

## **Non-Monetary Incentives: Nexus between Employees Motivation and Job Performance at Selected Hotels in Ghana**

**Eric Ohemeng Sarpong\***

**Shao Yun-Fei\*\***

**Cephas P.K Coffie\*\*\***

---

### **Abstract**

In the era of steep competition in the hospitality industry of Ghana, job performance is central to the ability of hotels to attract and maintain customers, achieve set-up targets and also survive the competitive market. With theories and studies pinpointing to the role of motivation in employees' job performance, our study assesses non-monetary incentives role in employees' performance at selected hotels in Ghana. Using a sample of 172 respondents and response rate of 78.7% from 68 selected hotels in Ghana, we analyze for the multiplicative effect of employees' characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives, and Social non-monetary incentives and, job-related non-monetary incentives on employee job performance using a hierarchical logistic model. The findings show that the probability of employees to improve job performance is higher for male, younger, more educated and employees with few duration of working years at the hotels. Further, the hierarchical logistic regression models show that tangible non-monetary incentives, social non-monetary incentives and, job-related non-monetary incentives altogether has an impact on the probability of employees to improve their job performance. Our results provide valuable insight into non-monetary incentives and employee job performance in hotels and could be extended to the hospitality industry in general.

---

#### **Keywords:**

Non-monetary;  
Incentives;  
Job performance;  
Hospitality;  
Employees.

*Copyright © 2019 International Journals of Multidisciplinary Research Academy. All rights reserved.*

---

#### **Author correspondence:**

Eric Ohemeng Sarpong,  
Doctorate Program, Management Engineering  
University of Electronic Science and Technology of China  
Email: eric@std.uestc.edu.cn

---

\* Doctorate Program, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China

\*\*Professor, School of management and Economics, University of Economics Science and Technology of China

\*\*\*Doctorate Program, University of Electronic Science and Technology of China

## 1. Introduction

In the wake of unemployment and intense competition in the hospitality industry of Ghana, while employees fear to lose their jobs, employers demand improved job performance from their employees to sustain competitive advantage. Having this in mind, one would expect employees to automatically improve job performance without extrinsic rewards to maintain their jobs at the least. However, as indicated by Wright (2003) humans have needs which if unmet could trigger behaviors that could directly or indirectly affect their performance at the workplace. As unemployment peaks and competition soars with the number of hotels increasing at a rapid rate, some hotel managers' resort to offering fewer salaries and rewards, skip training and promotion of employees, and engage in activities that brood poor employee management-relationship (Ahmed, 2015). Again reports of long working hours, poor work-life balance and stressful conditions in the hospitality industry raise unanswered questions with respect to the productivity of employees in the industry (Wireko-Gyebi & Akyeampong, 2014). Countless studies look into motivation and the performance of employees at the workplace. Some studies on motivation and job performance from other industries discover both monetary and non-monetary incentives as a catalyst for improved job performance (Ackah, 2014; Olusadum & Anulika 2018; Ibrahim & Brobbey 2015). Similarly, the hospitality industry has studies pointing to the role of motivation in improved job performance (Kahsay & Nigussie, 2018; Çetin et al., 2013; Ghebrejorgis, 2018). However, most of these studies focus on motivation in general with little consideration to specific incentive packages. Our study adds to literature and knowledge by considering specifically non-monetary incentives and the resultant impact on employee job performance in some selected hotels in Ghana considering demographic factors. Specifically, we look at (1) the relationship between employee characteristics and job performance, (2) employee characteristics and tangible-non-monetary incentives on job performance, (3) employee characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives, and social non-monetary incentives on job performance and finally (4) employee characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives, social non-monetary incentives and, job-related non-monetary incentives on job performance. The justification of our decision to focus on non-monetary incentives is because of the current unemployment conditions in Ghana which provides employees with only a take or leave it situation, therefore, making non-monetary incentive special in the situation. Aside from monetary incentives the work organization, and the design and content of jobs can have a significant effect on the satisfaction of staff and their levels of performance (Mullins et al., 2007).

The remainder of the paper is organized as follows; next a brief overview of the hospitality industry in Ghana, the discussion of related literature shedding light on the subject under discussion, followed by the research methodology then the analysis of the data collected for the study. Finally, the presentation and discussion of the results from the analysis and suitable recommendations for policymakers and implication for future studies end the paper.

