



ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES

**RELATIONSHIP OF MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION ON
EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY: CASE STUDY AT
SAVE THE CHILDREN COUNTRY OFFICE**

By
AREYAM WORKNEH

NOVEMBER, 2013
ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

**RELATIONSHIP OF MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION ON
EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY: CASE STUDY AT
SAVE THE CHILDREN COUNTRY OFFICE**

By

AREYAM WORKNEH

**A THESIS SUBMITTED TO ST.MARY'S UNIVERSITY, SCHOOL
OF GRADUATE STUDIES IN PARTIAL FULFILLMENT OF THE
REQUIREMENTS FOR THE DEGREE OF MASTER OF BUSINESS
ADMINISTRATION (HRM CONCENTRATION)**

NOVEMBER 2013

ADDIS ABABA, ETHIOPIA

ST. MARY'S UNIVERSITY
SCHOOL OF GRADUATE STUDIES
FACULTY OF BUSINESS

**RELATIONSHIP OF MOTIVATION AND JOB SATISFACTION ON
EMPLOYEES' PRODUCTIVITY: CASE STUDY AT
SAVE THE CHILDREN COUNTRY OFFICE**

By

AREYAM WORKNEH

APPROVED BY BOARD OF EXAMINERS

Dean, Graduate Studies

Signature

Advisor

Signature

External Examiner

Signature

Internal Examiner

Signature

DECLARATION

I, the undersigned, declare that this thesis is my original work, prepared under the guidance of Assistant Professor Goitom Abreham. All sources of materials used for the thesis have been duly acknowledged. I further confirm that the thesis has not been submitted either in part or in full to any other higher learning institution for the purpose of earning any degree.

Name

St. Mary's University, Addis Ababa

Signature

November, 2013

ENDORSEMENT

This thesis has been submitted to St. Mary's University, School of Graduate studies for examination with my approval as a university advisor.

Advisor

Signature

St. Mary's University, Addis Ababa

November, 2013

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

I would like to thank Assistant Professor Goitom Abreham for guiding me as my advisor throughout the time it took me to complete this research and write the paper. My thanks and appreciation goes to everyone who took the time to respond to the survey I disseminated and also to those who took part in the interview. I also want to express my sincere gratitude to my husband, rest of my family and friends for their understanding and support. Finally, I thank God for giving me health, strength and perseverance to continue and finish this study.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study is to investigate whether there is any relationship between employee motivation, job satisfaction on employee productivity. A survey was carried out among head office staff of Save the Children, Ethiopia Country Office where by descriptive statistics such as frequency and percentage used to measure the percentage of returned questionnaire and also used to describe the respondents' profile such as their gender, year of service, and job classification. The Pearson correlation is used to measure the significance of linear bivariate between the independent and dependent variables thereby achieving the objective of this study. When selecting sample of the study, probability, stratified random sampling is used so that each member of the population has an equal chance of being selected. A key finding of this study is job satisfaction in Save the Children is largely caused by true motivators while hygiene factors contribute some towards job satisfaction. The finding also indicates a statistically significant three-way relationship between employee motivation, job satisfaction and productivity, within which several aspects of these constructs contributed more powerfully towards the relationship than others. The study recommends strategy on how the organization should invest on empowering managers to be better managers of their team as they play a key role in motivating staff. Furthermore, it is recommended that motivation of different groups of employees must be encouraged with different motivational factors, taking into account the importance of demographic factors.

Key words: *Motivation, Job satisfaction, Productivity, Monetary & non monetary rewards*

TABLE OF CONTENTS

ACKNOWLEDGMENTS.....	i
ABSTRACT	ii
TABLE OF CONTENTS	iii
LIST OF ACRONYMS.....	v
LIST OF TABLES	vi
CHAPTER ONE.....	1
INTRODUCTION.....	1
1.1. Background of the study.....	1
1.2. Statement of the Problem	2
1.3. Research Questions	4
1.4. Objectives of the Study	4
1.4.1. General Objectives	4
1.4.2. Specific Objectives.....	4
1.5. Definition of Terms	4
1.6. Significance of the Study.....	5
1.7. Delimitation/ Scope of the study	5
1.8. Organization of the Research Report.....	6
CHAPTER TWO.....	7
REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE.....	7
2.1. The concept of Work Motivation	7
2.2. Motivation Theories	7
2.2.1. Content theories.....	8
2.2.2. Process theories	12
2.3. The effects of motivation on employees performance	15
2.4. Monetary motivators versus non-monetary motivators.....	18
2.5. Motivation factors – employee choices.....	23
2.6. Job Satisfaction.....	25
2.6.1. Skills variety.....	26
2.6.2. Task identity	26

2.6.3.	Task significance	27
2.6.4.	Autonomy	27
2.7.	Organizational productivity	27
2.7.1.	Productivity outputs	28
2.7.2.	Productivity levels	28
CHAPTER THREE		29
RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY		29
3.1.	Introduction	29
3.2.	Research design	29
3.3.	Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques	29
3.4.	Types of data and tools of data collection	31
3.5.	Data collection procedures	31
3.6.	Methods of data Analysis	32
CHAPTER FOUR		33
DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION		33
4.1.	Introduction	33
4.2.	Characteristics of respondents	33
4.3.	Analysis of data pertaining to the study	34
CHAPTER FIVE		50
SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS		50
5.1.	Introduction	50
5.2.	Summary of findings	50
5.3.	Conclusions	51
5.4.	Limitation of the study	52
5.5.	Recommendations	52
REFERENCES		59
APPENDICES		61
APPENDIX I		61
APPENDIX 2		66

LIST OF ACRONYMS

SC	Save the Children
HR	Human Resource
HRM	Human Resources Management
SMT	Senior Management Team

LIST OF TABLES

Table 3.1: Sample size description in number.....	33
Table 3.2: Sample size description by gender.....	33
Table 4.1: Demographic Makeup of Respondents.....	38
Table 4.2: Respondents view on factors contributing to satisfaction in their work life.....	40
Table 4.2.1: Motivation factors based on gender.....	42
Table 4.2.2: Motivation factors based on year of service in Save the Children.....	43
Table 4.2.3: Motivation factors based on age group.....	44
Table 4.3 Factors causing dissatisfaction among staff when not present/not enough.....	45
Table 4.4 Perception of managers on what motivates staff.....	46
Table 4.5: Level of agreement of staff whether their line managers motivate them.....	47
Table 4.6: Adequacy of remuneration to the level of assignment given.....	48
Table 4.7: Motivation level of respondents.....	49
Table 4.8: Level of job satisfaction of respondents.....	50
Table 4.9: Feeling of respondents on their level of productivity in the organization.....	51
Table 4.10: Pair wise correlation.....	62
Table 4.10.1: regression analysis on motivation and job satisfaction over productivity.....	63
Table 4.10.2: level of relation between work motivation & job satisfaction	63
Table 4.10.3 level of relation between dependent and independent variables.....	63

CHAPTER ONE

INTRODUCTION

1.1. Background of the study

All non-for-profit organizations compete with each other for needed resources: donors, sponsors, clients, staff, volunteers, nearly anything and everything needed for success. They heavily depend on donations as a source of operating funds. In this time around many non-for-profit organizations are finding themselves in a position where they are expected to do more and more, with less and less (Allen & Meyer: 1990: 166).

Most donors are looking for what purpose their donation is being used and if it is going to be used wisely and most effectively. If a non-for-profit organization is not as effective or efficient as their competitors, donors will start sending their money elsewhere. Many organizations in the world have cut back their services while some have ceased to exist. For this reason, non-for-profit organizations need to find their competitive edge to be able to survive in the competition (Allen & Meyer: 1990: 167-172).

It is becoming evident that the key to sustained survival and organizational success lies not only in the rational, quantitative approaches, but more to the commitment of employee's involvement and motivation to work (Sims 2007: 4). Human resource management (HRM) as a consequence is more fundamental today for the success of any organization than ever before. Non-for-profit organizations often rely on their employees' commitment for their success and sustainability. But supporting, nurturing, and sustaining that commitment in a sector where burnout and high turnover rates are all too common can be a challenge (Ron Klivers: 2009:75).

In the recent years, there has been increased concern regarding the role of employees' motivation in organizational performance suggests that employee motivation is one of the most important and critical functions to be performed by managers due to need for increasing productivity and utilizing this resource in the most optimum fashion (Nohria & Lee: 2008: Vol 86: 78-79)

The query that arises at this point is what makes some employees seem better satisfied in their jobs than others? And in what ways can management improve the motivation

of its employees? Furthermore how can the management effectively use their motivation strategy to attract the right people that can bring result towards organization mission? Bateman and Snell (1996) stated that motivation is the force that energizes, directs and sustains a person's effort towards the achievement of a goal. In their book they have stated that a highly motivated person will work hard towards the achievement of organizational goal, given the ability and adequate understanding of the job. Therefore, the challenge for today's management is to administer motivational programmes which will encourage employees to improve their work performance and productivity.

It seems to be obvious that companies need motivated employees and without any doubts motivation is an important aspect of HRM. However, because of a complex nature of human behavior, motivation is not easy to understand and to use. The importance of motivating people at work is noticeable at all levels of organization (Rampersad, 2006).

Although, some of research finding suggested that money is not as potent as it seemed to be, many companies tried to implement monetary incentives as their main tool to attract and motivate employees. However, with the recent financial crisis a question is being asked if there are other options of motivating employees that would be equally effective but more cost efficient.

This has inspired the researcher to undertake a study on what drives motivation and job satisfaction in Save the Children and to determine to what extent motivation and job satisfaction affect productivity amongst employees.

1.2. Statement of the Problem

As it is in many developing countries, there are quite a large number of non-for-profit international organizations that are working to support the development activities in Ethiopia. A number of international non-for-profit organizations are opening more branches in the country which has created fierce competition in the sector. As a result recruiting and retaining qualified and self motivated staff in order to be competitive in the current market has become challenging (Ron Klivers: 2009:76).

Human resources translate all other resources in an organization into visible products (Mabonga: 2000:47). Bearing this in mind, it is important that organizations pay extra attention to their workers in order to attain optimum efficiency and effectiveness at the workplace. Strong and positive relationship and bonding should be created and maintained between employees and their organization to influence and persuade employees towards reaching the desired result. The current era is highly competitive and organizations, regardless of size, technology and market focus are facing strong competition in the market for attracting and retaining employees (Storey, 2001:6). This is found to be true for Save the Children International as well.

Save the Children is one of the international non-for-profit organizations that have started operating in Ethiopia since 1930s. Globally, Save the Children is the leading independent non-for-profit organization working for children in need, with the aim to inspire breakthroughs in the way the world treats children, and to achieve immediate and lasting change in their lives by improving their health, education and economic opportunities.

The organization has gone through a big merger on October 2012 where seven Save the Children Offices that used to operate independently came together to form one Save the Children International. Because of this merger, the staff are now experiencing significant change like being managed by new supervisors, having a new system, policy and procedures and adopting to new way of doing things.

Employees usually start to have the feeling of nervousness, stress and lack of self-confidence when there are organizational changes such as downsizing, restructuring as well as merging (Nicolaidis and Katsaros, 2007: 234-235). Thus, the employees may not have the motivation to work hard for the organization and their performance would be affected as well.

A look at the company's audit reports after transition shows inconsistent organizational performance and high level of uncertainty among staff which cannot be ignored. It has become regular comment from different program operation quality audits that there is mixed level of motivation and job satisfaction among staff after the merger.

There have been quite a lot of studies on how to improve productivity of employees where some support each other, while others offer a different viewpoint. Lack of one accepted theory has put managers to be uncertain of which approach/theory to adopt.

Although there are a number of studies related to this topic, this study tried to examine this topic from a local and one specific organization perspective. The study thus seeks to unravel the level of employee motivation and job satisfaction in Save the Children, Ethiopia Country Office and how it relates with organizational productivity.

1.3. Research Questions

This study intends to seek answer to the following basic questions:

1. What drives motivation and job satisfaction in Save the Children?
2. What factors lead to dissatisfaction of staff?
3. To what extent do motivation and job satisfaction influence productivity of employees?

1.4. Objectives of the Study

1.4.1. General Objectives

The general objective of the study is to assess dimensions of relationship between motivation and job satisfaction on staff productivity at work. The study will focus on which factors within the work environment motivates staff towards job satisfaction and make them dissatisfy in their work.

