



University of Wales Trinity Saint David – London Campus

School of Business

LCDB7003: QUALITATIVE RESEARCH

RESEARCH PROPOSAL

**A Study into The Behavioural Effect on Employees and Viability of
Total Reward System in U.K. Technology Companies**

Student ID: 1812495

Programme: Doctor of Business Administration

Lecturer: Dr Amare Desta

Date of Submission: 06 January 2020

WORDCOUNT: 7482

Abstract

This research proposal aimed at accomplishing two goals: First, unveiling the effect of non-monetary rewards on the behaviour patterns and motivation of employees of technology companies in UK. Second, to examine the viability of implementing the combination system between traditional, monetary remuneration reward with non-monetary remuneration: Total Rewards System (TRS). Although many companies are now utilising TRS in their organisational structure, they are still interested in learning how employees are reacting to the new change.

The research will be qualitative and will be conducted via a questionnaire and interview containing a series of questions aimed to collect data about the behavioural patterns and attitude of the employees being surveyed. Using this data, the viability of TRS can be deducted.

This research plan is expected to reflect the findings of previous limited researches being positive reception and heightened productivity, motivation among employees following implementation.

Table of Contents

Abstract	1
1. Introduction.....	3
Research contribution and objectives	4
2. Literature Review.....	5
2.1 Definitions.....	5
2.2 Monetary Remuneration and Non-Monetary Remuneration.....	5
2.3 The Viability of TRS In Corporations.....	8
2.4 The importance of technology in the UK	8
3. Research Question/Hypotheses.....	10
4. Research Design and Methods	11
4.1 Design Overview.....	11
4.2 Bias and Quality Control.....	12
4.3 Population and Study Sample	14
5. Research Methodology	15
5.1 Data Source and Data Collection Methods	15
5.2 Data Analysis.....	17
6. Ethics, Human Subjects and Data Management	18
7. Data Results and Findings.....	19
Part 2: Reflective Essay.....	21
Definition and Characteristics.....	21
Strength and Weakness	22
References.....	25
Appendix.....	28

1. Introduction

Whether a certain organisation can accomplish its strategic goals or not depend significantly on the effectiveness, productivity, and the motivation of its employees toward achieving the goals. Regardless of the characteristic of the business itself (Size, scope, industry, *et cetera*), it always falls down to the employees that decide the success of the organisation (Cheema *et. al.*, 2013).

With the importance of employees' motivation, it is a serious concern among management that demotivation could bring serious problems to the organisation. However, in spite of the acknowledged necessity of motivating employees to optimise productivity, the questions surrounding motivation and the techniques. Which can be best used to inspire employees is still heated topics among scholars as well as difficult riddles to be solved by managers alike (Mohamud *et. al.*, 2017). But one thing that all parties involved in the debate can agree on is that remuneration (Salary, bonuses, incentives, ...) plays a central role in the process of motivating employees (Calvin, 2017); (Stachowska, 2016); (Murey, 2007).

Monetary remuneration packages (Salary, bonuses, ...) represent the "traditional" method of compensation by businesses to its employees, as well as the type of compensation that employees most expect. As a result, this is the form of remuneration that has dominated the majority of the spotlight in academia for years with a voluminous number of researches and papers highlighting its importance and beneficial effects on employees' behaviours (Malhotra *et. al.*, 2007); (Bonner *et. al.*, 2000). It is only recent that other forms of remuneration, which are not monetary were taken into consideration and given the appropriate attention to (Peluso *et. al.*, 2017). Coalescing into an emerging concept known as the Total Reward (TR), which is "the sum" of financial and non-financial rewards achieved in the line of work. The application of Total Reward into a business' employee compensation policy is a model that's known as the Total Reward System (TRS). Considering the acknowledged importance of TRS as a contemporary remuneration model, an assessment of the behavioural impact of the new addition into traditional remuneration policies – non-monetary rewards – in this research can provide further insights into the viability of this remuneration model.

According to Peluso *et. al.* (2017), there is still a lack of research papers and projects that look into the relationship between the adoption of a comprehensive TRS and the behaviours and attitudes of employees thereafter (Hoole & Hotz, 2016). As a result, deeper research into this nascent field is not just academically beneficial but also going to provide interested corporations with a body of research that they can utilise to understand better the behaviours of their employees and remuneration strategies to improve organisation's success.

Research contribution and objectives

Even though an expansive number of researches had been conducted looking into new remuneration methods such as TRS with the aim of improving the state of labour. As previously mentioned, companies are still on the fence regarding the effectiveness of TRS as a practical remuneration system and there's still a lack of researches into TRS effectiveness manifesting in the improvement of employees' behaviours following its implementation (Appelbaum *et. al.*, 2000); (Peluso *et. al.*, 2017). This is the problem that this paper is trying to resolve by providing fresher entries into the lacking research body surrounding the problem of TRS viability and employees' behavioural effects, in the case study of technology companies in UK.

Employees from technology organisations are usually more creative than those in others, as their productiveness and creativeness are the most important for the company . Their motivation and desire are proved to be different from other companies , expecting they prefer intrinsic rewards rather than extrinsic. There are lack of research and papers looking into these matters to motivate them, considering the increasingly importance of technology in the community and economy.

The rationale of this research aims to collate researches and data regarding the effects of non-monetary remuneration packages on employees' behaviours such as productivity and motivation. Furthermore, the research is hoped to provide businesses with an idea of whether non-monetary remuneration packages are viable solutions for the challenge of employees' motivation. The proposal will start with existing literature review by other authors in previous studies to build hypotheses and review what knowledge and finding have been done. Second section is research design and method to explain what methods the researcher will use and the reason behind it, along with the questionnaire. The third section is expected result and findings after conducting the analysis, if they are support or reject the hypotheses.

2. Literature Review

2.1 Definitions

Maicibi (2005) defined the term '*Remuneration*' as a form of payment or "reward" given to an individual for work done. Remuneration can be monetary and extrinsic (Financial rewards that are fixed and variable) or non-monetary and intrinsic (Praises for achievements, honours, recognition, ...) (Armstrong & Murlis, 1991); (Lai, 2007).