### Contributions of Hotels to the Tourism sector in Ghana

Ghana is seen currently as one of the most promising tourism spots in sub-Saharan Africa. Until the year 1999 inadequate standard hotel facilities plagued the progress of the hospitality industry. However, with the increase in the number of hotels and the improvement in hotel services tourism boomed from the year 2000. Statistically, as in 1999, the total number of hotels in Ghana was 769. However, between the years 2000 and 2010, the total number of hotels in the country shot up to 1,797. The number of hotels in Ghana increased from 273 in 1989 to 767 in 1999. From 2000 to 2010, the number of hotels increased significantly from 992 to 1,797. Similarly, the number of rooms and beds in hotels and guest houses has also been increasing due to the emergence of oil sites in some parts of the country such as the western and the volta regions. Furthermore, the year 2009 the number of 3-star hotels dropped from 30 in 2006 to 17 in 2009, which represents a decline of 43%. Also, in 2009, there was a reduction in the number of 1-star hotels and guest houses from 188 in 2008 to 184 in the year 2009, representing a decrease of 2%. This was due to requirements from the Ghana Tourist Board that most hotels and guest houses could not cooperate during the reappraisal of all hotels in 2009 resulting in the closedown of most hotels and guesthouses. As at now, the number of hotels keeps increasing due to the growth in the tourism sector creating intense competition in the industry.

### Literature review

The subject motivation dates back centuries and it continues to be researched globally at different levels. To understand this phenomenon, there is a clear distinction between the terms incentives and motivation. While incentives hinge on the external promise, motivation is more internal. According to Dhanwada (2009), Incentive theory is primarily psychological in nature, thus clarifying the relation between motivation and behavior of the individual. Incentives in the form of care, love, affection, and respect for

employees have the propensity to nurture the conduct of employees at the workplace. Incentives can be monetary or non-monetary in nature providing a different level of employee motivation and per classification. Baker (1993) groups non-monetary incentives into three broad categories-Tangible non-monetary, social non-monetary, and job-related non-monetary incentive. Several myths, uncertainties, and misconception surround the subject incentives and the effect on job performance. While most assert incentives stimulate positive workplace attitude leading to increased productivity others to have doubts (Condly et al., 2003). Study results from the American productivity center indicated 99.9% of respondents viewed job recognition as an integral factor which motivates their actions (Spangenberg, 1994: p 229) as cited by Kposowa (2005). On the other hand, motivation as a process accounting for employee intensity, direction and persistence of effort towards attaining the specific goal is usually driven by intrinsic motives (Stephen et al 2005). According to Cresswell et al (2005) motivation is the desire within a person that causes him or her to act. The term seeks to explain how behavior gets started, is energized, is sustained, is directed, is stopped, and what kind of subjective reaction is present in the organization while all this is going on (Kleinginna & Kleinginna, 1981). Motivation in the workplace refers to “the degree to which an individual wants and tries hard to do well at a particular task or job” (Mitchell, 1982). The motivation of employees is very important because it may be a means to reduce and manipulate the gap between employees’ actual and desired state of commitment to the organization and to inspire people to work both individually and in groups. Govindarajulu & Daily (2004) argued that the use of monetary and non-monetary motivation can circumvent problems in the workplace. Sekhar, Patwardhan, and Singh (2013) also stated that the use of monetary and non-monetary motivation in the long round tends to cost-saving device for the organization.

The theoretical foundation of this study is anchored in Herzberg Two factor model and expectancy theory of work motivation. Although there are many competing theories of motivation, these theories may all be at least partially true and help to explain the behavior of certain people in specific times. Reviewing these theories of motivation facilitates our understanding of how monetary and non-monetary rewards can motivate employees to perform in an organizational setting. Herzberg two factor model of employee motivation is one of the widely discussed need-based theories of employee motivation. According to Werner and De Simone (2006), individuals have two sets of basic needs, one focusing on survival and another focusing on personal growth. Herzberg contended that factors in the workplace that satisfy survival needs or hygiene factors, cannot provide job satisfaction but only prevent dissatisfaction. These hygiene factors are pay and security, working conditions, interpersonal relationship, company policy, and supervisor. The personal growth factors he considered as motivators are achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Herzberg argued that the motivator factors create feelings of job satisfaction but their absence will not necessarily lead to job dissatisfaction. Herzberg two-factor model implies that management must not only provide hygiene factors to avoid dissatisfaction but also must provide motivators (intrinsic factors) for the job itself to have motivating potential.