1.4.2. Specific Objectives

1. To establish different ways in which Save the Children can improve the motivation level and increase the productivity
2. To make recommendation on how to reduce feeling of dissatisfaction

1.5. Definition of Terms

Motivation:

According to Okumbe (1998) motivation is defined as a physiological or psychological deficiency or need that activates behaviour or a drive that is arrived at a goal or incentive.

Job satisfaction:

Job satisfaction is simply how people feel about their jobs and different aspects of their jobs. It is the extent to which people like (satisfaction) or dislike (dissatisfaction) their jobs (Spector,1997:2)

Extrinsic Motivation:

According to Sansone & Harackiewicz (2000), extrinsic motivation is a behavior that results from the attainment of externally administered rewards, including pay, material possessions, prestige, and positive evaluations from others.

Intrinsic motivation:

Intrinsic motivation is an inducement derived from within the person or from the activity itself and, positively affects behavior, performance, and well being (Ryan & Deci, 2000). In contrast to extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation is said to exist when behavior is performed for its own sake rather than to obtain material or social reinforcers.

Organizational Effectiveness

Organizational effectiveness is the notion of how effectual an organization is in accomplishing the results the organization aims to generate (Muhammad, 2011: 15). It is defined as the extent to which an organization, by the use of certain resources, fulfils its objectives without depleting its resources and without placing undue strain on its members and/or society (Mary, 1996:34).

1.6. Significance of the Study

The findings of this study will assist management of Save the Children to devise strategies that will make staff motivated and satisfied with their job so that they can work hard towards the achievement of organizational goals. It also provides insight for HR professionals in similar sectors in how to create motivational climate embedded in the organizational culture to be able to improve productivity rates among employees. Again, this study serves as a source of reference for further studies and research.

1.7. Delimitation/ Scope of the study

The research focuses on the employees working at the head office of Save the Children; Ethiopia Country Office, acting as the representative sample for the overall

population of employees working at Save the Children, Ethiopia Country Office. The study focuses on head office staff as they are the most affected by the recent merger that the organization has gone through and further more time and convenience were also the other reasons for considering only Addis based staff for the study.

1.8. Organization of the Research Report

The study is organized in to five chapters. Accordingly, the first chapter introduces the problem of statement and describes objective of the study. The second chapter presents a review of literature and relevant research associated with the problem addressed in this study. The third chapter presents the methodology and procedures used for data collection and analysis while the fourth chapter contains an analysis of the data and presentation of results. The fifth chapter offers a summary and discussion of the researcher's findings, implications for practice, and recommendations. Reference and appendices are included at the end of the paper.

CHAPTER TWO

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE

2.1. The concept of Work Motivation

The word motivation is derived from a Latin word “Movere” which literally means “to move” Rajput (2011:5). The term motive usually is explained as desires, needs, emotions or impulses that make someone do something good or bad. When we take into consideration work environment it becomes clear that work motivation refers to motivation within a work setup. As a result, it refers to employees’ motivation to perform, stay and commit in a company, cooperate, lead or support a leader, help customers and so forth. It is the process of providing reasons for people to work in the best interest of the organization.

After doing same thing for a while, a staff member could start losing interest and curiosity may start to fade. But this is not true for everyone. Some people lose the joy in their work. Some continue in their roles in order to maintain their comfortable salaries and secure benefits long after they have mentally quit. Others presume a job change is the only way to get back that long-lost enthusiasm (Harrington, 2004:13). The above scenario captures the essence of the problem facing many organizations today. While other employees might be motivated to come to work, others may not for different reasons mentioned above and even more. This becomes management’s challenge to deal with employee inertia.

High morality of the employee results from different positive aspects to the job and the firm, for example, being recognized in the workplace and being financially secured. As indicated by Skinner (1953: 56), the concept of employee motivation has been clearly understood but rarely practiced. Skinner (1953: 56) stated that in order to understand motivation, there lays great need in understanding human beings. In this regard, human motivation has been strongly correlated with the level of human behavior; meaning the higher the level of motivation, the better the behavior. With this in mind, it has been concluded that, proper employee motivation leads to good organizational behavior, increased employee efficiency and output.

2.2. Motivation Theories

The subject of motivation has been present in the literature from the early beginning of 20th Century. Although, many theories have been developed and a plenty of

research has been conducted, factors that motivate people to perform well at work are still a controversial topic. Many researchers as a starting point for their work in the field of motivation used the most known theories and models of motivation. These theories are discussed below.

2.2.1. Content theories

The most well known and very often cited author of motivational theory is Maslow with his hierarchy of human needs. In his point of view human behavior is driven by the existence of unsatisfied needs. According to his theory the lower level needs have to be satisfied first before going to next higher level. According to Maslow, human need starts from psychological needs and lead through security needs, social needs, self esteem needs and self-actualization need. (Maslow,1943)

Maslow divided needs into two categories: deficiency needs and high-order needs. Deficiency needs include basic needs such as hunger or thirst and a need for shelter and protection. When these needs are satisfied people become motivated by high order needs such as the need for supportive and satisfactory relationships with others, needs for freedom, independence, recognition and achievement and finally the need to develop one's potential.

The self actualization which is the highest step in Maslow's pyramid can be described as the ending point of gradual psychological maturation process. This final level is achieved by few people and unlike other needs is never fully satisfied (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005:111).

Maslow's work on the theory of needs has been followed by other authors who took an attempt to improve it. One of modifications was presented in 1973 by Alderfer, who developed and tested model with fewer needs levels (Pinder, 1998). His study, unlike Maslow's, was based on empirical research in organizational settings. The theory suggests three general categories of human needs which are partly based on Maslow's model but are not the same. Alderfer's model is named ERG and consists of existence needs, relatedness needs and growth needs. The first group is closely related to Maslow's physiological needs and partly to security needs (only physical security). Existence needs are concrete in nature and are usually limited (Alderfer,1969).

Relatedness needs basically consist of the interpersonal security needs, the need for prestige and esteem from others. Satisfying relatedness needs requires development of relations and interactions with other people. The last group of needs in Alderfer's theory contains growth needs. Although, growth needs are corresponding to Maslow's self esteem and self actualization needs there are some major differences in a point of view of those two authors.

Maslow suggested that self-actualization consist of a fulfillment of unique, innate potential, whereas Alderfer's growth needs contain desire to interact with environment by investigating, exploring and mastering it. In Alderfer's model growth needs change if one's environment changes (Pinder, 1998).

The next important contributor to the field of content theories is McClelland whose model became a starting point for many other authors' research. McClelland's theory focuses on three motives that are relevant in an organizational context (Miner, 2006). Maslow differentiated between any certain transitions among the needs, whereas McClelland indicates that some people have higher needs than others. Moreover, needs in McClelland's point of view change over a life as they are shaped by peoples' experience. That is why in some sources his theory is called "acquired needs theory". McClelland (1990) suggested that most of acquired needs can be classified to one of three groups: achievement needs, power needs or affiliation needs. In his opinion some people have a strong need for achievement others for power and finally there is a group that desire affiliation. High achievers tend to perform better for the intrinsic satisfaction for doing something better or just to show that they are more capable of doing something. They prefer to work with tasks which are moderately challenging and they actually perform better with those kinds of tasks. In one of their papers McClelland and Burnham (1976) deliberate on what makes people good managers. They suggest that high achievement is an important factor that leads to the personal success but it does not necessarily make someone a good manager. High achievers work on their own success by doing everything personally and by receiving feedback that is crucial for them. Managers are not able to do everything by themselves so they have put some responsibility on others. As well as that, the feedback that they receive comes with a delay, so they are not able to find out immediately how well they performed. Regarding those facts McClelland and Burnham stated their opinion that the factor that has a great influence on being a successful manager is something else

than a need for achievement. They suggested that it is the need for power that is characterized by a desire to influence people. McClelland (1990) found that people who desire to have some serious influence on others have some special traits. The high need for power usually comes with features such as competitiveness, assertiveness and aggressiveness which result in a negative self-image. The socially acceptable way to fulfill the need for power is the search for prestige by collecting symbols of power. People characterized by a high need for power tend to act in a way that makes them recognized in a group. Finally, they are more willing to take a risk. The last group of needs described by McClelland's model is the group of needs for affiliation. The term affiliation was described by Atkinson, Hens, & Verity (1954), as "the concern over establishing, maintaining, or restoring a positive, affective relationship with another person or persons" (as cited in McClelland, 1990: 347). People with a strong need for affiliation perform better in tasks which are related to affiliative incentives. In other words, they prefer if their work requires maintaining contacts with other people. High affiliated individuals avoid conflict and prefer to solve problems by cooperative and confirmative behavior. The reason for that is the fear for rejection. McClelland's findings suggested that the need for affiliation is not a factor that supports management. Managers high in affiliation try to spend more time with employees and make good relations with them, but it is not a crucial part of being a manager, who sometimes has to make hard decisions (McClelland, 1990: 340-341).

The last content theory that will be presented in this chapter is Herzberg's two factor theory. The theory brought a lot of interest from academics and from managers who were looking for ways of motivating their employees. The reason for so much interest in Herzberg's results comes from a dual character of his work. His theory not only describes employees' needs but also goes further and presents how to enrich jobs and make workforce more motivated (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005). Herzberg indicates that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction are not opposite phenomena (Herzberg, 1968).

According to him the opposite of satisfaction is rather no satisfaction and the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction. Herzberg suggests that the factors that involve job content (motivation factors) tend to lead to job satisfaction. When these factors are not present on the job, workers do not tend to be dissatisfied – they are simply "not satisfied." Workers who are "not satisfied" do not tend to restrict productivity,

they just don't get involved in their job or put forth the extra effort to do a good job. Workers who are "satisfied" put forth that extra effort and productivity increases.

He also explained that factors that involve job context (hygiene factors) tend to lead to job dissatisfaction. When these factors are considered good, or acceptable, workers do not tend to become "satisfied", they simply become "not dissatisfied." Productivity is not restricted – it is just held at an acceptable level. When workers become dissatisfied with any of these factors they tend to restrict output.

People are satisfied at their work by factors related to content of that work. Those factors are called intrinsic motivators and contain achievement, recognition, interesting work, responsibility, advancement and growth. Factors that make people unhappy with their work are called dissatisfiers or hygiene factors. Herzberg found following dissatisfiers: company policy, supervision, working conditions, interpersonal relationships, salary, status, security. What makes them different from motivators is the fact that they are not related to the content of the work but to the context of the job (Herzberg, 1974).

In Herzberg's research the most frequently chosen factors which led to satisfaction were achievement and recognition, while the most frequently chosen factors which led to dissatisfaction were company policy and administration and good relations with supervisor.

Each of presented here content theories has some strengths and weaknesses. It might have happened that authors of those theories focused strongly on a one side of the problem but they missed other important side. Motivation of employees is really important topic, so every research in this subject is observed and evaluated by other researchers. As a result some researchers agree with and support original theories and others disagree and criticize them. In other words, the most well known theories in motivation bring some serious controversies. As an example, Maslow theory became popular despite a little evidence for its validity. As well as that, very often it seems to be presented in an oversimplified way (Pinder, 1998). Moreover, Maslow's originally did not intend to create a theory that will be used to explain organizational behavior.

Finally, his hierarchy does not appear in some circumstances, so it cannot be generalized to the whole population (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005). The validity was

taken in consideration in evaluation of Alderfer's theory. Also McClelland's theory was followed by many others researchers who tried to check if author was right (Rauch & Freese, 2000; Aditya, House & Kerr, 2000; Shane, Locke, & Collins, 2003; Vecchio, 2003; as cited in Miner, 2005). In fact their results were not always completely supportive for McClelland's model. Herzberg's two-factor theory was criticized for biases caused by selection of just two occupational groups. Another reason for skepticism is the fact that people tend to explain their success by internal factors and their failure by external reasons. That could influence their choices of intrinsic motivators in relation to satisfaction and of external, organizational factors in relation to dissatisfaction (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005). Herzberg results were also attacked because he did not try to measure relationship between performance and satisfaction (Armstrong, 2007). As can be seen from this short overview of controversies and overlaps on content theories not every theory managed to defend itself during decades. However most of them influenced the growth of interest in the topic of work motivation. In the next part of this paper more recently developed theories will be described and analyzed.

2.2.2. Process theories

Process theories are characterized by a dynamic character, not static as content theories. The main concern is not what motivates people but how motivation occurs. Process theories try to explain how and why peoples' behavior is directed to certain choices. The focus of all process theories is put on "the role of individual's cognitive processes in determining his or her level of motivation" (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005: 202). The process theory which seems to be the core one is the Expectancy Theory. This model was originally presented by Vroom (1968), however many other later researchers tried to adapt and develop it. Vroom's Expectancy theory comprises three factors: valence, instrumentality and expectancy. Vroom describes valence in a relation to peoples' affecting preferences toward particular outcomes. The valence of outcome is positive if a person prefers attaining it instead of not attaining.

