0.932). The clarity of the reward criteria after training had a mean of 3.40 (SD = 0.670), and regular access to training opportunities recorded a mean of 3.36 (SD = 0.722) - the lowest among the six items.

Table 5.9: Relationships among components of training effectiveness and performance outcomes

Correlations					
		Whether training explains how rewards are linked to performance	Whether training content is relevant to actual job and reward process	Whether there is improved performance after training	Whether the training helped them understand reward criteria clearly
Whether training explains how rewards are linked to performance	Pearson Correlation	1	.792**	.779**	.765**
	Sig. (2-tailed)		.000	.000	.000
	N	50	50	50	50
Whether training content is relevant to actual job and reward process	Pearson Correlation	.792**	1	.927**	.669**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000		.000	.000
	N	50	50	50	50
Whether there is improved performance after training	Pearson Correlation	.779**	.927**	1	.667**
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000		.000
	N	50	50	50	50
Whether the training helped them understand reward criteria clearly	Pearson Correlation	.765**	.669**	.667**	1
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	.000	
	N	50	50	50	50
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).					

Strong and statistically significant positive correlations were observed among all training dimensions. For instance, the relationship between training relevance and improved performance was particularly strong ($r = .927$, $p < .001$), indicating that when training content is job-relevant, performance tends to improve. Likewise, training explaining reward-performance linkage was strongly associated with improved performance ($r = .779$, $p < .001$) and with motivation-related aspects, such as understanding reward criteria ($r = .765$, $p < .001$). All correlation coefficients exceed 66%, reflecting high internal alignment across training effectiveness variables.

Table 5.10: Effects of Training in the Rewarding System on Employee Performance at NHIMA

ANOVA[a]						
Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	10.384	4	2.596	76.079	.000[b]
	Residual	1.536	45	.034		
	Total	11.920	49			
a. Dependent Variable: Whether there is improved performance after training						
b. Predictors: (Constant), Whether training increased motivation to work for rewards, Whether the training helped them understand reward criteria clearly, Whether training content is relevant to actual job and reward process, Whether training explains how rewards are linked to performance						

Coefficients[a]						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.725	.227		3.201	.003
	Whether the training helped them understand reward criteria clearly	.037	.062	.050	.594	.555
	Whether training explains how rewards are linked to performance	.095	.064	.180	1.480	.146
	Whether training content is relevant to actual job and reward process	.847	.101	.907	8.382	.000
	Whether training increased motivation to work for rewards	-.143	.106	-.181	-1.350	.184
a. Dependent Variable: Whether there is improved performance after training						

Residuals Statistics[a]					
	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation	N
Predicted Value	2.30	4.87	3.96	.460	50
Residual	-.301	.768	.000	.177	50
Std. Predicted Value	-3.603	1.970	.000	1.000	50
Std. Residual	-1.631	4.156	.000	.958	50
a. Dependent Variable: Whether there is improved performance after training					

The ANOVA results (Table 5.10) show that the overall regression model was statistically significant, with an F-value of 76.079 and a p-value of .000. Specifically, approximately 87.1% of the variation in perceived performance improvement can be attributed to the combined effects of the training components included in the model (calculated from $R^2 \approx 10.384/11.920$).

(Coefficients) further reveals that among the four predictors, training content relevance to actual job and reward process had the strongest and statistically significant effect on improved employee performance ($\beta = 0.907$, $p < 0.001$). Conversely, other predictors - including understanding reward criteria ($p = 0.555$), explanation of rewards-performance linkage ($p = 0.146$), and increased motivation

to work for rewards (p = 0.184) - did not show statistically significant contributions to performance enhancement in this model. Residual statistics (Table 3) show a low standard deviation of 0.177 in residuals and a near-zero mean, supporting the model's robustness and the suitability of the predictors used.