Theoretically, the combination of monetary, extrinsic rewards with that of non-monetary, intrinsic rewards creates a concept that's known as Total Rewards (TR). According to Nazir *et. al.* (2012), TR is the manifestation of "all the aspects of work that is valued by employees whether it is related to healthy work environment, better opportunities of learning and development or the benefits packages linked to the pay." (p.3050). For this reason, Total Rewards is often considered as "the sum" of all of the compensation and remuneration packages that the employers made available to the employees.

The concept of Total Reward, when coalesced and organised into a practical remuneration system, creates a Total Rewards System (TRS) that cannot just be a modern, "multifaceted" approach to compensation but also provides a competitive advantage in the face of the rapidly and dynamically changing business environment of the 21st century (Atambo & Nyongesa, 2015).

A comprehensive reward system such as TRS can also be a powerful system to attract new recruits and talents as well as an engine driving commitment, involvement, and engagement in the organisation (Peluso *et. al.*, 2017); (Hoole & Hotz, 2016). Such a system reflects the dedication of the organisation's management toward the task of enhancing its own workforce and also a commitment to keep its employees satisfied. As a result, HR strategies similar to TRS have been utilised as a form of performance and satisfaction enhancement in some successful firms (Khan *et. al.*, 2014).

2.2 Monetary Remuneration and Non-Monetary Remuneration

It is not wrong in the assumption that a full compensation system parting from the traditional monetary-only rewards can massively benefit productivity, satisfaction, commitment, and motivation from employees that companies can also reap benefits from (Awasthi & Pratt, 1990). As a matter of fact, a voluminous body of research agrees that a comprehensive

compensation strategy such as TRS can improve the level of engagement and motivation from employees, which also explains why modern organisations are attempting to shift to this model (Giancola, 2007); (Nienaber, 2010); (Hoole & Hotz, 2016); (Hewitt, 2015). The aim of this shift is to resolve the current issue by highlighting the correlation between employees' dedication and the returns in the form of rewards and proper appreciation from the company of employees' dedication and effort.

In order to achieve this aim, organisations have been focusing on improving the intrinsic rewards for their employees. Mahaney and Lederer (2006) listed the assortment of values that employees can enjoy as part of an intrinsic "*remuneration packages*": "growth opportunities, a sense of accomplishment, status, acknowledgement, satisfaction, self-esteem, challenge, autonomy and responsibility."

The result, as acknowledged by Hoole and Hotz (2016), is that the employees not just remain productive but they also remain engaged, satisfied, and proud of their job. It can be seen just how impactful non-monetary remuneration actually is to not just the employees but also the organisation: Commitment, job satisfaction and motivation, and job engagement are improved at little to no financial costs to the parent organisation in the same fashion that extrinsic rewards would have taken.

Extrinsic or monetary rewards include, according to Ajils (1997) includes pay, work condition, fringe benefits, security, promotion, contract of service, and the work environment. On a broader scale, Yapa (2004) simply concluded that extrinsic rewards are pay, promotion, interpersonal rewards, status, and fringe benefits. Naturally, extrinsic rewards are costly to implement and maintain, still, according to Klein *et. al.* (1997), extrinsic rewards in the form of monetary and tangible benefits is still one of the best ways to ensure that employees dedicate the most time and effort possible into their assigned tasks while maintaining performance. Furthermore, a robust extrinsic reward system that's better in comparison to competitors can also serve to increase engagement and commitment to the organisation, preventing turnover, while guaranteeing a healthy recruitment pipeline of new employees and talents (Goldsmith *et. al.*, 2000); (Hoole & Hotz, 2016).

Nonetheless, the fact that extrinsic reward system has historically been the sole reward management system in businesses had led to a series of observable negativities. According to Bussin (2011) and Balkin and Dolan (1997), an unbalanced system that's focused solely on monetary rewards serve to decrease the intrinsic motivation in the workforce to actually do

their assigned jobs. Greediness and corruption can also be bred as a result of an unbalanced, money-focused remuneration system. In addition, a poor motivator by itself, extrinsic rewards are not tied to neither higher engagement nor performance in employees – a job that's relegated to intrinsic, non-monetary rewards. The purpose of extrinsic rewards is being a good way to appeal to the workforce and highly skilled workers has also come under great contentions by those who are advocates for the TR concept. Watson and Singh (2005) argued that the modern workforce, especially the section that are highly skilled, is attracted less by financial benefits than other non-monetary rewards and compensation that the company could provide. As a matter of fact, the concept of TR revolves mostly around the line of thinking that employees work for values beyond financial gratification and monetary reward (Zingheim & Schuster, 2001).

There are obvious strengths and weaknesses to either types of remunerating. As a result, while scholars cannot find agreements on various grounds regarding the nature, efficacy, behavioural and organisational consequences of either types, all can agree that both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are equally crucial to employees' motivation (Harpaz, 1990); (Danish & Usman, 2010). However, some qualitative researches seem to indicate that from the point of view of the employees themselves, financial benefits from remuneration packages (Monetary compensation, bonuses, competitive position, *etc.*) are ranked lower in term of importance in comparison to non-monetary, intrinsic values such as improvement of the quality of the work-life balance, motivation, personal development (Atambo & Nyongesa, 2015); (Gunawan & Febrianto, 2014). This provides further incentives to implement non-monetary rewards in traditional companies wherein compensation policies had yet to be updated and moved away from the ordinary monetary rewards-only clauses.

In spite of the fact that many aspects of either remuneration types are understood and they both have seen implementation in some practical business settings for quite some time now, companies are still interested in further researches toward employees' behavioural responses, opinions, and performance results born from TRS (Appelbaum *et. al.*, 2000). Especially organisations that require creative and productiveness as technology, it is extremely vital.