On the other hand, the negative valence of outcomes characterize situation when a person prefers not attaining it instead of attaining. The third possibility is zero valence of outcome, which means that a person is indifferent between attaining outcome or not. The instrumentality is a belief that one action lead to another.

Finally, the expectancy is defined as a belief about likelihood that a particular behavior will be followed by a particular outcome (Vroom, 1964). Values of those three factors can be used to calculate the motivational force of the job, Summarizing, Vroom's theory suggests that a job is motivating for employees when they can see a relation between performance and outcome, if they have abilities to do the job and if they see outcome as satisfying their needs. Vroom's theory can be a suggestion for managers to focus on main aspects of their subordinates perceptions. As well as that, it is helpful in explaining occupational choices and in predicting tasks that people will work most and least hard at (Fincham & Rhodes, 2005). Another group of process theories - equity theories, are related to the distribution of resources. There are three main aspects that are common for all equity theories. Firstly, they suggest that employee perceive a fair return for his contribution at work. Secondly, they imply that employees compare the return they received to the return received by other for the same job.

Finally, they assume that employees who are in inequitable position comparing to others will try to do something to reduce the difference (Carrell & Dittich, 1978). The most influential and often cited in the literature of motivation is the Equity Theory, which was put forward in 1963 by Adams. The theory distinguishes between employee's inputs and outputs. Inputs are understood as the number and value of contributions that person make to his or her work. Outputs are described as the nature and quantity of received rewards for doing the job (Pinder, 1998). Examples of inputs and outputs are presented in time seniority pay satisfaction experience training status perks abilities education fringe benefits advancement

According to Adam's theory different employees stress different inputs and outcomes as the most important for them. However, all people evaluate their outcomes in a relation to their inputs and judge a fairness of this relation. What is suggested by the theory is the fact that people not only evaluate the equity by comparing the amount of their inputs and outputs but additionally they make social comparisons with other people. They feel that they are not treated fairly if other people receive better outputs for the same job. As was stated before, employees who encounter inequity try to do something to reduce it. The equity theory presents the most common consequences of perceived inequity. The first and the most common behavior is changing employee's own effort to increase or reduce performance. If it is not possible to solve the problem

of unfairness by changing effort then employee try to cognitively reevaluate outcomes and inputs. That means for example reconsideration of own credentials or effort in a comparison to credentials or effort of a person who was chosen as a referent. The inequity may lead to some dysfunctional reactions such as stealing from employer. Finally, employee may simply decide to withdraw from a company (Pinder, 1998).

Any chapter related to the process theories of motivation would not be complete without mentioning results of Locke and Latham's work. Those authors introduced the goal setting motivation technique which, according to them, is not only more effective than other methods, but also can be treated as a support for them (Locke & Latham, 1979). In their approach a goal is defined as an object or aim of an action that is attained in a specific limit of time. The one of their core findings is that the highest level of performance and effort are produced when the difficulty level of attaining goals is also very high.

The only limit here is an ability of a person who tries to attain a goal. Authors found that people perform better if a specific difficult goal is set than if they are asked to perform as well as they can (Locke & Latham, 2002). What was surprising in Locke and Latham (1990) results was that performance does not differ regardless goals are assigned to people or if people participate in choosing their own goals. Authors explain it by the fact that usually superior that assigns the goal is treated like an authority. Moreover, the act of assigning a goal means that superior believes that subordinate has ability to fulfill that goal. In a result people became motivated to prove their competences. Finally, the assigned goals are helpful with defining peoples' standards used to attain their self satisfaction from performance (Bandura, 1988, as cited in Locke & Latham, 1990). If there is an influence of setting goals on peoples' performance there must be some mechanism that explains it. In fact, Locke and Latham (2002) basing on their own research and other researchers results (LaPorte & Nath, 1976; Wood & Locke, 1990), distinguished even four of them. First, goals direct effort and attention toward all activities that are related to achieving them.

Difficult goals lead to more effort than easy goals, so it can be said that goals in general have energizing function. Moreover, they prolong effort, so they affect persistence. The forth mechanism is an indirect action caused by goals that lead to the

discovery, arousal or to use of task-relevant strategies and knowledge. The influence of goals on performance can be stronger in some circumstances. The one of them is a situation where an employee is committed to his goal, which occurs when the attainment of a goal is important for him and he believes that he is able to achieve it. Another important factor that was mentioned by authors is a feedback that helps people to adjust a level of effort needed to attain the goal (Locke & Latham, 2002).

2.3. The effects of motivation on employees performance

The authors of theories presented in previous parts of this paper tried to explain what motivate people to work. The answer to this question is important because it is obviously good to understand what influence people behavior. However, it is not the only reason for a great interest in the topic of motivation. Managers might look for ways to motivate employees because they assume that motivation can lead to some positive outcomes for a company.

Based on the research conducted by Harpaz (1990), level of employee motivation has been shown to have a significant impact on the way employee perform their duties. Hatch and Cunliffe (2006: 102) stated that motivated employees are always in the endeavors of looking for better ways of doing their job. This phenomenon leads to innovation and invention in the organization. With this in mind, the issue of efficiency and quality is adequately addressed thus leading to higher levels of organizational performance (Hamidi et al 2010).

Kovach (1987: 58) depicted that motivation leads to higher levels of employee productivity and the higher profitability of the organization. It has been realized that highly motivated employees are more productive. This is in relation to the higher levels of commitment demonstrated by employees in their job (Hamidi et al 2010: 4178). The levels of accuracy have also been enhanced through motivation, whereby instances of reckless and laxity among the employees have been countered. As stated by Higgins (1994: 134), motivation ensures that employees are highly focused to their work and the organizational objectives. This ensures that the issue of time wastage is avoided as well as minimization of conflicts (Lanfranchi et al (2010: 75).

However it should be noted that, motivation and performance cannot be treated as equivalent phenomena. The distinction between them was noted by Vroom (1964). He suggested that effective accomplishment of a task is not only related to motivation but

also to other factor. The picture that emerged from his studies suggested that even if people are motivated they cannot perform well if they do not possess abilities to fulfill the task. In Vroom's point of view motivation and abilities are equally important. In his opinion more is to be gained by increasing ability from people who are highly motivated to accomplish the task than from those who are not motivated. Vroom used indication from existing data and described relationship between motivation and performance as an inverted U function.

In other words performance is not constantly and always tend to increase when level motivation is rising. Vroom (1964) cited an early study of Yerkes and Dodson (1908) which showed that that highest level of motivation does not lead to the highest performance, especially when the task is difficult. In fact, extremely high levels of motivation lead to lower performance than moderate levels. This relation is explained in two ways. First assumes that high levels of motivation narrow the cognitive field. Second suggests that highly motivated people are afraid of failure and that results in a lower performance. Other authors mentioned several factors that might limit employees' performance such as restricted practices of their superiors, limits of company policies and physical work environment – lightening, temperature, noise or availability of materials (Hall, 1994; Baron, 1994, as cited in Pinder, 1998)

Limitations of peoples' performance is an important subject. However, it seems that there are more studies that search for the answer to the question what can positively influence performance of employees. Companies often use incentives to motivate their employees. Meta-analysis on the effects of incentives on workplace performance conducted by Condly, Clark and Stolovitch (2008), shows some interesting findings. The authors found that average effect of all incentive programs in all work settings lead to 22% gain in performance. It means that incentives can significantly increase performance but, as authors claim, they have to be carefully implemented. Results of this study indicated that some settings are better than others to increase performance. For example, if we take into consideration incentive programs it comes up that they lead to better performance of employees if a mechanism of the program includes competition between employees to earn a bonus. Another important feature of incentives programs is their length. Long programs increase performance more significantly than short programs. One of the greatest differences between levels of performance in authors' analysis was between incentives offered to teams and

individuals. Team directed incentives have much stronger effect on performance than individual directed incentives (Condly, Clark and Stolovitch, 2008).

Finally, incentives have less significant impact if they are used to get people do something than to get people do the job in a smarter way or to be more persistent at job that people already started. The last important finding of the study was a relation between a type of incentives and performance.

Studies indicated that monetary incentives resulted in a higher performance than nonmonetary incentives (Condly, Clark, & Stolovitch, 2008). Frey and Osterloch (2002) in their book about successful management by motivation stressed an important fact that can explain relation between performance and motivation. They suggested that different people have different goals in their life. Therefore, particular motivators influence performance of individuals differently. There are employees who are motivated extrinsically. Authors divided them into two types: Income maximizers and Status seekers. Income maximizers are only interested in earning money for consumption goods and they find work an unpleasant duty. Status seekers search for social comparisons. Work for them is a tool to gain “positional goods” that shows their high status. Employees can be also motivated intrinsically.

There are three groups of them characterized by specific features. Loyalists identify personally with the goals of company they work for. Formalists are focused on procedures and rules existing in a company, while Autonomists pursuit for own ideology. Defining those types of employees helps to predict which kind of motivators are effective in increasing individuals’ performance. As an example, performance-related pay increases performance of Income maximizers, especially when it is paid out as money rather than fringe benefits (Frey and Osterloch,2002).

The condition that has to be met is that employees see clear relationship between compensation and performance. Status seekers can also be motivated by wages as long as they let them distinguish themselves from other people. In their case compensation does not have to be in a form of money. They would rather prefer other benefits that directly show their status. Performance-related pay can also reduce performance. Loyalist may understand this kind of rewarding as a signal that their work is considered by company as inadequate. Formalists also may feel that company tries to change the way they work. Finally, Autonomists would lose their intrinsic

motivation because their self fulfilling work concept is put on doubt. Not-financial rewards also need to be matched with employees' types. For example praise would be desired by Status seekers but would be not motivating at all for Income maximizers who cannot buy anything for it. Autonomist may feel that management try to absorb them into the organization and Formalists may not appreciate praise as they "just do their job". Another way to increase performance is implementing commands and sanctions. This way would be effective for Formalists who understand them as a guide. On the other hand, it can dramatically reduce performance of other types of employees. Income maximizers, Status seekers, Loyalist and Autonomist see commands as restrictions, what result in crowding-out their intrinsic motivation to work. Participation can be helpful tool that positively affect performance of Autonomist but it would be treated as waste of time by Income maximizers and Status Seekers as they are not interested in the work itself. Finally, autonomy understood as possibility to make own decision is crucial for Loyalist and would definitely increase their performance. For other types of employees autonomy would not be an effective way of increasing their efforts. The characteristics of employees' types presented here suggest that people have different expectations and desires at work. Some rewards can be really rewarding for them but others are rather seen as factors that negatively influence their performance (Frey & Osterloch, 2002).

The question that occurs in this point is what motivate people in a better way; monetary or non-monetary ways? If non-monetary ways influence staff performance, what ways are there to motive employees? Those problems are broadly discussed by many researchers and professionals and seem to bring many opposite opinions.

2.4. Monetary motivators versus non-monetary motivators

The overview of content and process theories brings some important findings. Definitely a motivation influence on employees' performance exists. Motivation can be described as intrinsic and extrinsic. Some factors are more motivating then others. Researchers put much effort to find out which of them are the best motivators. The most common factors that are taken into consideration comes from two categories: monetary and non-monetary incentives. As Armstrong (2007) wrote, money is a motivator because it satisfies a lot of needs. It is a factor which is indispensable for life and which is needed to satisfy basic needs of survival and security. Higher needs

such as self-esteem can also be satisfied by it. Money let people buy things that show their status and create a visible sign of appreciation. In other words, money is a symbol of many intangible goals what makes it a powerful motivating factor. Some credible studies confirm that in fact money is a good motivator, while others, equally disagree. Rynes, Gerhart and Minette (2004) in their study on the importance of pay in employee motivation found that money is not a motivator for every person and not in every circumstance. However, it is an important factor for most people. Authors suggest that money is much more important in peoples' actual choices than in their responses to the question about importance of money as a motivator. That might lead to an underestimation of monetary rewards as one of motivating factors in job settings. A comparison of researches where respondents were asked to rank factors that motivate them with researches on actual behavior shows that people list money on a fifth position among other motivating factors while in actual behavior money is almost always the most effective motivator. One of explanation for that is that respondents tend to give the answer which is socially desirable. If they are asked what motivates other people, the most common answer is money.