Employee performance common to most jobs includes the element of output, timeliness of output, presence at work, and cooperativeness (Akafo, & Boateng, 2015). According to Jones, George, and Hill (2006), organizational performance is a measure of how efficiently and effectively managers use resources to satisfy customers and achieve organizational goals. The only means by which an organization stays alive within the context of the present-day environmental dynamics is through high-level performance, which can only be obtained through the development and maintenance of a crop of highly motivated workers (Smith et al., 1994). Lindner (1998) corroborates this by declaring that motivated employees help organizations to survive since motivated employees are more productive. Ojikutu (2007) further underscored the need for organizations to motivate their workforce by declaring that the motivation of the workers to commit itself and maintain uninterrupted and effective operations must be seen as also an important factor in the promotion of productivity for economic growth. Ahmed et al., (2009) revealed that if rewards or recognition offered to employees were to be altered, and then there would be a corresponding change in work motivation and satisfaction. By implication, this means that if more focus is placed on rewards and recognition, it could have a resultant positive impact on motivation and thus result in higher levels of job performance and overall corporate productivity. Admed et al., (2009) reiterates that Motivating people is not just about a financial investment though, but also an emotional one. A motivated workforce has more productive employees and this translates into bottom-line cost savings. On the other hand, motivated employees positively impact corporate culture, resulting in many intangible but equally important returns. Ezigbo (2011) on the effects of non-monetary rewards on manufacturing firms in Nigeria, it was noticed that workers place great value on rewards given to them by their employers, hence when these rewards are not provided, they express their displeasure through poor performance and non-commitment to the job.

## 2. Research Method

Quantitative method is applied in this study with descriptive and empirical evidence gathered with the help of a survey questionnaire. A distinct segment of a four-part survey instrument was devoted to determining the role of non-monetary incentives in motivating employee job performance at selected hotels in Ghana. The dispersed nature of Hotels in Ghana made it difficult to hand-deliver all the questionnaires and therefore part was mailed and part was hand-delivered. The survey was conducted from June 2018 through September 2018. The process began with the selection of hotels based on proximity in a purposive manner. The sample selection is made up of staff from the top-level position, middle-level positions as well as low-level positions in all the departments of hotels. From the total selected hotels of 68, 109 permanent staffs and 63 casual staffs made up the sample size; this makes the total sampling size 172. In total, 98 survey instruments were hand-delivered and 74 were emailed. However, due to inactive, erroneous, and non-existent emails, only 38 duly completed responses were received via email corresponding to a total response rate of 78.7% in total plus the hand-delivered questionnaires. See Table 1 for details. The study further examined the employee job performance (improvement in job performance) considering the multiplicative effect of employee's demographic factors, tangible non-monetary incentives, social non-monetary incentives and job-related non-monetary incentives using hierarchical logistic regression models. Improvement in employee job performance is employed as a response variable categorized into improvement and non-improvement. The remaining variables were included as explanatory variables in different models.

### *Summary of descriptive statistics*

Regarding the data collected from the selected hotels in Ghana, almost all respondents accepted the fact that they have witnessed an improvement in their job performance in one way or the other. Out of the total 136 respondents representing 100%, a total of 120 (88%) agreed as opposed to the remaining 16 (12%) who answered otherwise. On the employee's characteristics, it emerged 85 (62.5%) were male with 76 of them agreeing to witness improvement in their job performance as opposed to the remaining 9 who said otherwise. Respectively female occupied 51 (37.5%) with 44 witnessing job improvement as against 7. This is an indication that proportionately more males work at hotels in Ghana compared to females. On the ages of respondents who participated in the study, data shows that 69 (50.7%) are between the ages of 21-30 years and out of this number 58 said yes to job improvement and the remaining 11 said otherwise followed closely by the age group 31-40 years recording a total of 46 (33.8%) with 42 answering yes to job improvement while the remaining 4 said otherwise. The age groups 41-50 years and 50 years and above, recorded totals of 9 (6.6%) and 12 (8.8%) respectively to indicate that majority of the workforce at the selected hotels are between the ages of 21-40 years. Moving on, the education of the workers at the hotels revealed 80 (58.8%) had basic education with 71 saying yes to job improvement against the 9 saying otherwise. 40 (30%) had secondary education with 35 saying yes to job improvement and 5 saying otherwise, and 16 (12%) had tertiary education with 14 saying yes to job improvement and 2 saying otherwise and this clearly shows the nature of workforce at hotels since most tasks require not higher level of education to be completed. Finally, on the total number of years of services at the post, 96 (70.5%) of the respondents had been with their hotels for 3 years or less with 83 of them saying yes to job improvement while the remaining 13 said otherwise. The years from 4-7 years and 8 years or above recorded low numbers of 19 (14%) and 21 (15.4%) respectively to indicate the presence of possible high labour turnover at these hotels. Further, respondents were surveyed on a 5 point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree with respect to tangible non-monetary incentives received from their jobs considering vacations, free transportations, and symbolic gifts. On vacations, a total of 105 (77.2%) respondents strongly agreed to the fact that they had vacations in-between their jobs with 93 of them saying yes to job improvement and the remaining 12 saying otherwise. 6 (4.4%) agreed, 15 (11%) were neutral the issue, 5 (3.6%) disagreed and 5 (3.6%) strongly disagreed to indicate that the hotels offer vacations to their employees. On whether the hotels provided free transportation for their employees, 101 (74.2%) strongly agreed to have received free transportation with 90 saying yes to job improvement with 11 saying otherwise. 15 (11%) agreed 7(5%) stay neutral and 13 (9.5%) strongly disagreed to indicate that most of the hotel employees had access to free transportation. Finally, on the provision of symbolic gifts to employees 84 (61.7%) stayed neutral with 74 saying yes to job improvement and the remaining 10 saying otherwise. However, 28 (20.5%) agreed and 24 (17.6%) disagreed to show that the use of symbolic gift at the hotels is not prominent. Again, respondents were surveyed on a 5 point Likert scale from strongly agree to strongly disagree with respect to social non-monetary incentives received from their jobs considering feedback, verbal recognition and praise from superiors. On the provision of timely feedback 88 (64.7%) agreed to receiving timely feedback with 80 saying yes to job improvement and the remaining 8 saying otherwise. 26 (19.1%) agreed 6 (4.4%) stayed neutral 11 (8%) disagreed 5 (3.6%) strongly disagreed to indicate that the hotels provide timely feedback to help their employees to improve on their performance. Verbal recognition records 57 (41.9%) strongly agreed with 49 saying yes to job performance and 8 saying otherwise, 50 (36.8%) agreed with 47 saying yes to job performance and 3 saying