This paper is aimed at resolving the behavioural questions behind the newer, more academically intriguing form of remuneration being intrinsic (Non-monetary). Particularly, how a well-developed system of intrinsic rewarding affects the behaviours and attitudes of employees in comparison to when a company's reward system is without well-developed intrinsic rewards, in terms of technology companies in UK.

2.3 The Viability of TRS In Corporations

As previously mentioned, TRS models have been in use in many businesses and corporations recently. However, there are still many contemporary researches that are aiming to dissect the behavioural and motivational impacts that such a reward system has on the psyches of employees (Atambo & Nyongesa, 2015).

Not only so, in spite of the theoretical benefits of TRS, there are papers questioning the viability of TRS, calling for further researches in order to expand the intrinsic knowledge behind the concept as well as the modules, models, and strategies that are involved (Nazir *et. al.*, 2012). Additionally, several criticisms had been voiced against TRS being a respectable remuneration model. Giancola (2009) wrote TRS off as being a '*passing fad*' by contrasting the nature of TRS to the eight "*criteria*" for identifying a management fad from Miller and Hartwick (2002). Particularly, how in the beginning TRS is viewed as the catch-all solution to a myriad of challenging managerial problems such as culture, corporate atmosphere and leadership, *etc.* All of which demands substantial investment in term of time and capital to effectively solve. Giancola (2009) also stated that TRS is the response to several new developments in the business environment from globalisation, merger and acquisition, and the needs to improve the recruitment and employees' retention rate as well as driving down turnover.

While the critics are aplenty, there have been many qualitative researches that ended by concluding that comprehensive Total Reward Systems greatly satisfy and motivate employees by improving their compensation packages to also include performance recognition, career development opportunities (Atambo & Nyongesa, 2015); (Admassie, 2019). Adoption of TRS also provides a great opportunity for employers to consider expanding their extrinsic, monetary rewards.

For all of these reasons, this research proposal aims to produce usable results that can aid academic in the task of deciding whether TRS is a viable strategy or else. The question of viability is decided through a qualitative research into how employees respond behaviourally to the addition of non-monetary remuneration (Intrinsic rewards) into a typical compensation scheme comprising singularly of financial (Extrinsic) rewards.

2.4 The importance of technology in the UK

According to Hauser (2009), technology can change the economic landscape of a country and worldwide, throughout the Industrial Revolution in the 18th century. Internet was introduced in the 1970s to encourage consumer electronics. Therefore, a fierce competition has been created

to adapt and bring new technology into the organisation and market to become first mover advantage. Technology can enhance effectiveness and production of organisations, create new value and industries for the economy. The UK Government has been providing support and funding for technology development in business for decades through Technology and Innovation Centre (TIC) (Hauser, 2009). Therefore, there is an increasingly number of technology companies and organisations adopting technology innovation in the UK.

According to Technology Nation Report (2018), the digital technology sector is accounted for £184billion to the UK economy and grow 2.6 times faster than the UK economy. (N.Ismail, 2018). London – the capital of UK is rank as the second most connected location for technology development. It has impacts on every aspect of the community life and economy, from health services, banking, automatic vehicle, artificial intelligence (AI) and so on. Technology firms in the UK are holding growth and huge potential for creating financial source and value for the economy. They also create and attract high-skilled labour and high-paying jobs, which have creativities, innovation and entrepreneur value. The turnover of technology companies in the UK grew by 4.5% in 2017, comparing to 1.7% growth in UK GDP in the same time (N. Ismail, 2018). The sector also creates extremely number of jobs to reduce unemployment for the UK economy. Digital companies in UK also raised approximately £4.5 billion in capital investment in 2017. There are several growing technology companies in UK includes Deliveroo ; Revolut ; Transferwise ; Skyscanner ; Elivie ; Bulb; Medopad and so on. They are proved to be successful, make contribution to the convenience of consumer and modern life ; as well as contribution to the UK economy.

Employees in those technology companies are the key behind the organisation's success with their innovation and creativeness. Therefore, it is important to understand how to motivate them through rewards, what they prefer in order to keep the success rate of those companies.

3. Research Question/Hypotheses

In order to fulfil this, in support of the research question is *“What is employees’ behaviours in response to TRS implementation in technology companies in UK ?”*.

There are several sub research questions includes:

- What is the importance of the TWS in organisations in general and in UK technology companies ?
- Is it a viable strategy to employ TRS as the primary remuneration strategy for businesses and Why ?
- How UK technology companies can implement the TRS into their organisations?
- Is there any challenges or disadvantages in implementing the TRS?

According to the literature review, two hypotheses have been formed in order to test for this research objective.

H1: Employees positively react to TRS implementation, manifesting in more positive attitudes and heightened productivity.

H2: Employees negatively react to TRS implementation, manifesting in negative attitudes, sunken productivity.

4. Research Design and Methods

4.1 Design Overview

Importance of Qualitative Research

The research will, first and foremost, be conducted by both qualitatively and quantitatively. However, qualitative research will be the main method.

The accurate definition for qualitative research is relatively meagre in number and there are different interpretations of what it means for a research to be '*qualitative*'. Regardless of this difficulty, the definition by Aspers and Corte (2019) will be utilised being: "an iterative process in which improved understanding to the scientific community is achieved by making new significant distinctions resulting from getting closer to the phenomenon studied" (p.139). An easy method to distinguish qualitative research from its sole counterpart – quantitative research – is that while quantitative researches utilise measurements, numbers, and statistics to arrive to conclusion. According to Johnson and Vogt (1998), qualitative research is the "residual category" wherein the subject that is being researched cannot be easily or even feasible to describe through numerical, mathematic means. An example that Johnson and Vogt (1998) gave for a field that's better described by qualitative research, being art history. Jackson *et. al.* (2007) expanded this point by stating that qualitative research is used to describe social phenomena and found heaviest usage in the social sciences.