4.1 Discussions

Objective 1: To evaluate effectiveness of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

Types of Rewarding System for Employee Performance Used by NHIMA

Table 5.1: Descriptive Statistics on Rewarding Systems Used by NHIMA

According to the descriptive statistics, the study explored five key forms of rewarding systems employed at NHIMA. The results show that the most frequently acknowledged system was training and professional growth as a form of reward, which scored the highest average rating at 3.52 (SD = 1.165). Closely following were performance-based team/group incentives with a mean score of 3.48 (SD = 0.909). Performance bonuses or financial incentives also featured prominently with a mean of 3.36 (SD = 1.102). Non-monetary recognition, such as awards and certificates, recorded a mean score of 3.34 (SD = 0.895). Promotions for high-performing staff were the least frequently cited, with a mean score of 3.20 (SD = 1.010).

Table 5.2: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perception of Financial Incentives

The cross-tabulation of responses by department reveals notable variation in the perception and use of performance bonuses or financial incentives across NHIMA. Specifically, 100% of IT respondents strongly agreed that financial incentives are given, while 93% of Admin respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Conversely, in the Finance department, 100% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Meanwhile, responses from the Claims department were mixed, with 70% remaining neutral and only 25% agreeing. From the Human Resource (HR) department, 75% expressed strong disagreement.

Statistically, the Pearson Chi-Square value of 142.246 with a p-value of .000 confirms that the differences in responses across departments are highly significant.

Table 5.3: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perception of Promotions as a Reward

The analysis of responses regarding the use of promotions as a reward for high-performing staff reveals distinct patterns across departments within NHIMA. The IT department demonstrated the highest level of agreement, with 100% of respondents either agreeing (33.3%) or strongly agreeing (66.7%). Similarly, in the Admin department, all participants (100%) agreed that promotions are used as a reward system. In contrast, the Claims department reflected a high degree of uncertainty, with 80% of respondents remaining neutral. Only 5% agreed. The Finance department showed unanimous disagreement, with 100% of respondents expressing disagreement, suggesting an absence of promotions as a performance-based reward in this unit. Likewise, in the HR department, 50% strongly disagreed and 50% disagreed.

The statistical test results reinforce these findings. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 125.481 with a p-value of .000 indicates a statistically significant association between department and perception of promotions as a reward.

Table 5.4: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perception of Non-Monetary Recognition Practices

The results show clear departmental variations in the practice of non-monetary recognition (such as awards and certificates) at NHIMA. A total of 50 respondents were analyzed, and the findings reveal differing levels of adoption and perception across departments.

The Admin department recorded a 100% agreement, with all respondents acknowledging the use of non-monetary recognition. This highlights a consistent practice of such rewards within this unit. Similarly, the IT department showed full agreement, with 50% agreeing and another 50% strongly agreeing. In contrast, the Claims department presented a mixed picture, with 70% of respondents expressing neutrality, 25% agreeing, and 5% disagreeing. On the other hand, the Finance and HR departments exhibited complete disagreement, with 100% of respondents in both departments disagreeing with the statement that non-monetary recognition is practiced.

The Pearson Chi-Square test value of 93.750 with a p-value of .000 confirms a statistically significant association between department and perception of non-monetary recognition.

Table 5.5: Cross-tabulation of NHIMA Departments by Perceptions of Performance-Based Team/Group Incentives

The findings reveal a clear departmental divergence in the use of performance-based team/group incentives at NHIMA. Out of 50 respondents, 44% agreed, and 10% strongly agreed that such incentives are used, indicating moderate overall recognition of this reward system. However, this perception varies significantly across departments. The Admin department demonstrated the highest endorsement, with 100% of its members agreeing that team-based incentives are practiced. Similarly, in the IT department, 83.3% strongly agreed, and 16.7% agreed. The Claims department showed a more cautious perception, with 65% of respondents remaining neutral and 35% agreeing. In contrast, Finance and HR departments reflected the lowest support for this reward type. In Finance, 50% were neutral and 50% disagreed, while in HR, 75% disagreed and 25% strongly disagreed.