Similarly, if respondents' role is to evaluate attractiveness of holistic job alternative, they most often choose jobs which are characterized by higher level of salaries. The results indicate that people if asked indirectly about importance of money as a motivator rank it much higher than if the question is stated directly.

As was stated at the beginning of this chapter money seems to be controversial topic related to motivating employees. There are many supporters of financial incentives but on the other hand, there is a large group of researchers who neglect the fact that money is a good motivator. Some of them are very critic about it. For example, McClelland (1968, p23) writes that "money isn't nearly so potent a motivating force as theory and common sense suggest it should be". As an example he cites other authors' research that showed no influence of money on peoples' motivation in boring and fatiguing jobs but indicated other factors that had influence such as freedom to schedule their work by employees. The results that support McClelland words come from *McKinsey Quarterly* recent survey conducted in June 2009 (Dewhurst, Guthridge, & Mohr, 2009). Responses received from 1,047 executives, managers, and employees around the world showed that three noncash motivators (praise from immediate managers, leadership attention, a chance to lead projects or task forces) are

more effective motivators than the three highest-rated financial incentives (cash bonuses, increased base pay, and stock or stock options). The study on health workers motivation which was not related to business environment also showed that non-financial motivators play important role in employees' motivation (Mathauer & Imhoff, 2006). Presented examples support hypothesis that money is not as good motivator as it is said to be. This might result in asking which motivators have stronger influence on employees' behavior than money.

One of the non-financial motivators that plays important role in shaping employees' behavior is job design. Authors of the Job Characteristic Model as a core of their theory presented three psychological states (Experienced Meaningfulness of the Work, Experienced Responsibility for Outcomes of the Work, Knowledge of the Actual Results of the Work Activities) and related them to job characteristics and personal and work outcomes. In their opinion if employees experience the work to be meaningful, feel personally responsible for outcomes and have knowledge of the results of their work it results in their motivation to perform well (Oldham & Hackman, 2010). Oldham & Hackman based their work on Vroom's expectancy theory. According to Vroom's theory there are two variables that determine motivation: effort reward probability and reward value or valence. Changes in job design may influence individuals' motivation if they change the value of outcomes which are dependent on effort or if they positively affect employees' beliefs about the probability of results in relation to the level of needed effort. The one of important determinants of job design is its content. Lawler presented three characteristics of job that may lead to employees' assumption that their good performance will bring intrinsic rewards.

First, employees must receive meaningful feedback that let them evaluate their performance. Second, job must require using abilities that employee value – that will result in the feeling of accomplishment and growth. And third, employees must have control on setting their goals - that will bring the feeling of self control. Lawler going further into the topic propose job design changes that lead to work enlargement. One of them is the number and variety of task that employee do (vertical enlargement).

The other one is a degree to which employee controls planning and execution of his job (horizontal enlargement). In Lawler's opinion the best effect can be achieved if

both ways of changing job design are used simultaneously. The additional finding was that job enlargement lead to increased product quality more than to increased productivity (Lawler, 1969). To summarize, it can be said that well designed job is meaningful for employees. It improves workers morale and positively influences their productivity what results in a better overall performance of a company.

The job can be made meaningful by involving employee in a problem solving by letting him plan, organize and control the job that he does. The level of responsibility and freedom given to employee is closely related to the leadership style that characterizes his superior. Roche and MacKinnon (1970) developed a program for managers that helps motivate their employees. The crucial goal of this program is to make work meaningful. Theoretical base for the meaningful work program was the Motivation-maintenance theory, which says that employees are motivated by challenging tasks that lead to growth, advancement, recognition and achievement, and well known Theory X & Y by McGregor that distinguished two managerial styles. The first one is characterized by bureaucracy and authoritarianism while the other one by a democratic approach to employees that gives them a chance for being creative and responsible. Authors of the meaningful-work program suggested that leaders should not act in a traditional way by setting goal, defining standards and controlling results. Instead of that they should participate with employees in solving their problems, setting their goals and enable them to check their performance. This approach to motivating by appropriate leadership style was confirmed in a practice. The research results showed significant increase in morale and production level (Roche & MacKinnon, 1970). As some authors suggest (Allender & Allender, 1998) leadership style of managers should be matched with a proper style of teams. The combinations of two variables (a concern with task and a concern with relationships) were used to group leaders.

Another often used tool to motivate employees is recognition. Indeed, it can be a powerful reinforcer that affects peoples' performance. Employee not only wants to know how well he performed but also desires the feeling that his effort is appreciated. Recognition is a reward for employee's performance that is defined as "acknowledgement, approval and genuine appreciation (not phony praise)" (Luthans & Stajkovic, 2000: 1). There are several ways in which recognition can occur. It can be a verbal or written praise, formal or informal, administrated on public or privately.

Research shows that recognition indeed has a positive influence on employees' motivation. A motivational function of recognition can be explained by the Reinforcement Theory and the Social Cognitive theory (Luthans & Stajkovic, 2000). Those theories suggest relating recognition to the real achievements and rewarding them immediately after accomplishment (Armstrong & Murlis, 2004). The Maritz Pool Survey (www.maritz.com) conducted in 2005 on 1002 employees showed that managers do not meet employees' needs regarding recognition. The most often used form of recognition is a verbal praise. Results show that just 50% of employees want to receive it and 40% would rather prefer written praise.

Personality might be an important factor that creates people preferences about the form of recognition. Some people may be proud to be honored in a front of wide public, whereas the others might be simply embarrassed. The main and the most important finding of this study is that a great part of employees agrees that recognition motivate them and affect their performance. Summarizing, recognition can be a powerful tool used to motivate employees. It is desired by employees and significantly increases their performance. Some authors (Luthans & Stajkovic, 1999) suggest that social reinforcers such as recognition may affect employees' performance at the same level as pay.

The approaches presented in this subchapter show that there is no clear answer to the question which kind of motivators are the best to increase peoples' performance. There is a strong support for the economic man approach which priorities money as a motivating factor. On the other hand there is a group of researchers who completely disagree with that model saying that money does not significantly affect peoples' motivation. Finally, there is a number of researchers who do not focus on money at all. Instead of that they put their interest and effort to analyze other motivators. Their findings show the importance of leadership style and language used by leaders in increasing subordinates' performance. They suggest that job design is a crucial in motivating employees. Also recognition is considered by some of them as a powerful motivator. The question that may come out after reading the overview of those complimentary or sometimes opposite models is what employees themselves think that motivates them the most. The answer to this question will be searched in the next subchapter.

2.5. Motivation factors – employee choices

Employee motivation can be investigated in many different ways. The one of approaches to research on employee motivation is looking for factors that are most often chosen by employees when they are asked to decide what motivates them at work. The most common method to collect data in this kind of studies is a survey. It usually consists of a number of motivating factors that are supposed to be ranked or assessed. There is a long history of research on motivating factors. Sonawane (2008) in her paper about rewards mentioned the most important studies on this topic. As she suggests one of the first survey about motivating factors was conducted by Lindhal in 1949. The result of those studies indicated “full appreciation of work done”, “feeling of being in on things” and “interesting work” as the most important motivators for employees. Another mentioned author who through questionnaires distinguished the most important factors was Herzberg (1968). He suggested that the order for crucial factors is following: Security, Interesting work, Opportunity for advancement, Appreciation, Company and management, Intrinsic aspects of the job. Another example comes from Keller’s (1965) research. In his research ranking was opened by Job satisfaction on the first position and was followed by Pride in organization, Relation with fellow workers, Relation with superiors, Treatment by management, Opportunity to use ideas, Opportunity to offer suggestions at work and Appreciation of one’s effort. Sonawane (2008) cited Jurgensen (1978) as his studies showed interesting differences between subgroups of respondents. The study was conducted on a sample of fifty-seven thousands job applicants. It showed significant difference between male and female choices regarding motivating factors.

Males indicated Security, Advancement, Opportunity and Type of work while females chose type of work, company and security as the most important factors. Another cited study was conducted by Sharma (1989) in 51 organizations in India. Author found that Safety, Security and Monetary benefits were recognized as the most important by Indian workers. As was suggested in a previous chapter of this paper leadership style plays important role in motivating employees. This suggestion is confirmed by results of the survey that asked people to rank factors taken into consideration when they decide whether take the job or not. Respondents’ choices included Open communication, Effects on personal/family life, Nature of work, Management quality (Nelson, 2001, as cited in Sonawane, 2008). Job design factors

such as Advancement opportunities, Flexible work schedules and Opportunities to learn new skills were chosen in a survey by Watson Wyatt in 2006 (as cited in Sonawane, 2008). Kinnear and Sutherland (2000) focused on knowledge workers and factors that motivated that occupational group. They found that financial reward and recognition was the motivator ranked at first place. Knowledge workers were also strongly motivated by Freedom to act independently, Developmental opportunities and Access to new technologies. A comparison of this study with other studies leads to the conclusion that specific occupational groups may be motivated by other factors than other groups.

The difference between groups of respondents was also noticed by Kovach (1980, 1987, and 1995). His studies seem to cover many important areas from previous research on motivational factors mentioned in this short overview. Moreover, he was followed by other researchers who replicated or modified his researches to find out more about the topic. All these features make Kovach's work interesting and therefore will be a subject of more detailed analysis.

Kovach has been doing research and practically work on employees' motivation for over 20 years. He conducted survey in 25 organizations and had responses from 1000 participants. Respondents were asked to rank factors and the three most important factors in respondents' opinion were Interesting job, full appreciation of work done and Feeling of being on things.

Kovach compared those findings with findings from similar surveys from 1946 and 1980. The comparison showed the difference between answers from 1946 and both later surveys. Workers in the middle of the century on the first position placed full appreciation of work done. Interesting work was placed on the sixth position and sympathetic help with personal problems was on the third position - much higher than in later studies. Those differences could be caused by economic growth and changes in standard of living. The difference between employees' choices in the different points of time is interesting but it was not the main finding of Kovach's studies. The crucial part of Kovach's research was comparison of responses given by employees and supervisors who were asked to rank factors that motivate their subordinates. It became clear that supervisors have very inaccurate perceptions about their employees needs.

The most important factors for employees according to managers were: 1. Good wages, 2. Job security, 3. Promotion and growth in the organization. Supervisors' answers were the same in different points of time. Kovach (1987, 1995) suggests possible reasons for such significant differences. Employees might give more socially desired answers, but on the other hand they may be simply better witnesses of own motivation than their supervisors. Supervisors may choose factors that they are not directly responsible for, such as wages. Finally, managers might be motivated by other factors than employees. Possibly, by taking themselves as a reference point they rank factors in a different way than people on lower positions. Another step that Kovach (1995) took was comparing subgroups. He indicated that there was no statistically significant difference between males and females. However, it could be noticed in the ranking that women chose Full appreciation of work done on the first position while men chose Interesting work. The comparison between different age groups showed that employees who were under 30's were characterized by similar answers as supervisors. Differences were also observed between groups with lowest income and lowest position in the organization and groups with high income and position. Kovach's studies were replicated by other authors. Linder's research (1998) indicated Interesting work and Good wages as the most important motivators for university workers. Results from a survey conducted by Harpaz (1990) on a representative sample of employees in seven countries showed the same two factors as the most important motivators. Fischer and Yuan's research (1998) also compared employees from various countries. They indicated that Chinese employees ranked Good wages, Good working conditions and Personal loyalty of boss as the most important factors. Their findings showed that Chinese managers, oppositely to US managers, were able to provide appropriate answers to the question what motivate their employees.

2.6. Job Satisfaction

There has been significant research done around job satisfaction in recent times, with many researchers trying to understand and define what this term means. The simplest definition comes from Specter (1997) who described job satisfaction as a feeling people have about the different aspects of the job. Job satisfaction can have an impact on one's attitude towards their job. According to Robbins, Odendaal and Roodt (2003), people who are satisfied with their job will demonstrate a positive attitude

towards their work, while people who are not satisfied will demonstrate a negative attitude towards their work. Obtaining satisfaction in one's job, according to Cherrington (1994), is a result of the following factors: colleagues at work, remuneration, managers, and job tasks and variety. According to Kreitner and Kinicki (2008) this results in needs fulfillment, met expectations, value attainment, equity and dispositional or generic components.

Herzberg's Theory stated that satisfaction on the job depends on two issues, namely: Hygiene issues (dissatisfiers) which cannot motivate employees but can possibly minimize dissatisfaction. If handled properly, these issues are directly related to the employees' environment and motivators (Satisfiers) create satisfaction by fulfilling an individual's need for meaning and personal growth (Syptak, Marshland & Ulmer, 1999).