Returning back to the point of the research: To uncover the behavioural effects of the addition of non-monetary remuneration packages and rewards to traditional compensation system. To establish a TRS as well as providing justification for the adoption along with proof of viability of TRS for technology firms in UK. It is quite clear that, since the core of the research is all about the individual opinions of the employees taking part in the research, quantitative means cannot be wielded to extract usable data that can answer the question of the research, therefore qualitative method also needs to add.

Type of Study

With the nature of the research topic understood, the best type of study that can be launched to conduct the research is through the establishment of a case study. Much like the challenge of defining as complex as qualitative research, the efforts of a great many authors to put an

accurate definition upon what constitutes a '*case study*' had only served to make it even more confusing rather than providing clarification (Gerring, 2004). As a result, a simple, general explanation of '*case study*' was given by Sturman (1997) as: "the exploration of an individual, group or phenomenon" (p.61).

The reasoning behind the decision to go with case study as the type of qualitative research to pursue is contained within the research question. Case study is a method, which single object is tested by different methods to gain in-depth knowledge. Case study method is helpful to answer questions start with How?, Why?, What?.

Since the research's case is to understand the behavioural effects of employees, however, the case cannot be considered without the context of the addition of non-monetary rewards and the establishment of TRS. It would not be possible to gain the general picture being employees' behaviours influenced by the addition without such context. In short, the contextual conditions of the research are vital to its success, which, according to Yang (2003), is one of the signals for researchers to utilise the case study approach above all else.

This research will survey the behavioural patterns of employees of popular tech companies in the U.K. Specifically, five companies have been selected utilising TargetJobs database for the top IT/tech employers in the U.K. being Deliveroo ; TransferWise; Revolut; Amazon and Skyscanner.

Quantitative method is used for the questionnaire to conduct a generalised result and finding for the population, which is the employees of UK tech companies in this research. It is more accurate and can represent the whole population, through the survey questionnaire. The qualitative method is to get a deep understanding of the participant opinions and thinking about the effectiveness of the TRS and find out what rewards they prefer. Another smaller sample is necessary for the interview in qualitative research.

4.2 Bias and Quality Control

Pannucci and Wilkins (2010) defined bias as: "any tendency which prevents unprejudiced consideration of a question" and can occur via "system error" in the process of conducting research. These errors when introduced into the sampling and testing phases could negatively

affect the integrity of the research's products by encouraging the appearance of one result over another. Biases can occur at any stages of research from research design, data analysis, down to conclusion and publication. As a result, bias preventative measures must be implemented from the very start to mitigate the risk of biased result.

There are many biases that could be seen from the research. The first one is that since this falls down to personal opinion and preference of the employees toward remuneration, it is not possible to expect the same kind of response from the entirety of the population without deviation. By selecting too specific of a demographic within a population, it is possible for the research to select a subset that's skewed toward certain qualities and opinions that's different from the rest of the general population. For example, choosing a group of employees from a single company cannot provide guaranteed accurate result that their opinions toward non-monetary remuneration and TRS are similar to the rest of the population of workers that they represent. This is the reason why, according to Taylor (n.d.), a randomised sampling should be conducted. For example, selecting random employees from different departments, rankings, and roles of a range that are currently utilising non-monetary remuneration policies can be a good way to diversify the background of those that are involved and therefore, minimise biased selection.

The second problem that the research could face is the fact that the data collection method (Questionnaire, in this case) could be designed in a way that a certain result is encouraged over another. Even though questionnaires were originally designed to allow the participant to answer the questions in the most neutral and objective as possible, the designers behind these questionnaires are, at the end of the day, still humans with personal opinions, perspectives, and biases (Klein, 2003). To prevent this from happening, the draft of the questionnaire will be peer-reviewed by respectable authorities to ensure that it remains as impartial and neutral as possible before finally being sent off to participants.

These are all central biases that the research could be facing. With their identification in this section, solutions can be prescribed to ensure that they do not impact the results of the research. Since the majority of the data collection is collected through questionnaires, the role of the researcher in this case is to ensure that all of the questions that are being asked remains as neutral as possible to encourage freer responses from participants. The selection of possible participants will also fall down to the researcher. In order to address biased selection, the researcher need to diversify the sample population and demographic as possible to reflect the

general line of thinking of the population in the most accurate manner. The researcher will undertake a role that's more similar to a controller for responses, which is rather different from physically collecting data.

4.3 Population and Study Sample

The nominal population size for this study is determined to be around 400 people taken from top companies listed in employment databases such as TargetJobs (TargetJobs, n.d.). Considering that the tech industry is one of the quickest growing sectors in the U.K. and that it is a fiercely competitive environment for companies not just in the business aspect but also in recruitment. Therefore, as previously mentioned, since policies such as TRS are highly attractive to highly skilled workers, these companies are more likely to have already had TRS or forms of non-monetary remuneration programmes in place than most other sectors (KPMG U.K., 2019).

Assuming that the confidence level is 95%, with a population of 200 and a sample size of $\frac{1}{2}$ the population (100), the margin of error is as followed:

$$MOE = z * \frac{\sqrt{p * (1 - p)}}{\sqrt{(N - 1) * \frac{n}{(N - n)}}} = 1.96 * \frac{\sqrt{0.5 * (1 - 0.5)}}{\sqrt{(200 - 1) * \frac{100}{(200 - 100)}}} = \pm 6.947\% = \sim 7\%$$

With z being the pre-determined z-score (1.96 for a confidence level of 95%), p being the proportion, n being the sample size, and N being the population size (Sullivan, n.d.).

Participant Selection

To support the research, employees of companies that are based in the U.K. and are considered as part of the tech industry.

As previously mentioned, it is extremely important to understand employees' behaviours and attitudes toward the addition of non-monetary remuneration and the implementation of the TRS system into its organisation (Appelbaum *et. al.*, 2000). For this, communicating with businesses of the research is a plausible method of acquiring a complete sampling frame.