otherwise, 22 (16.2%) stayed neutral, 2 (1.5%) disagreed and 5 (3.6%) strongly disagree to indicate that verbal recognition is used at the hotels to motivate employees. On praise 38 (27.9%) strongly agreed, 59 (43.3%) agreed, 22 (16.1%) stayed neutral 9 (6.6%) disagreed and, 8 (5.8%) strongly disagree to indicate that employees are praised. Finally, job-related non-monetary incentives surveyed indicated; on flexible work schedule 41 (30.1%) strongly agreed, 60 (44.1%) agreed, and 35 (25.7%) stayed neutral. On a safe work environment, 30 (22.1%) strongly agree, 76 (55.8%) agreed and, 30 (22.1%) stayed neutral. Finally, on the involvement of employees in decision making process of the organization, 23 (16.9%) agreed, 89 (65.4%) stayed neutral 7 (5%) disagreed and, 17 (12.5%) strongly disagreed to indicate that the hotels did not involve their employees in their decision-making process and this is characteristics of small and medium scale business in Ghana.

**Table 1. Summary of descriptive statistics**

Variables	Job performance	Otherwise	Total
<b>Employee characteristics</b>			
Gender			
<i>Male</i>	76	9	85
<i>Female</i>	44	7	51
Age			
<i>21-30 years</i>	58	11	69
<i>31-40 years</i>	42	4	46
<i>41-50 years</i>	9	0	9
<i>50 and above</i>	11	1	12
Education			
<i>Basic education</i>	71	9	80
<i>Secondary education</i>	35	5	40
<i>Tertiary education</i>	14	2	16
Duration of Service			
<i>Below 3 years</i>	83	13	96
<i>4-7 years</i>	18	1	19
<i>8 years and above</i>	19	2	21
<b>Tangible non-monetary incentives</b>			
Vacations			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	93	12	105
<i>Agree</i>	6	0	6
<i>Neutral</i>	15	0	15
<i>Disagree</i>	3	2	5
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	3	2	5
Transportation			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	90	11	101
<i>Agree</i>	13	2	15
<i>Neutral</i>	5	2	7
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	12	1	13
Symbolic gifts			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	25	3	28
<i>Neutral</i>	74	10	84
<i>Disagree</i>	21	3	24
<b>Social non-monetary incentives</b>			
Feedback			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	80	8	88
<i>Agree</i>	23	3	26
<i>Neutral</i>	5	1	6
<i>Disagree</i>	8	3	11
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	4	1	5
Verbal recognition			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	49	8	57
<i>Agree</i>	47	3	50
<i>Neutral</i>	19	3	22
<i>Disagree</i>	1	1	2
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	4	1	5
Praise			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	33	5	38
<i>Agree</i>	50	9	59
<i>Neutral</i>	21	1	22
<i>Disagree</i>	8	1	9
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	8	0	8



<b>Job-related non-monetary incentives</b>			
<b>Flexible work</b>			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	34	7	41
<i>Agree</i>	54	6	60
<i>Neutral</i>	32	3	35
<b>Safe environment</b>			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	25	5	30
<i>Agree</i>	69	7	76
<i>Neutral</i>	26	4	30
<b>Decision making</b>			
<i>Strongly Agree</i>	21	2	23
<i>Neutral</i>	80	9	89
<i>Disagree</i>	5	2	7
<i>Strongly Disagree</i>	14	3	17
Total Number of respondents	120	16	136