2.6.1. Skills variety

Bottomley (1983) defines skill variety as the degree to which a job requires a variety of different activities, and the use of a number of different skills and talents of the employee. This could also be purely individually based i.e. if an individual prefers to focus on one task that he/she is good at and nothing else, then the job characteristic of skill variety will demotivate the employee, leading to job dissatisfaction and resulting in a decrease in the productivity/performance of this individual (Bottomley, 1983). However, if the individual prefers a challenge and wants no two days to be the same then this characteristic would result in a motivated and productive employee (Bottomley, 1983).

2.6.2. Task identity

Task identity is the ability of the individual to perform all the tasks required to complete a job. A simple explanation would be to perform a job from beginning to end with a visible outcome. For example, an individual who builds something from start to finish would most likely be able to identify more with the task than someone who works on a production line (Jones & George, 2008).

2.6.3. Task significance

Task significance means the task must be significant to you as an individual. It is important for an employee to know why he/she is performing the task and its substantial impact on the organization and other staff. Task significance has been found to give people a sense of personal satisfaction. Methods to increase task significance are to encourage feedback from relevant parties and to provide regular and timely feedback, as well as providing praise and recognition (Bottomley, 1983).

2.6.4. Autonomy

Autonomy is the degree to which an employee has freedom and independence to make decisions pertaining to his/her job, resulting in empowerment of an employee (Jones and George, 2008). It is important that an employee feels trusted in his/her position; although the employee must be managed it is important to allow for flexibility of autonomy on a day-to-day basis. Ways of providing autonomy would be to provide the employee with the scope to make decisions within the limits of his/her job, supporting decisions made by the employee whether right or wrong within the appropriate parameters, minimizing checkups once the employee becomes comfortable with the responsibility, and setting goals for employees to achieve and allowing them to use their own initiative to achieve them (Bottomley, 1983).

2.7. Organizational productivity

Charles, Danforth and Veitch (2004) stated that organizational productivity is a measure of the output of goods and services relative to its inputs. The primary goal of an organization is to decrease cost while increasing outputs, thus ensuring the organization is as profitable as possible (Charles et al, 2004). According to Cascio (1995) the more productive a company is, the better its competitive position will be, as its unit costs are lower. Improving organizational productivity simply means getting more out of what is put in. Productivity is a performance measure encompassing both efficiency and effectiveness. High performing, effective organizations have a culture that encourages employee involvement. Therefore, employees are more willing to get involved in decision making, which results in increasing employee performance (Cascio, 1995).

2.7.1. Productivity outputs

According to Charles et al (2004) people often consider organizational productivity to be the output an individual produces. This approach only provides a partial view of an organization's productivity as employees jobs have become more complex in the modern work environment, which has made productivity difficult to measure. In the past, output from a job was relatively easy to measure, due to employees having roles which were repetitive. Charles et al (2004) suggest that, in some cases, it would be easier to measure output at an aggregate level as almost all organizations have data reflecting their sales revenue, market share and other relevant management information. On the other hand, some organizational output variables are hard to measure in financial terms, especially if the output relates to delivery of a service. Without being able to quantify this and other output measures, it is difficult to evaluate the effectiveness of steps taken to improve productivity in an organization.

2.7.2. Productivity levels

According to (Cascio, 1995) productivity is directly linked to how motivated a person is to perform a task or activity. Many businesses devote much time and effort to finding ways to motivate employees. Work enhancement programmes that are built on ways to motivate workers can optimize productivity (Cascio, 1995). When an employee is satisfied and motivated in what they do, organizational productivity will increase. As long as employees perceive that their total compensation is equitable and that their benefits are fairly priced, productivity can be achieved (Cascio, 1995). According to Miller and Morge (1986), job satisfaction increases productivity through bringing high quality motivation and through increasing work capabilities at time of implementation. According to Grant (2008), studies have revealed that when people experience the results of their work on a first-hand basis they then perceive their work as being socially valued and as having a tangible impact on society. This makes them feel more loyal to the people who will be the end-users of their work. This results in them working harder and achieving higher performance and productivity (Grant, 2008).

Charles et al (2004) suggest that organizational productivity is not only dependent on job satisfaction, but on a plethora of factors. These include an employee's commitment to the organization, interaction with co-workers, creativity in completing tasks, and employee health and well-being.

CHAPTER THREE

RESEARCH DESIGN AND METHODOLOGY

3.1.Introduction

This chapter describes the methodology used for the study. The main issues discussed here are the research design, research population, sample and sampling technique, source of data and data collection methods, procedures of data collection and method of data analysis.

3.2.Research design

Although considerations surrounding convenience, timing and cost also influenced the decision regarding the choice of methodology, a quantitative research design was deemed appropriate, primarily because of the descriptive nature of the study. It allowed for the precise and objective measurement of the dimensions of the constructs of employee motivation, job satisfaction and employee productivity, as experienced by the respondents.

In this case, the arguments and ideas generated from the research are used based on rules, laws as well as accepted theories in the topic of employee motivation. The ideas of different scholars and philosophers in the fields of employee motivation are taken as a reference.

3.3.Population, Sample Size and Sampling Techniques

The target population of the study consists of all staff of Save the Children working at the Head Office. The total number of people forming the population is four hundred seventy eight(478).

As to the sample size determination, among from different methods, sample size calculator developed by Public service of creative research on line sample calculator system is used. This method is selected because of it is highly scientific and easy to use as compared with other sample size determination methods.

As indicated above the population size of the study is 478, taking confidence level of 95% and confidence interval of 5; 213 sample size is selected for the study.

The researcher chose the stratified random sampling method to select respondents for the study. The reason is that all types/categories of employees fall under the selected moderating variables and each of these categories have the opportunity to be sampled.

This method is believed to give more precise information than other sampling methods. The population was divided into relevant strata, and a simple random sampling technique was used to choose respondents from each stratum and combined them into overall sample in order to attain balanced representation in the sample.

Table 3: 1 presents the sample size description.

Table 3.1: Sample size description in number

Job classification	Population		Sample Size	
	No .	% age	No .	% age
Executive	24	5%	11	5%
Managerial & Specialized	148	31%	66	31%
Professional	143	30%	64	30%
Administrative & clerical	53	11%	23	11%
Manual & technical	110	23%	49	23%
Total	478	100%	213	100%

Proportionate number of staff is represented of each job classification in the sample size. For instance, staff under Executive job classification accounts 5% of the total population and for this reason the same proportion of staff under executive position are represented in the sample size. The same thing goes for each job classification as put in table 3:1. Majority of staff are under managerial and professional job classification while staff under executive job classification represents the lowest percentage of the total population.

Table 3.2: Sample size description by gender

Job classification	Population size						Sample size				
	No of staff	Male		Female			No of staff	Male		Female	
		No	%	No	%			No	%	No	%
Executive	24	14	58%	10	42%	11	6	58%	5	42%	
Managerial & Specialized	148	116	78%	32	22%	66	52	78%	14	22%	
Professional	143	80	56%	63	44%	64	36	56%	28	44%	
Administrative & clerical	53	13	25%	40	75%	23	6	25%	17	75%	
Manual & technical	110	71	65%	39	35%	49	32	65%	17	35%	
Total	478	294	62%	184	38%	213	132	62%	81	38%	

When looking into the total staff at head office level female staff accounts 38% while 62% are male staff. When selecting the sample size, proportionate percentage is allocated to male Vs female staff. When the composition is further looked at each job classification, the composition of male Vs female is not the same in all positions. Under administrative/clerical

job classification, the number of female staff is higher than male staff but under managerial position the number of male staff is higher than female staff by 56%.

3.4.Types of data and tools of data collection

Both primary and secondary data sources were used to conduct this study. Primary data source was used so that the researcher can interact with the source of information directly and get information that is original and suits the purpose of the study. Secondary data was also used in order to have better knowledge on the problem of statement and get different perspective of the variables under study.

Primary source of data was collected through questionnaires (Appendix 1) and interview (Appendix 2). Secondary sources of data were collected from company's HR manual, audit report, bi annual exit interview report; staff pulse survey, websites, academic journals, business periodicals, business magazines, books and conferences along with the works of various scholars, and researchers in the topic of motivation and job satisfaction and productivity.

3.5.Data collection procedures

In gathering the primary data a questionnaire comprising closed ended questions was distributed that filled out by the respondents. Questionnaire was used since its administration is comparatively inexpensive, enables respondents to complete at their convince, can easily reach large sample size and is believed to reduce chance of bias by the researcher because the same questions are asked to all respondents. Tabulation of closed-ended responses is also an easy and straightforward process

When developing the questionnaire, the researcher has gone through related theories and then came up with quite a lot of questions that were believed to be useful in obtaining appropriate responses from the target sample. Some questions were also adopted from Survey monkey webiste which; of course, was helpful in including the key elements of topic of discussion.

The questionnaires were distributed to the identified respondents through survey monkey (on line survey tool). This method was chosen as it helps save money and time by not printing out survey paper. Furthermore it maintains respondents' anonymity. A sample questionnaire is attached to this study as Appendix 1

In order to get an insight on what management has done in regards to workers productivity and their independent opinion on why performance is unsatisfactory or satisfactory, interview method is also used. The key informants for in depth interviews included 6 Senior Management Team (SMT). This was purposely intended to get more information about the effect of motivation on staff performance and compare it with that given by other staff. A sample Key informant interview guide is attached to this study as Appendix 2

3.6.Methods of data Analysis

Once data was collected, it was necessary to employ statistical techniques to analyze the information, as this study is quantitative in nature. Using the Statistical computer program, two-tailed Pearson correlation analysis was conducted to test the hypothesis of this research (using SPSS). The correlation analysis helped in determining both the form and degree of the relationship between staff motivation and job satisfaction on employee productivity. Thus, both the strength of the relationship between variables and the level of statistical significance were assessed.

Frequency tables were used to summarize the respondents profile in the form of frequency and percentages whereas the descriptive statistics such as mean and standard deviations of employees' answers to motivation level and employee job satisfaction scales were calculated in order to determine employees' productivity.

CHAPTER FOUR

DATA ANALYSIS AND INTERPRETATION

4.1.Introduction

This chapter presents the data collected via the internet-based survey done through monkey survey and compare variables to establish trends. In this chapter, comparisons are made between the different variables to establish to what extent each affects the other, if at all.

In order to understand the makeup of respondents, a demographic analysis was conducted first. This was followed by the analysis which directly relates to the research being carried out.

A total of 213 questionnaires were sent out, a total of 180 returned and 33 did not. Out of the 180 questionnaires collected, 166 were complete (about 93%) and analysis was made based on these questionnaires. If a survey is administered by email, acceptable response rate should fall between 40-60%. (www.utexas.edu). Accordingly, the research was conducted using 166 respondents.

4.2.Characteristics of respondents

The first part of the questionnaire consists of the demographic information of the respondents. This part of the questionnaire requested a limited amount of information related to personal and professional characteristics of the respondents. Accordingly, the following variables about the respondents were summarized and described in table 4.1.below. These variables include: the position, age, gender and year of service of the respondents in the organization.

Table 4.1 Demographic Makeup of Respondents

Job Classification	No of respondents	DEMOGRAPHIC COMPOSITION																	
		By Gender				By Age						By year of service in SC							
		M		F		18-31 yrs		32-45 yrs		Above 46 yrs		1-3 yrs		4-6 yrs		7-9 years		Above 10 yrs	
		N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%	N	%
Executive	11	6	6%	5	8%	0	0%	7	7%	4	36%	4	4%	5	22%	2	13%	0	0%
Managerial & Specialized	58	50	47%	8	13%	16	29%	42	42%	0	0%	50	51%	4	17%	3	20%	1	3%
Professional	45	29	27%	16	27%	11	20%	34	34%	0	0%	30	31%	4	17%	1	7%	10	33%
Administrative & clerical	20	3	3%	17	28%	7	13%	13	13%	0	0%	7	7%	1	4%	4	27%	8	27%
Manual & technical	32	18	17%	14	23%	21	38%	4	4%	7	64%	7	7%	9	39%	5	33%	11	37%
Total	166	106		60		55		100		11		98		23		15		30	

In Save the Children, jobs are classified into five major categories. The executive positions are the top management that report to the Country Director and they are the highest in the job classification; while the lowest job grades are manual and technical group that include positions like driver, guard, cleaner and so on.