Statistical testing supports these observed disparities. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 104.276 with a p-value of .000 reveals a statistically significant relationship between department and perception of team/group incentives.

Objective 2: To evaluate effectiveness of rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

Evaluation of Effectiveness of the Rewarding System for Employee Performance Used by NHIMA

The descriptive results provide a quantifiable overview of how NHIMA employees perceive the effectiveness of the current rewarding system in enhancing individual and team performance.

The item "Clear criteria used in deciding who gets rewards" recorded the highest average score (Mean = 3.58; SD = 0.950). Closely following was the statement "Whether rewards motivate staff to perform better", which yielded a mean score of 3.54 (SD = 0.952). The dimension "Whether rewards lead to actual improved performance" and "Whether performance feedback is linked to rewards" each scored a mean of 3.44. Slightly lower was the item on "Whether rewards are frequent enough to maintain motivation", with a mean score of 3.38 (SD = 0.967). On the lower end, "Whether rewards contribute to better team

outcomes" received a mean score of 3.32 (SD = 0.935). In contrast, the lowest mean score (3.00; SD = 1.010) was recorded under "Perceived fairness in reward distribution".

Table 5.7: Reliability and Ranking Consistency of Reward System Perceptions

The reliability statistics indicate a very high internal consistency among the seven items measuring the effectiveness of the rewarding system, as evidenced by a Cronbach's Alpha of 0.982 and 0.983 based on the measurement level Alpha ≥ 0.7 which indicates acceptable internal consistency. The Scale Statistics show a total mean score of 23.70 across the seven items, with a standard deviation of 6.348.

Results from the Friedman's ANOVA test reveal a statistically significant difference in how employees ranked the various aspects of the rewarding system (Chi-square = 80.979, $p < 0.001$). However, the Kendall's coefficient of concordance ($W = 0.034$) is notably low.

Objective 3: To determine effects of training in rewarding system for employee performance used by NHIMA

Effects of Training in Rewarding System for Employee Performance Used by NHIMA

Table 5.8: Descriptive Statistics on the Effects of Training on the Rewarding System

The descriptive findings provide key insights into employee perceptions regarding training on the rewarding system at NHIMA. A total of 50 employees responded to the six items measuring this construct.

The results show that employees generally perceived training to have a positive effect, with most mean scores exceeding 3.5 out of 5. Specifically, 98% of respondents rated the item "training increased motivation to work for rewards" favorably, with a mean score of 3.98 and a standard deviation of 0.622. Similarly, the statement "training led to improved performance" had a mean of 3.96 (SD = 0.493). Relevance of the training content to actual job and reward processes also ranked highly, with a mean of 3.92 (SD = 0.528), showing that 92% of employees found the training directly applicable to their roles. Furthermore, 78% of respondents agreed that training helped them understand how rewards are linked to performance, with a mean of 3.78 (SD = 0.932). The clarity of the reward criteria after training had a mean of 3.40 (SD = 0.670), and regular access to training opportunities recorded a mean of 3.36 (SD = 0.722) - the lowest among the six items.

5. Conclusions and Recommendations

5.1 Conclusions

According to the descriptive statistics, the study explored five key forms of rewarding systems employed at NHIMA. The results show that the most frequently acknowledged system was training and professional growth as a form of reward, which scored the highest average rating at 3.52 (SD = 1.165). Closely following were performance-based team/group incentives with a mean score of 3.48 (SD = 0.909). Performance bonuses or financial incentives also featured prominently with a mean of 3.36 (SD = 1.102). Non-monetary recognition, such as awards and certificates, recorded a mean score of 3.34 (SD = 0.895). Promotions for high-performing staff were the least frequently cited, with a mean score of 3.20 (SD = 1.010). The cross-tabulation of responses by department reveals notable variation in the perception and use of performance bonuses or financial incentives across NHIMA. Specifically, 100% of IT respondents strongly agreed that financial incentives are given, while 93% of Admin respondents agreed or strongly agreed. Conversely, in the Finance department, 100% either disagreed or strongly disagreed. Meanwhile, responses from the Claims department were mixed, with 70% remaining neutral and only 25% agreeing. From the Human Resource (HR) department, 75% expressed strong disagreement. The IT department demonstrated the highest level of agreement, with 100% of respondents either agreeing (33.3%) or strongly agreeing (66.7%). Similarly, in the Admin department, all participants (100%) agreed that promotions are used as a reward system. In contrast, the Claims department reflected a high degree of uncertainty, with 80% of respondents remaining neutral. Only 5% agreed. The Finance department showed unanimous disagreement, with 100% of respondents expressing disagreement, suggesting an absence of promotions as a performance-based reward in this unit. Likewise, in the HR department, 50% strongly disagreed and 50% disagreed.