When the sampling frame is acquired, probability sampling is the main category of sampling technique utilised and random sampling the procedure. As mentioned before, in order to negate

the effect of biased selection, random selection of participants is necessary. Designed this way, the participant selection process can ensure that all member of the population will be given equal chance of being selected. Particularly, every one member of the 400-strong population will all share a 1/400 chance of being selected to become part of the sample. The potential bias will be effectively dispersed while also ensuring that there is a quality pool of sample participants.

Participant Selection Criteria

In accordance to the context of the research, there are two criterions that the participants must be able to meet:

- 1/ They hail from U.K.-based tech companies (Or tech companies with physical presence in the U.K.) that have employed non-monetary rewards as part of remuneration strategy in the past.
- 2/ They must not be in a managerial role within their organisation.

5. Research Methodology

5.1 Data Source and Data Collection Methods

Data Gathering

Questionnaires have been regularly sent out to acquire information for qualitative researches since as far back as the 20th century (Eckerdal & Hagström, 2016). The questions within these questionnaires often prompt the participant to recall a memory, experience, or to clarify their opinions regarding the matters that the questionnaires were designed to address. This particular research is no difference in the way that it is prompting employees to recall their experiences regarding their behaviours, attitudes, and reactions toward the addition of non-monetary awards in their working environment. Lastly, to provide a personal opinion regarding the viability of the TRS model.

Aside from being the most popular method for data gathering in researches, since questionnaires can be filled out and transferred through so many communication mediums (E-

mails, calls, telephone, physical mails...), the method conforms with the lack of time and resources made available to the researcher perfectly (Kabir, 2016).

As previously mentioned, the final template for the questionnaire that is going to be sent to participants will have to go through an extensive peer-review and editing period before it could be published to ensure that the questionnaire is composed of questions that's most impartial and neutral as possible about the different options that they present.

The Questionnaire

The questionnaire that will be sent out to selected sample and participants will be compiled of close-ended questions with the objective of testing the literature review that was mentioned before (Through close-ended questions), the questionnaire is also hoped to be able to provide some new perspectives on the matter through the eyes of employees with its series of open-ended questions (Hyman & Sierra, 2016) for the interview. As previously mentioned, all of the questions are designed to be as impartial as possible to reduce bias. The reliability of this research is depending on the designed questionnaire. The questionnaire will be separated into two components.

The first one is a series of close-ended questions for the quantitative research method about the non-monetary remuneration rewards at the company. To aid with establishing statistics on the type of non-monetary reward, that's most sought after by employees, participants will tick into the box next to an item correlating with a reward if it was being implemented at their company.

The second component is made of open-ended questions where the participant can fill in their opinions regarding the remuneration system at the company such as their level of satisfaction with the company's remuneration policies, what can be changed, *etc.* The researcher also can conduct an interview to ask questions apart from the other questions in the questionnaire. This interview can be flexible, informal depending on how much data the researcher wants to collect. The sample can be random such as two employees of each chosen companies, for a total number of ten participants.

These questions are designed to aid in the construction of the general picture of the remuneration system that's being used at the sampled company and, when combined with data

from other companies in the U.K. tech industry, to provide the general picture regarding the most popular design for compensation system and employees' attitudes toward them, which solve our hypotheses regarding employees' behavioural responses to TRS and provide evidences for answering the research question.

5.2 Data Analysis

Data Analysis Tool

Data can be processed more accurately, reliably, and speedily when off-loaded to computers, furthermore, the scope of the research ranges in the hundreds, it is not within the time constraint to conduct manual tabulation and analysis. According to Ashirwadam (n.d.), aside from providing all of the previously mentioned benefits, computers are also able to monitor the accuracy and completeness of the collected data.

For all of these reasons, it is decided that the raw data derived from the questionnaire will then be processed with a specialised data analysis programmes NVivo and SPSS for the quantitative data to analyse.

Coding

Coding is, according to Elliott (2018), a “universal process” in qualitative research.

For this particular research, concept-driven coding will be used (Cessda, n.d.). The first step to concept-driven coding is the establishment of a codebook: A set of codes that is expected to appear in the data based on the research theme. This codebook will be utilised to categorise data provided by participants. This process involves reading through all of the data provided by the participants (Specifically the text data in the open-ended questions that would be given in the second component of the questionnaire). With the codes already at hand, the task of the researcher will be separating text segments into respective categories in accordance to their meaning and signification.

For example, a codebook for this particular subject can involve the following codes:

- “Attitudes”.
- “Satisfaction”.
- “Job satisfaction”.

- “Personal growth”.
- “Work-Life Balance”.
- “Productivity”.
- “Benefits”.

6. Ethics, Human Subjects and Data Management

Since the questionnaires will be sent electronically and there is no sensitive physical documentation to be concerned of for this research, the task of data storage and management will occur on computers.

To make it more convenient for the researcher to access relevant research data, all of the information that would be collected through the course of the research will be stored in the cloud on secured services such as Google Drive. Because this is a popular service, it will require the application of extensive security settings and methods to protect data from being leaked. An instructional article from Princeton University (n.d.) suggested a spectrum of data security method like embedding passwords into sensitive personal information of participants that would be collected during the course of the research. A log of all members involved in the research project should also be kept.

The login information that can be used to access this database will be strictly monitored against misuse or leak and breach. This can be done by providing all members of the research team or the researcher unique access information for easier monitoring and for identification purposes. Additionally, for example, when a member leaves the research team, it would be easier to cancel the access account of that member instead of having to go through the intricacies of changing a singular, shared access account.

Lastly, for the purpose of data transmission, secured mediums such as CDs, flash drives should be preferred over e-mails. Before transmission, all of the files will be compressed and secured with a password to ensure that even in the case of interception or breach, there is an additional layer of security presents against prying eyes.

After the research had finally concluded, all sensitive data will be summarily destroyed to protect the confidential information of participants. Data stored on cloud servers will have to

be permanently deleted. In the case of physical, written data or electronic data that cannot easily be purged (CDs), all will have to be physically destroyed through shredding or other methods in such a fashion that the data can neither be read nor restored by unauthorised, third-parties.