The overall gender composition at head office level is 62% for male and 38% for female staff even though the percentage is not uniform when looked by each job category. However, since all selected respondents have not completed the questionnaire, when looking at the number of respondents, the percentage of gender composition is changed a little bit to 64% and 36% (106 male and 60 female). Except in Administrative/clerical job classification, number of male staff takes higher percentage when compared with female staff.

The majority of respondents fall into the age group of 32-45 followed by age group of 18-31 age categories. The majority of the respondents are managers or specialist, followed by professional position with combined rate of 61.5%. Manual and technical positions are at third, comprising of 23% of respondents. On the other hand, 10.5% of the respondents falls under administrative and clerical while executive position takes the smallest percentage.

60% of the respondents have been working for the organization for 1-3 years while 40% of the respondents have stayed in the organization for 4 years and above.

It has become important to look the result from different demographic makeup in order to understand the topic of study from different perspectives. According to different motivational theories, there are differences between what motivates employees and what employees want over time. For this reason the result is analyzed using different demographic markup like job classification, gender, age, year of service in the organization.

4.3. Analysis of data pertaining to the study

In this section, the data collected through the use of questionnaire and interview is tabulated, analyzed and interpreted to address the basic questions of the study by categorize it into the following three group.

1. Motivational factors that contribute to job satisfaction of Save the children staff
2. Factors that lead to dissatisfaction of staff
3. The extent to which motivation and job satisfaction influence productivity of employees

4.3.1. Motivational factors that contribute to job satisfaction of Save the Children staff

Different studies have reached at different result when it comes to what motivates people to perform well at work. To see which factors motivate staff to contribute towards job satisfaction at Save the Children, question was asked to the respondents to identify motivational factors that contribute to satisfaction in their work life. The respondent opinion is summarized in table 4:2 in the following page.

Table 4.2: Respondents' views on factors contributing to satisfaction in their work life

Factors contributing to job satisfaction	Total		Rank	Executive		Managerial & specialized		Professional		Administrative & clerical		Manual & technical	
	F	%age		F	%age	F	%age	F	%age	F	%age	F	%age
Remuneration	15	9%	4th	0	0%	1	2%	9	20%	3	15%	2	6%
Recognition	50	30%	1st	3	27%	9	16%	24	53%	6	30%	8	25%
Interpersonal relation	22	13%	3rd	0	0%	7	12%	3	7%	1	5%	11	34%
Supervision	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Achievement	37	22%	2nd	4	36%	26	45%	5	11%	2	10%	0	0%
Growth	6	4%	8th	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	6	19%
Work itself	9	5%	7th	0	0%	3	5%	1	2%	2	10%	3	9%
Working condition	12	7%	6th	2	18%	4	7%	0	0%	4	20%	2	6%
Responsibility	15	9%	4th	2	18%	8	14%	3	7%	2	10%	0	0%
Organization policy and administration	0	0%	0	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Total	166			11		58		45		20		32	

The table above illustrates that more than a quarter of respondents (30%) felt that recognition is the most prominent factor contributing for their motivation at the work place. The next most frequently mentioned factor was achievement, with 22% and for 13% of respondents interpersonal relation was the most important motivating factor. The factor that was least frequently mentioned was growth, with only 4% of respondents selecting this as a motivating factor.

Remuneration and responsibility have also been selected as the 4th most motivating factors that contribute towards satisfaction. Employees under professional job classification take the majority share of selecting remuneration as their motivating factor when compared with other job classification. Considering the total percentage

of staff that selected responsibility as their most motivating factor, staff under managerial job classification have accounted the highest number in confirming that control over their own job or being given the responsibility for the work of others has motivating factor in their work life.

According to the study by Pollock (2002) recognized Herzberg's motivators, recognition as being crucial in motivating people. He says, over and above monetary reward, what people crave is praise. They need assurance that their efforts are known, valued, and appreciated. Sometimes all it takes to satisfy this deep desire is a sincere "well done", preferably delivered in front of their peers. Pollock further says making peoples' work interesting means driving away boredom because it's a great turn-off. Make their work meaningful and you will spur them to realize their own highest potential.

It is clear from the above results that staffs at different job grade have different opinion when it comes to motivating factors. Even though recognition is the most selected motivating factor when considering the overall result, for staff under executive and managerial position, achievement is rated high while majority of lower position holder has selected interpersonal relation as their most contributing factor to satisfy them in their work life.

Motivational factors are strongly associated to different demographic factors. By understanding both, demographic factors and their influence on motivational factors, it is possible to successfully motivate different groups of employees. Practical considerations for managers, how to selectively motivate different groups of employees according to different demographic characteristics, are discussed in conclusion.

The researcher has again analyzed the result in relation with other demographic makeup as indicated in table 4.2.1.

Table 4:2:1 Motivation factors based on gender

Factors contributing to job satisfaction	Executive		Managerial & specialized		Professional		Administrative & clerical		Manual & technical		Total			
	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	F	M	%	F	%
Remuneration	0	0	1	0	8	1	0	3	2	0	11	10%	4	7%
Recognition	2	1	4	5	14	10	2	4	3	5	25	24%	25	42%
Interpersonal relation	0	0	6	1	1	2	0	1	5	6	12	11%	10	17%
Supervision	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
Achievement	4	0	25	1	5	0	0	2	0	0	34	32%	3	5%
Growth	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	4	2	4	4%	2	3%
Work itself	0	0	3	0	0	1	1	1	3	0	7	7%	2	3%
Working condition	0	2	4	0	0	0	0	4	1	1	5	5%	7	12%
Responsibility	0	2	7	1	1	2	0	2	0	0	8	8%	7	12%
Organization policy and administration	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0	0%	0	0%
Total	6	5	50	8	29	16	3	17	18	14	106		60	

When looking into the result based on male versus female staff; achievement is selected more among male staff as their motivation factors while recognition is for female staff. Out of the 34 male staff who selected achievement as their most motivating factor; 29 of them are under executive and managerial position while none of male staff under manual and technical position has selected achievement as having motivating factor upon them. However, when looking into both male and female respondents who selected recognition as their motivating factor; similar proportion of male and female staff have selected in each job classification.

From this result, managers are expected to devise the best mechanism of motivating their team by considering gender differences. The next table shows the motivation factors according to number of service that respondents worked in the organization

Table 4:2:2 Motivation factors based on year of service in Save the Children

Factors contributing to job satisfaction	# of staff within 1-3 years of experience in SC		# of staff within 4-6 years of experience in SC		# of staff within 7-9 years of experience in SC		# of staff 10 yrs & Above experience in SC		Total
	F	Rank	F	Rank	F	Rank	F	Rank	
Remuneration	12	2	2	4	1	4	0		15
Recognition	23	1	15	2	3	2	9	2	50
Interpersonal relation	8	5	3		1	4	10	1	22
Achievement	10	3	24	1	3	2	0		37
Supervision	0		0		0		0		0
Growth	6	7	0		0		0		6
Work Itself	7	6	2		0		0		9
Work condition	10	3	0		1	4	1	3	12
Responsibility	4	8	4	3	6	1	1	3	15
Organization policy and administration	0	9			0		0		0
Total	80		50		15		21		166

Those staff who stayed in the organization for 1 to 3 years has selected mostly recognition and remuneration as their 1st and 2nd motivating factors while achievement and recognition are the ones selected by those staff who stayed in the organization 4-6 years. Among those who stayed in the organization for 7-9 years, responsibility is the key motivational factor that contributes to their job satisfaction. The ones who stayed in the organization form more than 10 years has selected interpersonal relation as their major motivating factor.

Staying in the organization for long, staff who worked for long years have shown tendency of selecting interpersonal relation as their motivating factor. Working in the same organization can increase the social net work among staff members but this may not be true for recently joined staff. From the above result, those staff who has worked only for 3 years or below, selected the working condition, achievement and of course recognition as their motivating factor. As a result, HR department as well as respective managers should assess the working condition and how it matches with staff expectation.

Table 4:2:3 Motivation factors based on age group

Factors contributing to job satisfaction	Total	18-31 age group		32-45age group		Above 46 age group	
		F	Rank	F	Rank	F	Rank
Remuneration	15	10	2	3	6	2	2
Recognition	50	4	7	45	1	1	4
Interpersonal relation	22	3	8	13	3	6	1
Achievement	37	15	1	22	2	0	
Supervision	0	0		0		0	
Growth	6	6	3	0		0	
Work Itself	9	5	6	3	6	1	4
Work condition	12	6	3	4	5	2	2
Responsibility	15	6	3	9	4	0	
Organization policy and administration	0	0		0		0	
Total	176	55		99		12	

As it is the case for the previous results, the above table also illustrates that people at different age group has different preference when it comes to motivating factors. For age group 32-45, recognition is the most selected factor similar to the total sample result while achievement and interpersonal relation is selected for age group 18-31 and 46 and above respectively.

Staff between age group 18-31, tend to give priority to their earning when compared with other age group. This gives clear direction that managers should consider their style when motivating their staff. Their approach to motivate their staff should vary according to the demography of their team as their motivator varies widely as indicated

4.3.2. Factors that lead to dissatisfaction

To see which factors cause dissatisfaction among staff of Save the Children, respondents were asked to identify factors that cause dissatisfaction when either not present at all or not properly present. The respondents' opinions are summarized in Table 4.3 next page.

Table 4:3 Factors causing dissatisfaction among staff of Save the Children when not present/ not enough, according to the respondents

Factors that cause dissatisfaction when not present / not enough	Total			Executive		Managerial & Specialized		Professional		Administrative & Clerical		Manual & technical	
	No	%	Rank	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%	No	%
Remuneration	30	18%	2	1	9%	10	17%	15	33%	3	15%	2	6%
Recognition	29	17%	4	1	9%	6	10%	12	27%	3	15%	6	19%
Interpersonal relation	9	5%	6	0	0%	0	0%	2	4%	3	15%	4	13%
Supervision	38	23%	1	1	9%	19	33%	13	29%	0	0%	5	16%
Achievement	9	5%	6	4	36%	1	2%	0	0%	2	10%	2	6%
Job security	2	1%	9	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	6%
Responsibility	7	4%	8	0	0%	2	3%	1	2%	1	5%	3	9%
Working condition	12	7%	5	2	18%	4	7%	0	0%	4	20%	2	6%
Work itself	0	0%		0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%
Organization policy and administration	30	18%	2	2	18%	16	28%	2	4%	4	20%	6	19%
Total	166			11		58		45		20		32	

The table above illustrates that poor supervision came out as the highest contributor to job dissatisfaction at 23% while lack of adequate remuneration accounts and organization policy accounts 18% for dissatisfaction. Lack of recognition contributes 17 % to job dissatisfaction. Problem in the working condition contributes 7% while poor interpersonal relations and lack of achievement accounts 5% respectively to job dissatisfaction. Lack of responsibility contributes 4% for dissatisfaction while 1% from lack of job security.

When these demotivating factors are again looked in each job classification, the result varies. Majority of the staff at executive level have chosen lack of sense of achievement demotivate them most while those under administrative and clerical job grade chose not having good/adequate working condition and organizational policy and administration can cause demotivation in their job. When we look into staff under the managerial and professional job classifications, supervision is selected most frequently.

When the overall population is considered, those staff under job classification of manager and professional job grade are mostly the one who claimed that they are not motivated. It is within this group supervision is given higher percentage for their cause of dissatisfaction followed by organization policy and lack of

recognition. This result puts into the question of managers competency or technical ability including their willingness to teach or delegate authority, and job knowledge.

Peterson, Puia, and Suess (2003) showed that supervision and coworker relationships are amongst the factors that are predictive of overall job satisfaction. In other words, if employees are happy with the quality of supervision or relations with fellow workers, one can predict that they will be happy at work; if employees are not happy with the quality of supervision or relations with fellow workers, one can predict that they will not be happy at work.

4.4. Do Managers in Save the Children Motivate their team

According to Levinson (1989) every manager must motivate and encourage employees somehow reconciling the individual needs with the goals of the organization. All employees have aspirations and objectives which they want to achieve through their organizations. Responsible managers ought to help them to achieve their modest aspirations.

Accordingly, among the sample respondents, managers were asked to which motivating factors they use to motivate their staff and their response was compared with what actual motivate staff as tabulated below.