## Model specification

With the aim of estimating the relationship between employee job performance and non-monetary incentives, the study proposes four different logistic regression models in hierarchical forms. Employee characteristics which has been researched previously by (Bertolino, Truxillo, and Fraccaroli, 2013; Bhargava, Kotur, and Anbazhagan, 2010; Bowen, Swim, and Jacobs, 2000) to have varying degrees of effect on job performance of employees, Tangible non-monetary incentives, Social non-monetary incentives and, Job-related non-monetary incentives have been studied separately as variables and have been found to have varying degrees of effect on employee job performance (Okwudili, Beede Emerole 2015; Erbaşı and Tugay Arat 2012; Sonawane, 2008)

$$\text{Model 1 } \text{diff}(y_1) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \varepsilon_i$$

Where  $\text{diff}(y_i)$  represents the proxy for the job performance of employees.  $\text{Empl}'xtics$  Represents employee's gender, age, level of education as well as the number of years spent working for the hotel.  $\beta_0$  is the intercept whereas  $\beta_1$  captures the effect of employee's characteristics on the job performance and  $\varepsilon_i$  represents the error term. Since the response variable (job performance) is dichotomous with 1 indicating the improvement in job performance and 0 representing non-improvement, it indicates that the model in Equation (1) follows the binomial distribution which based on exponential family in canonical form yields the logistic regression of the form;

$$\text{Model 1a } \pi(\text{diff})_i = \frac{\exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \varepsilon_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \varepsilon_i)}$$

Where  $\pi(\text{diff}_i)$  is a probability value indicating the likelihood of improved job performance with  $\beta_1$  in this case, representing the multiplicative effect of employee's characteristics on the likelihood of improved job performance. Whilst other studies place much emphasis on employee characteristics with regards to job improvement also prove that business characteristics in addition to the aforementioned variable (CEO characteristics.. we extend the model in Equation (1) in order to look into the relationship between job performance, employee characteristics, and tangible non-monetary incentives.

$$\text{Model 2 } \text{diff}(y_1) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \varepsilon_i$$

Where  $\text{Tang}$  represent the tangible non-monetary incentives which could serve as a motivational tool for employees. Tangible non-monetary incentives include vacation, transportation, symbolic gifts with  $\beta_2$  measuring the effect of tangible non-monetary incentives on job performance. By expression the model in Equation (2) in the form of logistic regression, since the response variable is binary we have;

$$\text{Model 2a } \pi(\text{diff})_i = \frac{\exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \varepsilon_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \varepsilon_i)}$$

Further, we extend the model in Equation (2) in order to look into the relationship between job performance, employee characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives, and social non-monetary incentives.

$$\text{Model 3 } \text{diff}(y_1) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \beta_3 \text{Soc} + \varepsilon_i$$

Where  $\text{Soc}$  represent the social non-monetary incentives which could serve as a motivational tool for employees. Social non-monetary incentives include feedback, verbal recognition, and informal praise

from superiors with  $\beta_2$  measuring the effect of tangible non-monetary incentives on job performance. By expression the model in Equation (3) in the form of logistic regression, since the response variable is binary we have;

$$\text{Model 3a } \pi(\text{diff})_i = \frac{\exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \beta_3 \text{Soc} + \varepsilon_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \beta_3 \text{Soc} + \varepsilon_i)}$$

Finally, we extend the model in Equation (3) in order to look into the relationship between job performance, employee characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives, social non-monetary incentives and, job-related non-monetary incentives.

$$\text{Model 4 } \text{diff}(y_1) = \beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \beta_3 \text{Soc} + \beta_4 \text{Job} + \varepsilon_i$$

Where *Job* represent the job-related non-monetary incentives which could serve as a motivational tool for employees. Job-related non-monetary incentives include flexible work, conducive work environment and, participation in decision making with  $\beta_2$  measuring the effect of tangible non-monetary incentives on job performance. By expression the model in Equation (4) in the form of logistic regression, since the response variable is binary we have;

$$\text{Model 4a } \pi(\text{diff})_i = \frac{\exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \beta_3 \text{Soc} + \beta_4 \text{Job} + \varepsilon_i)}{1 + \exp(\beta_0 + \beta_1 \text{Empl}'xtics + \beta_2 \text{Tang} + \beta_3 \text{Soc} + \beta_4 \text{Job} + \varepsilon_i)}$$