The statistical test results reinforce these findings. The Pearson Chi-Square value of 125.481 with a p-value of .000 indicates a statistically significant association between department and perception of promotions as a reward. The results show clear departmental variations in the practice of non-monetary recognition (such as awards and certificates) at NHIMA. A total of 50 respondents were analyzed, and the findings reveal differing levels of adoption and perception across departments. The Admin department recorded a 100% agreement, with all respondents acknowledging the use of non-monetary recognition. This highlights a consistent practice of such rewards within this unit. Similarly, the IT department showed full agreement, with 50% agreeing and another 50% strongly agreeing. In contrast, the Claims department presented a mixed picture, with 70% of respondents expressing neutrality, 25% agreeing, and 5% disagreeing. On the other hand, the Finance and HR departments exhibited complete disagreement, with 100% of respondents in both departments disagreeing with the statement that non-monetary recognition is practiced. The Pearson Chi-Square test value of 93.750 with a p-value of .000 confirms a statistically significant association between department and perception of non-monetary recognition.

5.2 Recommendations

- Need to harmonize on packages that will be appreciated by staff and thus enhance performance.
- Need to train staff in HR so as to increase knowledge on rewarding systems.

6. Acknowledgement

Many thanks to ICU staff and my supervisor.

7. References

1. Abey Francis. Developing a Reward Strategy for your Organization. MBA Knowl. Base, 2017. URL https://www.mbaknol.com/human-resource-management/developing-a-reward-strategy-for-your-organization/ (accessed 1.17.20).
2. Aguenza BB, Som APM. Motivational factors of employee retention and engagement in organizations. IJAME, 2018.
3. Anyango RA. Effects of reward system on employees performance a case of Kenya pipeline company-

Kisumu depot 102, n.d.
4. Armstrong M. A handbook of employee reward management and practice, 2nd ed. ed. Kogan Page, London; Philadelphia, 2007.
5. Armstrong M. A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practice. Kogan Page Publishers, 2006.
6. Bjornavold J. European Centre for the Development of Vocational Training, 2008. Valid. Non-Form. Informal Learn. Eur. Snapshot, 2007.
7. Demirci M. The effect of motivation tools on employee performance: An application on an automotive company in Turkey, 2007.
8. Dininni J. Management theory of Federick Herzberg. Bus. Com Media Inc Assess, 2011. www.bus.commanagementmanagement-Theory--Federick-Herzbergon 5, 2015.
9. Fayol JH. Henri Fayol. Routledge, 2001.
10. Güngör P. The Relationship between Reward Management System and Employee Performance with the Mediating Role of Motivation: A Quantitative Study on Global Banks. Procedia - Soc. Behav. Sci. 2011; 24:1510-1520. Doi: https://doi.org/10.1016/j.sbspro.2011.09.029 Human Resource Management (HRM): Definition & Functions – StudiousGuy, n.d. URL https://studiousguy.com/human-resource-management/ (accessed 1.8.20).
11. Ibrar M, Khan O. The Impact of Reward on Employee Performance (A Case Study of Malakand Private School). Int. Lett. Soc. Humanist. Sci. 2015; 52:95-103. Doi: https://doi.org/10.18052/www.scipress.com/ILSHS.52.95