7. Data Results and Findings

It is anticipated by the researcher that the respondents will react positively to non-monetary rewards and will encourage their company into expanding further the system into a full-fledged TRS. Since remuneration – regardless of its format, monetary or non-monetary – is a form of incentive and the tool to enhance motivation and productivity, it can be expected that employees will have no criticism with expanding further their remuneration package. Furthermore, previous researches have all indicated positivity from employees following the addition of non-monetary rewards, as a result, we also expect the same opinion to persist in the sample (Atambo & Nyongesa, 2015); (Admassie, 2019). Therefore, the first hypothesis that: “Employees positively react to TRS implementation, manifesting in more positive attitudes and heightened productivity” is expected to be the case, answering our chief research question in a positive note that TRS is a strategy worth pursuing for businesses in the future. The sub-research question regarding viability is answered as well and also positively. The hypothesis 1 is expected to accept and hypothesis 2 will be rejected. How the TWS will affected the motivation of employees in technology companies and their opinions will be discovered in details after analysing the data set collected.

From this research, companies will be able to understand by a greater degree their employees’ perception toward non-monetary remuneration packages, and by extension, the framework to decide whether the implementation of Total Rewards in the organisation’s remuneration policies to be a viable move or else. Nonetheless, this research should not be passed as the final say in the matter. The complexity of the argument behind non-monetary remuneration and its application in business is difficult to provide a complete answer to the problem of whether it is a good evolution of corporate remuneration models or, as its many critics had said, a mere ‘*game plan*’ by corporations to have short-term benefits.

In conclusion, the research proposal has written about the researcher's plan and interest object, also highlighted the importance of qualitative research and how to use qualitative research in the research problem.

Part 2: Reflective Essay

The main purpose of research is to generate new knowledge and develop new findings for existing knowledge in order to improve practice. Qualitative and quantitative are the two most common methods of research. There are numerous debate over the benefits and drawbacks of those methods, by both researchers and readers. It can be argued that they have extremely different features, skills and mindsets, depending on the subject. In contrast, others proved that both methods have similar features about collecting and analysing the data. This essay will demonstrate my knowledge and personal opinion about both methods, based on my experience.

There are several similarities of both methods that I recognised from my own experience. First, literature review is necessary in both research in order to provide a throughout understanding of the research problem and what have been done, what is missing to generate new finding in the research. In addition, in both method, the researcher needs to treat their participants and respondents with fairness and involve them in most of decision-making process in the research. They are allowed to make their own choice and have their own voice in both method and the data gained from participants have to be confidentially. The researcher can use coding in both methods, such as number for quantitative and themes and sub themes for qualitative.

Definition and Characteristics

According to Wayne (2010), quantitative research is used to quantify different variables. Quantitative research includes collecting data and information which is absolute, such as in the form of counts or numbers. The data using in quantitative research has to be quantifiable , so that it can be interpreted and analysed by calculation, numerical comparison or statistical analysis. Specifically, the data can be put into categories, rank orders or measurements to construct tables and graphs. The researcher needs to have clear idea what data they need, what they will measure in this method. Quantitative research mainly focus on working with different hypotheses, and then reaching a final conclusion. The most common way to form the hypothesis in quantitative research is testing and showing the relationship between a dependent and an independent variable.

Second, qualitative research is an observation of variables in a comprehensive manner. In my opinion, qualitative research is descriptive as it focuses more on finding and understanding opinions, reasons and motivations of the participants in the research, therefore it sets a hypothesis for a potential quantitative research. The population, observation and the amount of data in qualitative research is less than in quantitative. The data collected can only be observed, not evaluated or quantified. Data for qualitative research normally collected from interviews, participant observations, reflections, field notes without fully understanding yet which data will be meaningful. Data collected is then represented by text, form, words or illustration and the researcher needs to look for trends in the data. Qualitative data can also be stored and code for analysis in a software called Nvivo.

Comparing to quantitative, qualitative method allows participants in the research express their opinions more, as a form of written text. The result are more descriptive than quantitative method. According to my experience, qualitative research is more frequently used for social and behavioural subject. For instance, when researching about attitudes within a target group, such as in workplace, consumer behaviour. Qualitative research is more appropriate for these subjects. The most common method to conduct qualitative research is through case study.

It is extremely important to understand the paradigm of research, which includes positivism and interpretivism. Quantitative research is based on positivism. It generates truth and knowledge from single prediction and idea of the researcher. On the other hand, qualitative research is based on interpretivism. The research is subjective and the knowledge is generated from collecting and analysing different views of people's behaviour with little prediction from the researcher. (Truncellito, 20117)

Strength and Weakness

From my point of perspective, qualitative is easier to use, conduct and analyse than quantitative method. For quantitative, the researcher need to study and understand clearly how SPSS software work and be able to put it into practice. It require extensive statistical analysis, therefore it is difficult for researchers who is not from non-statistical backgrounds, including myself. The data number and the result can be confusing for researchers as well. In addition, the sample size for quantitative needs to be large and therefore, sometimes there are difficulties

to control the sample size and the respondents. It can be also time-consuming, as the researcher needs to wait for a period of time until enough respondents return the survey.

In contrast, qualitative approach is easier to control and manage as it requires small sample size only and the researcher can collect and analyse the data by observation and record. It provides more specific value and understanding of the respondent's opinion such as consumer attitudes, behaviours and feelings. It focuses on quality, rather than quantity in quantitative research. The finding from this method is also more in-depth than quantitative because the finding takes into account respondents' opinions, emotion and feedback through open-ended questions. Furthermore, it is a flexible approach comparing to quantitative. When conducting the research and design the questionnaire or interview questions, the researcher can change the questions quickly to improve the response's quality. Qualitative research also motivate creativity in the research and from the respondents and researchers.

However, because the data is not in form of number, the analysis process can take more time than quantitative method. The interpretation of result is usually biased because it can be influenced by the researcher's view and perspective. In addition, the result and finding cannot generalised and represented the study population or community, as the sample size is small. Theoretical framework and hypotheses is less structured in qualitative research.