### 3. Empirical results and discussions

#### *Hierarchical logistic regression estimation*

The table below presents the results of the estimates of the hierarchical logistic regression model for the association of variables postulated to have a significant multiplicative effect on job performance at the selected hotels in Ghana. As outlined in Table 2, three (4) different models were estimated with the first model assessing the multiplicative effect of employees characteristics on job performance, second model investigating the multiplicative effect of both employee characteristics and tangible non-monetary incentives, the third model looks at estimating the multiplicative effect of employees characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives and social non-monetary incentives while the fourth model assessed the multiplicative effect of employee characteristics, tangible, social and job-related non-monetary incentives on job performance at the selected hotels. All variables used as proxies or indicators of employees characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives, social non-monetary incentives and, job-related non-monetary incentives were categorical. Thus by default, all the first categories of each of these measurements as illustrated in Table 2 were respectively used a reference point in order to make the interpretation of the multiplicative effects more meaningful. Table 2 contains the parameter estimates (coefficients), standard error values, odd ratios and the significant levels indicated with stars of the categorical variables used in the various models. The parameter estimates from the table have been interpreted in terms of the significant levels and the odds ratio ( $\exp(\beta)$ ). In the context of Model 1a, employees' characteristics show a positive relationship with job performance with the coefficient of 0.905\*\*\*. Gender of employees proves to affect job performance with a positive coefficient of 0.325\*\*\* and an odd ratio of 1.384 to indicate male employees are 1.4 times likely to have higher job performance compared to their female counterparts. On the age category of employees and how it affects job performance, a coefficient of 0.527\*\*\* and the odd ratio of 1.694 reveals younger employees have 1.7 better chance of improving upon their job performance compared to older employees. Regarding the educational level of employees, a negative coefficient of -0.116\*\* and a corresponding odd ratio of 0.890 is indicative of the fact that less-educated employees have 0.9 chance of improving on their job performance compare to more educated employees. Considering the years of service of employees and the effect on job performance, a coefficient of 0.172\*\* and the odd ratio of 1.187 reveals employees with less number of years in service had a higher chance of improving their job performance compared to employees who have stayed much longer. Moving on to Model 2a, there is an improvement in the relationship between employee characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentives and job performance with a positive coefficient of 1.805\*\*\*. Again male employees show 1.2 probability of having high job performance compared to their female counterparts, younger employees also show 1.7 probability of having high job performance compared to older employees, however, less educated employees continue to show less probability of improving job performance with 0.9 probability while employees with fewer number years of experience had 1.2 probability of improving their job performance. Concerning tangible non-monetary incentives, with a coefficient of -0.307\*\* employees who had vacations in-between their working days have 0.734 of improving their job performance as compared to their counterparts who did not have vacations. Again with a coefficient of -

0.081\* hotels that provided their employees with free transportation services stood the chance of improving their employees work performance by 0.922. Finally, on the provision of symbolic gifts, recording a coefficient of -0.083\* and an odd ratio of 0.920 is an indication that employees receiving symbolic gift could improve their job performance. Model 3a improves upon the second model significantly with a positive coefficient of 1.978\*\*\*. While employee characteristics continue to show a positive relationship with employee job performance, significantly the odd ratio for employees with fewer education increases to 1.009. Tangible non-monetary incentives continue to show a positive relationship with job performance with not much significant change from the results from model 2a. However, results from social non-monetary incentives indicate, employees, receiving timely feedback had 0.666 chance of improving on their job performance as compared to employees who did not receive timely feedback with a coefficient of -0.407\*\*. Similarly, employees receiving verbal recognition from their employers had 0.932 chance of improving on their job performance as compared to their counterparts who did not receive any form of verbal recognition, verbal recognition plays a key role in motivating employees (Khan, Ahmed, Paul, Hasnain, & Kazmi, 2018). Surprisingly, employees who were praised by their employers had a higher probability of 1.412 to improve on their job performance compared to their counterparts who had no praise from their employers. Model 4a which is the final model equally provides a strong indication that there is a positive relationship between the variable in the model with a positive coefficient of 1.322\*\*\* although significantly lower than that of model 3a. On the relationship between employee characteristics, tangible non-monetary incentive and, social non-monetary incentive the results from model 3a are similar to that of model 4a with minimal changes. However, on the job-related non-monetary incentives which define model 4a, significantly employees with flexible work schedule had 1.650 chance of improving their job performance with a positive coefficient of 0.501\*\*\*. Again, employees working in a conducive work environment had a 1.127 probability of improving their job performance as indicative in studies (Khan et al., 2018). Finally, employees involved in the decision-making process of the hotels had 0.911 of improving their job performance. See table 2 for details.