Table 4:4 Perception of managers compared with employee on what motivate staff

What factors actually motivate staff	Motivating factors	What managers rely on to motivate their staff
1 st motivating factor	Due recognition at work	5 th motivating factor
2 nd motivating factor	Achievement on the current job is satisfying	4 th motivating factor
3 rd motivating factor	Good relationships between the worker and manager	3 rd motivating factor
4 th motivating factor	A high basic salary	1 st motivating factor
5 th motivating factor	Giving authority to the staff to do their job	2 nd motivating factor

It is interesting to note the discrepancies between what employees want and what managers rely on to motivate their staff. It was of particular interest for the researcher that while recognition has high motivating effect on individuals, the managers believe that salary was more important to individuals. However, that said both employee and managers seemed to recognize the importance of good inter personal relationships.

For this reason, question was asked to respondents if their managers motivate them and the answers are tabulated below

Table 4.5- Level of agreement of staff whether their line managers motivate them

Job grade	Total	Strongly disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
Executive	11	0	0%	1	9%	8	73%	2	18%
Managerial	58	0	0%	12	21%	31	53%	15	26%
Professional	45	2	4%	3	7%	20	44%	20	44%
Administrative	20	0	0%	6	30%	2	10%	12	60%
Clerical	32	1	3%	7	22%	23	72%	1	3%
Total	166	3	2%	29	17%	84	51%	50	30%

From the above table, it can be inferred that even though majority of the respondents (81%) respond positively to the question, 32 number of staff (19%) of the sample population feel that their line managers does not motivate them. When looking into the total number of respondents that have strongly disagree with the statement, they are found under professional job category followed by staff under clerical job grade. When we see opinion of staff under executive job classification, 91% agrees that their managers motivate them while 9% disagree. 79% of sample respondents that are under managerial job classification have responded positively that their managers motivate them while 11% disagree. Under professional job classification, 88% of the respondents have positively responded to the question while 12% disagree. 70% and 75% from administrative and clerical position has positively agreed with the statement respectively while 30% from administrative job classification and 25% have disagreed to the statement that their managers motivate them.

4.5. Matching of remuneration package with responsibility of employees

Vroom’s Expectancy theory says that people are motivated when they have a self-belief on their skills, belief in the promises of the management about getting the reward and the personal value they place on a specific reward (Vroom, 1964:15). Money is always an ambiguous subject in the discussion of motivation. It is considered within many theories and even though it cannot be considered the only factor for staff motivation, it can however be argued that to what extent and how important it is depends upon employees’ “personal circumstances and the other satisfactions they derive from work”. (Mullins 2007: 255).

Accordingly in order to find out how adequate the salaries of staffs are, respondents were asked the question: “Do you find your salary level to be adequate?” Their responses are indicated in Table 4.4 below.

Table 4.6. Adequacy of remuneration to the level of assignment given

Position	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		Total
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Executive	0	0%	1	9%	10	91%	0	0%	11
Managerial	3	5%	30	52%	25	43%	0	0%	58
Professional	11	24%	25	56%	9	20%	0	0%	45
Administrative	1	5%	8	40%	11	55%	0	0%	20
Clerical	1	3%	11	34%	20	63%	0	0%	32
Total	16	10%	75	45%	75	45%	0	0%	166

Table 4:6 shows that 45% of the staff agrees that they are remunerated adequately for the job they are performing, while 55% disagree. When comparison is done in each job classification, staff under professional job grade are the one who at higher rate responded negatively in having adequate remuneration package that matches with the work they are doing followed by staff under managerial job grade and clerical positions respectively. It is also important to point out that none of the respondents have strongly agreed in getting adequate remuneration for the work they are performing.

This implies that the majority of the staff’s salary is inadequate to meet their needs. As a form of motivation, therefore, salary was insufficient to motivate employee to perform efficiently. This was further revealed by all the Senior Management Team (SMT) who participated in key informant interviews.

4.6. Level of motivation

According to Walkup (2002:62), motivated and satisfied employees are critical to the success of organizations. In order to deliver expected result, having motivated and happy employees is important.

For this reason , questions were asked to assess respondent’s belief about their level of motivation and the results are presented in Table 4.7.

Table 4.7 Motivation level of respondents

Statements	Total Respondents	Responses							
		Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree	
		F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%
My achievement on the current job is satisfactory	166	18	11%	45	26%	80	48%	23	14%
I am satisfied with the recognition I for the work I accomplished	166	28	17%	38	23%	86	52%	13	8%
The work itself is interesting and challenging	166	12	7%	22	13%	118	71%	15	9%
I am satisfied with the degree of independency associated with my work	166	0	0%	7	4%	100	60%	60	36%
Personal growth(i.e)skills acquired through training & development) on the current job is satisfactory	166	42	25%	50	30%	35	21%	40	24%
Average result		15	9%	28	16%	96	58%	28	17%

At average 75% of the respondents feel that they are motivated while 25% of the respondents feel that they are not motivated. When each motivating factor is analyzed, 62% of the respondent felt that their level of achievement is satisfactory, while 60% of respondents felt that they are well recognized by their managers. It is clear from the above table that the organization has given better attention in making the work assignment interesting and giving employee space to do their job by their own as a motivation factor while lesser attention is given to recognition and achievement even though majority of respondents has chosen recognition and achievement as their major motivating factor. From this, it can be inferred that discrepancy exist between the expectation of staff member compared with what the organization has adopted as a system to motivate its employees.

4.7. Level of job satisfaction among staff

According to Oshangbemi; Organizations strongly desire job satisfaction from their employees . Due to important role of human resource on organization performance, they try to keep employees satisfied. Satisfied employees would produce superior performance in optimal time which leads to increase productivity. Based on this the employees' responses summarized in the tables and narrated below.

Table 4.8- Level of job satisfaction of respondents

Position	Responses								Total
	Strongly Disagree		Disagree		Agree		Strongly Agree		
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Executive	0	0%	1	9%	9	82%	1	9%	11
Managerial	0	0%	20	35%	19	32%	19	33%	58
Professional	0	0%	14	31%	29	65%	2	4%	45
Administrative	0	0%	5	25%	10	50%	2	10%	20
Clerical	0	0%	1	3%	3	9%	28	88%	32
Average Result	0	0	8	21%	14	48%	10	32%	33.2

The level of job satisfaction can be concluded in general terms as good even though certain number of the sample population illustrated that they don't enjoy their job. About 80% of respondents enjoyed their job, while the remaining 20% did not. Among the ones who claim that they don't enjoy their work, staff under professional and managerial job classification takes the highest percentage. This result matches with the level of staff motivation. Proportional number of respondents under professional and managerial job classification has claimed not to be motivated; and also not satisfied with their job. By taking the result on table 4.8; it is important to observe that even though majority of staff has claimed that they are not getting adequate payment, majority of them has again responded to enjoy their work.

This finding concurs with Herzberg studies that concluded motivators are those factors which provide feeling of job satisfaction at work. Remuneration, being hygiene factor does not have strong influence over staff job satisfaction.

4.8. Level of productivity of respondents

Since one of the objective of this study is to understand the level of productivity of staff and understand how much the level of productivity is affected by staff motivation and job satisfaction; respondents are asked about their level of productivity in the organization. When evaluating their productivity, respondents were asked to evaluate their performance comparing with their annual work plan.

Table 4.9 Feeling of respondents on their level of productivity in the organization

Position	Highly Unproductive 0-20%		Unproductive 21-40%		Moderately productive 41-60%		Productive 61-80%		Highly Productive 81-100%		Total
	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	F	%	
Executive	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	9	45%	2	9%	11
Managerial	0	0%	5	9%	13	22%	30	52%	10	17%	58
Professional	0	0%	6	13%	15	33%	20	44%	4	9%	45
Administrative	0	0%	0	0%	0	0%	2	10%	18	90%	20
Clerical	0	0%	0	0%	1	3%	11	34%	20	63%	32
Total	0	0%	13	8%	32	19%	68	41%	53	32%	166

Table 4.9 shows that 32% of the respondents felt that 81 to 100 percent of their time is spent being productive. On the other hand 41 % of the respondents believed 61 to 80 percent of their time was spent being productive, while 10% respondents felt that less than 41% of their time is spent being productive.

Administrative and clerical job grades take the highest productivity level while feeling of not being unproductive is mainly observed on managerial and professional positions. Thus,19% of the respondents fall under moderately productive category and 8% under unproductive category. A total of 27% from the total respondent fall under the category where staff are either moderately productive or are unproductive. This number is significant for an organization where the environment has become high productivity driven with limited resources.

This issue of productivity was further analyzed by asking open ended questions to selected 6 Senior Management Team. The management team Managers were asked of their opinion about staff productivity. All respondents have similar view when it comes to Save the Children staff productivity. Because the office has not yet started using performance appraisal process, it has been indicated that staff productivity is not objectively measured by managers. It is of the opinion of the management team that there is mixed level of productivity among head office based staff. Based on the finding of different audits, and also their personal observation of their team, it is their opinion that quite significant number of staff productivity has either become static as they don't put forth extra effort in their work or have restricted their output as they are dissatisfied even though there are staff with high productivity.

When asked what they think has resulted this, the common points indicated in the interview were:

- inadequate benefit package;
- poor planning or scheduling of work;
- unclear instruction to employees;
- poor coordination of work flow and
- not having one organizational culture.

4.9. Complimentary effect of motivation and job satisfaction on productivity

Correlation and linear regression is the tool that was applied to analyze the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction on productivity. Correlation is not the same as linear regression but they are related. The best way to predict the work motivation and job satisfaction toward employee productivity is linear regression but the correlation quantified the magnitude and direction the relation between work motivation, job satisfaction and employee productivity. Relation of dependent and independent variables are shown in **table 4.10**.

Table 4:10. Pair wise correlation

Correlations		Employee productivity	Job	Work Motivation
Employee productivity	Pearson Correlation		.494 **	.654 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	1.000	.000	.000
	N	200.000	200	200
Job Satisfaction	Pearson Correlation	.494 **		.549 **
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	1.000	.000
	N	200	200.000	200
Work Motivation	Pearson Correlation	.654 **	.549 **	1.000
	Sig. (2-tailed)	.000	.000	200.000
	N	200	200	

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

The above result revealed that there is a positive and significant relationship between work motivations, job satisfaction with employee productivity. The correlation found to be strongly and positively associated with the employee productivity (work motivation, $r = 0.654$ and job satisfaction, $r = 0.494$). Results are showing that work

motivation is more strongly associated with employee productivity as compared to job satisfaction. (Job satisfaction $r = 0.494 < \text{work motivation} = 0.654$). It means that if the work motivation and job satisfaction is increasing the employee productivity may also increase. Moreover, in the case of negative the independent variable will also decline.

To validate the result from correlation, linear regression was calculated in table 4.10.1. It also shows that work motivation, job satisfaction are significantly associated with employee productivity (at 99% confidence level) and may predict employee productivity depending upon work motivation and job satisfaction of the employees.

Table 4:10:1 Regression analysis on motivation and job satisfaction over productivity

Coefficients ^a						
Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	2.144	1.444		1.485	.139
	Job Satisfaction	.179	.058	.193		.002
	Work Motivation	1.101	.126	.549	3.067	.000
Dependent Variable: employee productivity						

The intercept 2.144 represents the estimated average value of employee productivity when work motivation and job satisfaction is zero. The slop of job satisfaction 0.179 means change in employee productivity is 0.179 when job satisfaction increase by 1. And the slop of work motivation 1.101 showing that change in employee productivity is 1.101 when work motivation is increased by 1.

Table 4:10:2- level of relation between work motivation & job satisfaction

Model Summary				
Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R	Std. Error of the
1	.674 ^a	.454	.449	3.1057
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction				

Table 4:10:3 level of relation between dependent and independent variables

ANOVA ^b						
					F	S
1	Regression	1582.047	2	791.023	82.010	.000 ^a
	Residual	1900.148	197	9.645		
	Total	3482.195	199			
a. Predictors: (Constant), Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction b. Dependent Variable: Employee productivity						

The result from the above tables indicates that work motivation and job satisfaction could significantly contribute toward R^2 value of 0.454. An examination of these two variable indicated that the work motivation represented the strongest effect on employee productivity with the standard beta of 1.101 followed by job satisfaction with the beta of 0.179, thus the statistical results prove that positive and strong linear relationship exist between dependent and independent variables.

CHAPTER FIVE

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1.Introduction

The previous chapters in this study provided insight into current available literature on motivation and job satisfaction, as well as findings of previous studies conducted on related topics. The research methodology adopted for this study was also explained, followed by the presentation of the data obtained during the study. The presentation of this data forms the base for the discussion in chapter five. This chapter highlights any relationships between the literature review and the presentation of data in the previous chapter.