The first advantage of quantitative research is able to reduce bias and support neutrality of the result. Bias happens when the researcher select or support the outcome or result they draw into over others. The finding is generalised because of larger sample and participants and can represented the population. Different data sets can be analysed at the same time on statistic software, therefore it saves time for the researcher. Because the data is normally from surveys or public data sources, it is consistent, reliable and precise. Therefore, the analysis and finding is more accurate as they are interpreted by software and based on proof. Different hypotheses is formed to make the research more reliable , the researcher just need to test those. In contrast, there are several weakness . Quantitative research is not supported the richness of the data, the result and finding is only generalised. As mentioned above, the analysis process is hard because of the usage of SPSS software.

For my future research, I prefer to use the mixed-method, which is a combination of both qualitative and quantitative research method. By using this method, my research will take both

advantage of the two methods and neglect the weakness. The research can be both generalised to the population and have depth and richness in the study of the chosen subject. Mixed-method can also provide a better understanding of the research problem. However, I want to focus more on doing qualitative research in the future. I find the method is more interesting and easier to use. I can get a clear insight to the research problem. I also can have close relationship with my respondents. It is also easier to conduct and analyse for me. One of my main interest for future research is student entrepreneurship, what are the factors can affect their intention to become entrepreneurs, both external and internal. Qualitative research methods through interview can help me to know in details what are their opinion and motives to become entrepreneurs , while quantitative can test external factors such as education, financial ability, employment rates have positive or negative effects on the decision to become an entrepreneur in the chosen population.

In conclusion, the essay highlighted the importance, strength and weakness of both methods based on my own opinion and experience. Although both methods have their strength and weakness, none is superior to the other so careful consideration needs to take into account. Depending on the nature of the subject that researcher choose, the validity, accuracy and reliability of each method. The most basic characteristic of quantitative method is to generalised the finding and result to the population, while in qualitative is more focused on detailed behaviour and richness of the data. Recently, quantitative method using SPSS and Stata software has been becoming more common in research, but qualitative has its own strong point for researchers to choose.

References

- Appelbaum, E., Bailey, T., Berg, P. & Kalleberg, A. (2000). *Manufacturing Advantage*. Why High Performance Work Systems Pay Off. Ithaca, N.Y: Cornell University Press.
- Armstrong, M. & Murlis, H. (1991). *Reward management*. London, U.K: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Awasthi, V. & Pratt, J. (1990). *The effects of monetary incentives on effort and decision performance: The role of cognitive characteristics*. Accounting Review. 65(4). p.797–811.
- Atambo, G. & Nyongesa, W.J. (2015). *Effects of a Total Rewards System on the Motivation and Quality of Working Life of Female Employees in Institutions of Higher Learning: A Case of the Catholic University of East Africa*. Public Policy and Administration Research. 5(8). p.97-105.
- Admassie, G.A. (2019). *Impact of Rewards Management System on Employees' Satisfaction in Case of DebreBirhan University Administrative Staffs*. Journal of Investment and Management. 8(1). p.16-24.
- Aspers, P. & Corte, U. (2019). *What is Qualitative in Qualitative Research*. Qualitative Sociology. 42. p.139-160.
- Akkelin, D. (2014). *Using SPSS to Understand Research and Data Analysis*. Psychology Curricular Materials - Book 1. Retrieved from: https://scholar.valpo.edu/cgi/viewcontent.cgi?article=1000&context=psych_oer
- Ashirwadam, J. (n.d.). *Communication Research Methods - Methods of Data Analysis*. Tamilnadu Theological Seminary. Retrieved from: https://www.academia.edu/8135057/Methods_of_Data_Analysis
- Bonner, S.E., Hastie, R., Sprinkle, G.B. & Young, S.M. (2000). *A Review of the Effects of Financial Incentives on Performance in Laboratory Tasks: Implications for Management Accounting*. Journal of Management Accounting Research. 12(1). p.19-64.
- Cheema, F.E.A., Shujaat, S. & Alam, R. (2013). *Impact of Non-monetary Rewards on Employees' Motivation: a Study of Commercial Banks in Karachi*. Journal of Management and Social Sciences. 9(2). p.23-30.
- Calvin, O.Y. (2017). *The Impact of Remuneration On Employees' Performance (A Study of Abdul Gusau Polytechnic, Talata-Mafara And State College of Education Maru, Zamfara State)*. Arabian Journal of Business and Management Review (Nigerian Chapter). 4(2). p.34-43.

- Giancola, F. (2008). *Should Generation Profiles Influence Reward Strategy*. Employee Relations Law Journal. 34 (1). p.56-66.
- Gunawan, R.G. & Febrianto, H. (2014). *The Impact of Monetary and Non-Monetary Incentives On Employees' Motivation In PT XYZ's Finance Function In Subraya*. iBuss Management. 2(2). p.60-69.
- H.Hauser (2009). *The current and future role of Technology and Innovation Centre in UK*. Retrieved from: <https://catapult.org.uk/wp-content/uploads/2016/04/Hauser-Report-of-Technology-and-Innovation-Centres-in-the-UK-2010.pdf> Accessed on 04 January 2020
- Hoole, C. & Hotz, G. (2016). *The impact of a total reward system of work engagement*. SA Journal of Industrial Psychology. 42(1). a1317. <https://doi.org/10.4102/sajip.v42i1.1317>
- Hyman, M.R. & Sierra, J.J. (2016). Open versus Close-Ended Survey Questions. Business Outlook. 14(2). p.1-5. Retrieved from: https://www.researchgate.net/publication/282249876_Open-versus_close-ended_survey_questions Accessed on 29 December 2019
- Jackson, R., Drummond, D.K. & Camara, S. (2007). *What Is Qualitative Research?*. Qualitative Research Reports in Communication. 8(1). p.21-28.
- Johnson, R.B. & Vogt, W.P. (1998). *The SAGE Dictionary of Statistics & Methodology: A Nontechnical Guide for the Social Sciences (NULL)* (5th ed.). Singapore: SAGE Publications, Inc.
- Khan, F., Rasli, A. M., Khan, S., Yasir, M. & Malik, M.F. (2014). *Job burnout and professional development among universities academicians*. Science International Lahore. 26(4). p.1693-1696.
- Kabir, S.M.S. (2016). *Methods of Data Collection*. In: *Basic Guidelines for Research: An Introductory Approach for All Disciplines* (1st ed.). Chittagong-4203, Bangladesh: Book Zone Publication.
- KPMG UK. (2019). *KPMG UK Tech Monitor Q1, 2019*. Retrieved from: <https://home.kpmg/uk/en/home/insights/2019/05/uk-tech-monitor-q1-2019.html> Accessed on 02 January 2020
- Mohamud, S.A., Ibrahim, A.A. & Hussein, J.M. (2017). *The Effect of Motivation On Employee Performance: Case Study In Hormuud Company In Mogadishu Somalia*. International Journal of Development Research. 7(11). p.17009-17016.
- Miller, D. & Hartwick, J. (2002). *Spotting management fads*. Harvard Business Review. 80(10). p.26-27.