**Table** Summary of results from the logistic regression

Variables	Model 1a			Model 2a			Model 3a			Model 4a		
	Coeff	Std. error	Odd ratio	Coeff	Std. error	Odd ratio	Coeff	Std. error	Odd ratio	Coeff	Std. error	Odd ratio
Constant	0.905***	1.004	2.473	1.805***	1.522	6.078	1.978***	1.785	7.231	1.322***	2.607	3.751
<b>Empl'xtics</b>												
Gender (Ref. Male)	0.325***	0.544	1.384	0.242***	0.554	1.274	0.101**	0.586	1.106	0.052*	0.594	1.054
Age (Ref. 21-30yrs)	0.527***	0.378	1.694	0.544***	0.384	1.722	0.619***	0.404	1.858	0.630***	0.426	1.878
Education (Ref. Basic education)	-0.116**	0.380	0.890	-0.124**	0.388	0.883	0.009*	0.411	1.009	0.020*	0.447	1.020
Years of service (Ref. below 3 yrs)	0.172**	0.302	1.187	0.179**	0.311	1.197	0.185**	0.321	1.203	0.144**	0.325	1.155
<b>Tangible</b>												
Vacation (Ref: SA)				-0.307**	0.219	0.734	-0.309**	0.231	0.734	-0.306**	0.229	0.737
Transportation (Ref: SA)				-0.081*	0.232	0.922	-0.108**	0.240	0.897	-0.129**	0.259	0.879
Symbolic gifts (Ref: SA)				-0.083*	0.281	0.920	-0.156**	0.293	0.855	-0.222**	0.310	0.801
<b>Social</b>												
Feedback (Ref: SA)							-0.407**	0.220	0.666	-0.387**	0.224	0.679
V. recognition (Ref: SA)							-0.070*	0.283	0.932	-0.053*	0.286	0.948
Praise (Ref: SA)							0.345**	0.286	1.412	0.332**	0.281	1.394
<b>Job-related</b>												
Flexible work (Ref: SA)										0.501***	0.441	1.650
Environment (Ref: SA)										0.119**	0.451	1.127
Decision (Ref: SA)										-0.093*	0.280	0.911
-2LL	95.547			93.669				88.740			87.028	
Nagelkerke $R^2$	4.2%			6.8%				13.5%			5.7%	
Hosmer & Lemeshow test	p= 0.646			p= 0.438				p= 0.265			p= 0.114	
Classification accuracy	88.2%			88.2%				87.5%			87.5%	

Note: \*\*\* represented statistical significance at 1% level. P-values can be provided upon request

#### **4. Conclusion**

Our analysis reveals the determinants of employee job performance amongst the selected hotels in Ghana, where the hotels are willing to offer varying kinds of non-monetary incentives to their employees. In as much as the majority of the respondents agreed to have experienced an improvement in their job performance, other factors have been found by the study to have a significant impact on their job performances. Our empirical analysis reveals that the probability of employees having a higher job performance without the presence of non-monetary incentives increases significantly when the employee is a male which favours existing male bias theory on job performance and gender. Again the age of employees also affected the ability of employees to improve their work performance as indicative of the fact that younger employees have the ability to acquire new skills compared to older counterparts. As significantly proven over the years, the level of education proves to have an effect on job performance as more educated employees had a higher probability of improving their work performance. Factoring the presence of non-monetary incentives into the equation results from model 2,3 and 4 reveals similar employee characteristics effect on job performance to validate the results in model 1. Going forward, the presence of tangible non-monetary incentives proves to affect significantly the probability of employees to improve on their job performances. Again both social non-monetary and job-related non-monetary incentives also support the model to indicate that employees having access to these incentives had a higher probability of improving their job performance as compared to those who did not.

Our study provides a roadmap for hotel owners, small and medium scale business owners, policymakers and researchers interested in motivation tools that generates the highest result. In as much as motivational theories have existed over centuries, most businesses in Ghana are yet to understand the full implication of the phenomenon on the performance of their employees due to the high unemployment rate leading to employees settling for less than they are actually worth. Financial incentives provide motivation for employees as it has been widely researched and accepted, however, the use of non-monetary incentives also provide some level of motivation that if tapped into by hotel owners and other small business owners in Ghana could provide a breakthrough for higher organizational output. Motivational studies based solely on incentives is still emerging and therefore a number of unanswered question remain. What is the effect of unemployment on employee job performance in an environment devoid of non-monetary incentives? What is the contribution of individual perception on non-monetary incentives offered at the workplace? Does race matter in the type of non-monetary incentive given to employees? These and many other questions remained unresolved and therefore we anticipate that future studies on this subject could look into finding answers to these questions. In summary, the reported findings per this study are strong, robust and reliable due to the fact that, the various proposed models employed in the study are evidenced to be significantly fit and valid as well.

#### **References**

1. Ackah, D. (2014). The impact of motivation on employee performance in the manufacturing industry in Ghana. *Global Journal of Management Studies and Researches*, 1(5), 291-310.
2. Ahmed, S. (2015). Rhetorical organization of tourism research article abstracts. *Procedia-Social and Behavioral Sciences*, 208, 269-281.
3. Akafo, V., & Boateng, P. A. (2015). Impact of reward and recognition on job satisfaction and motivation. *European Journal of Business and Management*, 7(24), 112-124.
4. Ali, R., & Ahmed, M. S. (2009). The impact of reward and recognition programs on employee's motivation and satisfaction: an empirical study. *International review of business research papers*, 5(4), 270-279.
5. Baker, J. D. (1993). The effects of two motivational factors on accuracy and persistence for second graders.

6. Bertolino, M., M. Truxillo, D., & Fraccaroli, F. (2013). Age effects on perceived personality and job performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology, 28*(7/8), 867-885.
7. Bowen, C. C., Swim, J. K., & Jacobs, R. R. (2000). Evaluating Gender Biases on Actual Job Performance of Real People: A Meta-Analysis 1. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology, 30*(10), 2194-2215.
8. Brookman, F., Mullins, C., Bennett, T., & Wright, R. (2007). Gender, motivation and the accomplishment of street robbery in the United Kingdom. *The British Journal of Criminology, 47*(6), 861-884.
9. Condly, S. J., Clark, R. E., & Stolovitch, H. D. (2003). The effects of incentives on workplace performance: A meta-analytic review of research studies 1. *Performance Improvement Quarterly, 16*(3), 46-63.
10. Cresswell, S. L., & Eklund, R. C. (2005). Motivation and burnout in professional rugby players. *Research Quarterly for Exercise and Sport, 76*(3), 370-376.
11. Dhanwade, M. S. N. PERFORMANCE INDICATORS (PBAS) EMPOWERED THE TEACHING.
12. Erbas, A., & Arat, T. (2012). The effect of financial and non-financial incentives on job satisfaction: An examination of food chain premises in Turkey. *International Business Research, 5*(10), 136.
13. Ezigbo, C. (2012). Reducing turnover by motivation. *European Journal of Business and Management, 4*(17), 115-125.
14. Ghebrejorgis, F. Factors Influencing Employee Performance in Hotel-A Comparative Study of Government and Privately Owned Hotels in Eritrea.
15. Govindarajulu, N., & Daily, B. F. (2004). Motivating employees for environmental improvement. *Industrial management & data systems, 104*(4), 364-372.
16. Ibrahim, M., & Brobbey, V. A. (2015). Impact of motivation on employee performance. *The case of some selected Micro Finance Companies in Ghana, 2*(5), 45-62.
17. Kleinginna, P. R., & Kleinginna, A. M. (1981). A categorized list of motivation definitions, with a suggestion for a consensual definition. *Motivation and Emotion, 5*(3), 263-291.
18. Kotur, B. R., & Anbazhagan, S. (2014). Influence of age and gender on the performance. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management, 16*(5), 97-103.
19. Kposowa, S. J. (2005). *Motivation of the skilled workforce in the construction industry of South Africa* (Doctoral dissertation).
20. Lindner, J. R. (1998). Understanding employee motivation. *Journal of extension, 36*(3), 1-8.
21. Miner, J. B., Smith, N. R., & Bracker, J. S. (1994). Role of entrepreneurial task motivation in the growth of technologically innovative firms: Interpretations from follow-up data. *Journal of applied psychology, 79*(4), 627.
22. Mitchell, T. R. (1982). Motivation: New directions for theory, research, and practice. *Academy of management review, 7*(1), 80-88.
23. Nigusie, Y. Determinant of Employees' Motivation in the Hotel Industry. *Significance, 157*(4.197452), 1-200638.
24. Ojikutu, R. M. (2007). Impact of Rewards on Motivation of Workers: A Study of the Civil Service of Osun State, Nigeria. *International Business Management, 1*(4), 99-103.
25. Okwudili, B. E. (2015). Effect of non-monetary rewards on productivity of employees among selected government parastatals in Abia state, Nigeria. *IOSR Journal of Business and Management (IOSR-JBM), 17*(2), 6-11.

26. Olusadum, N. J., & Anulika, N. J. (2018). Impact of Motivation on Employee Performance: A Study of Alvan Ikoku Federal College of Education. *Journal of Management and Strategy*, 9(1), 53-65.
27. Sekhar, C., Patwardhan, M., & Singh, R. K. (2013). A literature review on motivation. *Global business perspectives*, 1(4), 471-487.
28. Sonawane, P. (2008). Non-monetary rewards: Employee choices & organizational practices. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 256-271.
29. Wireko-Gyebi, S., & Akyeampong, O. (2014). Work-related stress in hotels: An analysis of the causes and effects among frontline hotel employees in the Kumasi Metropolis, Ghana. *Journal of Tourism & Hospitality*, 3, 1-9.
30. Wright, T. A. (2003). Positive organizational behavior: An idea whose time has truly come. *Journal of Organizational Behavior: The International Journal of Industrial, Occupational and Organizational Psychology and Behavior*, 24(4), 437-442.
31. Zeyer, A., Çetin-Dindar, A., Md Zain, A. N., Juriševič, M., Devetak, I., & Odermatt, F. (2013). Systemizing: A cross-cultural constant for motivation to learn science. *Journal of Research in Science Teaching*, 50(9), 1047-1067.