- Lai, C. (2009). *Motivating Employees through Incentive programs*, Dissertation Thesis of Bachelor Degree. Jyväskylä University of Applied Sciences. Retrieved from: https://publications.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/17561/jamk_1237444488_5.pdf?sequence=2 Accessed on 25 December 2019
- Murey, J.K. (2007). *An Investigation Of the Effect Of Remuneration On Motivation And Performance Of Employees - A Case Study Of Nation Media Group*. Nairobi, Kenya: University of Nairobi.
- Malhotra, N., Budhwar, P. & Prowse, P. (2007). *Linking Rewards to Commitment: An Empirical Investigation of Four UK Call Centres*. International Journal of Human Resource Management. 18(12). p.2095–2128.
- Maicibi, N.A. (2003). *Pertinent issues in employees management*. Kampala, Uganda: MPK Graphic Ltd.
- Nazir, T., Shah, S.F.H. & Zaman, K. (2012). *Literature review on total rewards: An international perspective*. African Journal of Business Management. 6(8). p.3046-3058.
- N.Ismail (2018). Tech Nation 2018 Report : UK tech expanding faster than the rest of the economy. Retrieved from : <https://www.information-age.com/tech-nation-2018-report-uk-tech-faster-economy-123471982/> Accessed on 03 January 2020
- Stachowska, S. (2016). *The role of remuneration in building employee engagement*. World Scientific News. 57(2016). p.503-512.
- Sullivan, L. (n.d.) *Confidence Intervals*. Retrieved from: http://sphweb.bumc.bu.edu/otlt/MPH-Modules/BS/BS704_Confidence_Intervals/BS704_Confidence_Intervals_print.html Accessed on 10 December 2019
- Peluso, A.M., Innocenti, L. & Pilati, M. (2017). *Pay is not everything: Differential effects of monetary and non-monetary rewards on employees' attitudes and behaviours*. Evidence-based HRM: A Global Forum for Empirical Scholarship. 5(3). p.311-327.
- Pannucci, C.J. & Wilkins, E.G. (2010). *Identifying and Avoiding Bias in Research*. Plastic Reconstruction Surgery. 126(2). p.619-625.
- Princeton University. n.d. *Best Practices for Data Analysis of Confidential Data*. Retrieved from: <https://ria.princeton.edu/human-research-protection/data/best-practices-for-data-a> Accessed on 04 January 2020

Appendix

QUESTIONNAIRE

First, thank you for your time and participation.

My name is and I am currently studying DBA at the University of Wales Trinity Saint David in UK. My email is

This questionnaire is designed to support the aim to collect the data for the result only, all answers will not be used for different purposes. My research is about the effectiveness of intrinsic and extrinsic rewards to employees motivation and the effect of Total Reward System to the organisation for UK technology firms. All the data will be deleted after.

There are some definition you need to know before doing the survey:

1. TRS: Total Reward System – The combination of both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards in the organisation to motivate and keep their employees.
2. Remuneration : Reward

The survey will take 5 minutes to complete with some open-end questions, your response will be anonymous. There are two parts in the questionnaire. Please choose and answer them honestly.

Part 1: Close-end questions

1. How old are you ?
 - ☐ 18-24 years old
 - ☐ 25-36 years old
 - ☐ 37-54 years old
 - ☐ Over 55 years old
2. What is your gender ?
 - ☐ Female
 - ☐ Male
 - ☐ Prefer not to say

3. What is the position you are holding in the company ?
 - ☐ Employee
 - ☐ Team Leader / Leader
 - ☐ Manager
 - ☐ Senior Manager/ CEO

4. Is your company implementing the TRS ?
 - ☐ Yes
 - ☐ No
 - ☐ I don't know

5. Which reward is your company normally offer to the employee ?
 - ☐ Extrinsic
 - ☐ Intrinsic
 - ☐ Both
 - ☐ None of them

6. On the scale of 1 to 10, please rate your satisfaction towards your company rewards?

7. Please tick on the option you find the most accurate based on your experience:

My level of satisfaction towards ...	Yes	No
Career Progression Opportunities		
Skill and Knowledge Development		
Paid Leaves		
Insurance		
Tangible benefits (Food, resting places, ...)		
Overtime Compensation		
Flexibility of Working Hours		

Part 2: Open-end question

1. What is your favourite type or rewards and which reward is most appealing to you ?
Does it affect your performance and commitment positively ?
2. What do you feel when you achieve the goal and get reward or promote?
3. Your opinion and feeling towards the company and my job after non-monetary rewards are added to my compensation plan ?
4. Your opinion about the combination of both monetary and non-monetary rewards.
5. Any criticisms and recommendations for the management and the reward system of your company ?