5.2. Summary of findings

The previous chapters of this paper help to provide insight into motivation and job satisfaction in the workplace, and their relation to productivity. Chapter four also aimed to identify to what extent, if any, the different aspects such as remuneration, recognition, achievement, working environment, and responsibility affect motivation and job satisfaction.

The current study provides insights which led to the following key findings.

- The biggest contributing factor with regard to staff motivation in Save the Children is recognition that is selected by 30% of the respondents. This factor was selected as being the factor that motivates them most than other factors, like remuneration. Achievement and interpersonal relation accounts the 2nd and 3rd most selected factors that motivate staff while remuneration takes 4th place along with responsibility. Growth and work itself are the least likely motivators respectively.
- Supervision is repeatedly selected as the most dissatisfying factors by the respondents followed by remuneration and organization policy.
- When respondents are asked if their managers currently play part in motivating them, quite a number of respondents from professional job

classification claimed not to be true. Similar percentage of staff from professional job classification has indicated that they have either moderate or low level of productive.

- The respondents' job satisfaction was directly related their motivation. Furthermore, their job satisfaction was also directly related there level of productivity, and finally, the results shows respondent's motivation lelvel also directly related to their level of productivity. From these results it can be concluded that a three-way relationship between employees' motivation level, job satisfaction, there productivity level.

5.3.Conclusions

- Job satisfaction in Save the Children is largely caused by true motivators (70%); while hygiene factors contribute 30% to job satisfaction. A mixture of true motivators and hygiene factors can contribute to job satisfaction.
- Factors that involve job context (hygiene factors) tend to lead to job dissatisfaction. When these factors are considered good, or acceptable, workers do not tend to become "satisfied", they simply become "not dissatisfied." Productivity is not restricted – it is just held at an acceptable level. When workers become dissatisfied with any of these factors they tend to have lesser productivity.
- Since human beings are of widely varied natured, factors that motivate them also varies. From the previous chapter, it was observed that even though majority of the respondents selected recognition as their number one motivator that leads them to job satisfaction, the result varies quite significantly among different demography like age, gender, job classification, year of service. In order to be able to motivate their staff, managers should understand that there is no globally agreed staff motivation method that they can adopt.
- Managers in Save the Children have inaccurate perception about their employee needs. They give remuneration as the most effective way of motivating their staff while recognition and achievement is the real motivator selected by staff. For this reason, managers should not make

mistake of assuming what motivates their staff. Rather they should appreciate the difference among the team they are leading and use different tactics to motivate each of them based on their personal wants and needs.

- Job satisfaction within organization should be targeted as a key priority when trying to improve productivity. Management of Save the Children should ensure staffs are matched to the job they do, thereby ensuring adequate use of individual skills. Managers of Save the Children should understand the major role that they can play in motivating the team they are managing.

5.4.Limitation of the study

Although the research is believed to reach its aims, it has some unavoidable limitations. This study has focused on a phenomenon that is very extensive and major one i.e. motivation. Clearly, this represents challenging task for research regardless of the more specific interests that the study may have.

Because of the time limit, this research is conducted on a small size of population. Therefore, the result may not be applicable to every staff of the organization as the motivational needs of employees may be different from place to place.

Since the organization has recently established, the performance management process has not been properly administered. For this reason, respondents were asked to evaluate their level of productivity by themselves in order to know staff productivity level which may lead to subjective result.

Furthermore, since on line questionnaire is used to collect information from most the respondent's it may have restricted respondents to qualify their response and limit the researcher from probing response.

5.5.Recommendations

Using the finding of this study as a base, this section presents some key recommendations that can improve the motivation level and increase productivity. A recommendation is made only with regard to the major contributors to job satisfaction (recognition and achievement). No discussion or recommendations is made with regard to the factors that contributed minimally or insignificantly to

job satisfaction. Recommendation is also made on how to address the major cause of dissatisfies in Save the Children.

I. Recognition

Recognition of employees work should be a deliberate strategic exercise for management. Managers must as part of their Key Performance Areas (KPA) continuously look for opportunities to notice or praise employees for good ideas and work well done. For example:

- For work well done or great ideas ensure you give praise preferably in the presence of colleagues.
- Create an opportunity for one-on-one sessions with each employee to give feedback on performance and set new targets and timelines. This can be accompanied an appreciation letter for the period reviewed.
- Continuously share positive feedback from external clients with staff. This will motivate them to perform even better and smarter.
- Management should consistently give positive feedback and not dwell on the negatives, this motivates employees
- Introduce achievement awards for individuals, teams or sections to encourage best practice;
- Send messages of support and condolences during hospitalization and bereavements and where practically possible visit or attend funeral.

II. Achievement

In order to strategically utilize achievement as a motivational tool for employees, it is recommended that Save the Children should:

- Set clear challenging goals for individuals or teams and when these are achieved acknowledge them in a team function or a social activity where other sections are invited to the occasion.

- Introduce an end of the year function where the most senior manager renders a speech, highlighting the achievements of individuals and teams.
- Create space and time for individuals and teams to be innovative and allow them to pursue goals that they believe will benefit them and ultimately the organization.
- Create exposure opportunities for individuals and teams to do special projects outside own country so that they can gain useful experiences to be shared in own country.
- Create opportunities where employees participate in decision-making processes. For example involve employees in meetings, workshops, conferences wherever it is practically possible from conception to implementation of decisions.
- Also create space to talk to all staff on issues of concern to them and seek their input. Even if there are no immediate solutions to their concerns, the fact that a platform is created for engagement goes a long way to creating a perception of achievement.

III. Supervision-technical

Supervision- is the major dissatisfier amongst the sampled employees at the time of this study. The question is can management improve this situation? It is recommended that management should:

- Make themselves visible to employees throughout the work cycle, input-production-output processes.
- Engage employees on process issues as well use the opportunity to solve process related issues. Asking questions aimed at finding problems and solving them to make life easy for employees can turn employee attitudes around.
- Supervisors should use the space and time to show that they know something about the core functions of the organizations albeit at a different level. Share some visions and missions and ask for ideas from employees.

- Explore the attitudes of employees towards management and strategically attempt to manage rumors. Straighten rumors by facts through notices in the notice board; call a staff briefing meeting; one-on-ones or send e-mails;

IV. Company policy and administration

Company policy and administration including the availability of clearly defined policies, especially those relating to people, adequacy of the organization and management was the second strongest factor causing dissatisfaction amongst the sample. This can be improved by:

- Simplifying policies and ensuring that they are accessible at places and in formats that are user friendly to employees such as:
 - On the intranet;
 - In booklet form;
 - regularly share on the company newsletter;
 - have a workshop and induction program to explain the implications of policies;
 - Organizational meetings where top management explain issues of policy and strategy.

V. Remuneration

Considering the fact that staff have selected inadequate remuneration as their 2nd most dissatisfying factor at work place, a good compensation strategy should be adopted by the organization that includes a balance between internal equity and external competitiveness and also that it comprises of both financial and non financial reward system. Compensation and benefits affect the productivity and happiness of employees, as well as the ability of the organization to effectively realize its objectives. It is to the organization advantage to ensure that employees are creatively compensated and knowledgeable of their benefits.

Training

Save the Children should not rely only on remuneration to motivate staff, as this only drives up expenses within the organization. As this study showed, recognition and achievement are key factors in them being motivated; therefore, the senior management should rather invest on their managers on the best way they can enrich

the existing culture where staff gets recognized and employees have a sense of achievement when they do something for first time. Proper investment has to be devoted to build high performing team through effective leadership and this can be achieved from formal and informal leadership training

Recommendation for future studies

It is important to note that, although the research was conducted focusing on head office, the office has several geographical regions within Ethiopia. Future studies should expand the sample to include a wider range of Ethiopia, as this would help improve the diversity and accuracy of the study.

As the organization recently merged, the performance rating process is at its early stage and this studies conducted in the future can consider performance management process and the effect of motivation and job evaluation on staff performance could also be investigated

REFERENCES

- Allen, N. J., & Meyer, J. P. (1990). **A cross-national perspective on managerial problems in a non western country**, *The Journal of Social Psychology*, vol. 136, No. 2, pp. 165-172.
- Alberts, E.M. (1996). **Human Resources Management**. Vanderbijlpark: Fundela Publishers.
- Armstrong, M. (1991). **A Handbook of Personnel Management Practice, 4th ed.** London: Kogan Page, Ltd.
- Botha, J.H. (2003). **The Relationship between performance evaluation and motivational patterns amongst production workers within a petro-chemical company**. Johannesburg: Unpublished M. Phil. Dissertation at the RAU.
- Backer, W. (1976). **Manpower Development**. Isando: MacGraw-Hill Book Company.
- Bhattacharyya, D.K. (2006). **Research methodology, 2nd ed.** New Delhi: Excel books.
- Bryman, A., & Bell, B. (2007). **Business research methods, 2nd ed.** New York: Oxford University Press Inc.
- Charles, E., Danforth, A.J., & Veitch, J.A. (2004). **Work station design for organizational productivity**. Canada: National Research Council of Canada.
- Clark, R.E. (2003). **Fostering the work motivation of individuals and teams; Performance Improvement**. Vol. 42, No. 3, pp 21-29.
- Cheung, Chau-Kiu., Scherling, Steven A. (1999). **Job Satisfaction, Work Values, and Sex Differences in Taiwan's Organizations**. *Journal of Psychology*: Vol. 133 Issue 5, p563.
- Du Preez, D. (2003). **Insights into organisational challenges**. *People Dynamics*, 21(9), 28 – 30.
- Efere, P. (2005). **Motivation and Job Satisfaction**. London: Trans-Atlantic College.
- Gerber, P.D., Nel, P.S., & Van Dyk, P.S. (1987). **Human Resource Management. International**. London: Thompson Publishing.
- Guppy, A. & Rick, J. (1996). *Work and Stress*, 10(2), 154 – 164.
- Gupta, S. (2007). **Research methodology and research methods**. New Dehli: Deep and Deep publications Pvt, Ltd.
- Hadebe, T.P. (2001). **Relationship between motivation and job satisfaction of employees at Vista Information Services**. M.A. dissertation, Rand Afrikaans

University, Johannesburg.

- Harris, J., & Brannick, J. (1999). **Finding & Keeping Great Employees**. New York; AMACOM books Inc.
- Herzberg Frederick, (1976). **Work and the Nature of Man**. Cleveland, New York: The Word Publishing Company.
- Herzberg Frederick, (1971). **The Managerial Choice; To be effective and to be human**. Illinois : Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Kanfer, R. & Ackerman, P.L. (2000). **Individual differences in work motivation: Further explorations of a trait framework**. Applied Psychology: An International Review, 49(3), 470-482.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943). **“A theory of human motivation”**, Psychological Review: Vol.50, pp. 370-396.
- McCoy, T.J. (1992). **Compensation and motivation: Maximizing employee performance with behavior-based incentive plans**. New York: AMACOM books Inc .
- Mayhew, R. (2011). **How to create job satisfaction and employee morale**. Retrived From eHow money website:http://www.ehow.com/how_7416450_create-job-satisfaction-employeemorale.
- Nohria, N., Groysberg, B., & Lee, L.E. (2008). **Employee Motivation**. Harvard Business Review: Vol. 86, pp 78-84.
- O’Neil, JR. Harold (Ed.), F. & Drillings, M. (1994).**“Motivation: theory and research”**. Hillsdale, New Jersey; Lawrance Erlbaum Assocaites, Inc.
- Ostroff, C. (1992). **The Relationship between satisfaction, attitudes and performance; An organizational level analysis**. Journal of Applied Psychology, Vol. 77, No. 6, pp 963-974.
- Sansone, C., and Harackiewicz Judith M. (2000). **Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation – the search for optimal Motivation and Performance**. California – USA: Academic Press.
- Travers,M. (2001). **Qualitative Research Through Case Studies**. London, Sage.
- Vaughn, Rececca M. (2003). **Nursing Management**. Chicago, USA: Apr. Vol. 34, Iss. 4; pp. 12.
- Walkup Carolyn. (2002). **Nation’s Restaurant News**. New York: Oct. 21, Vol. 36, Iss. 42; pp. 62.
- Zikmund, William G. (2003). **Business Research Methods,7th Edition**. USA: Thomson – South Western.

APPENDICES

APPENDIX I QUESTIONNAIRE FOR STAFF

My name is Areyam Workneh, a student at St Mary University College, pursuing a Masters Degree in MBA; Human Resource Management. I am carrying out research on relationship of motivation and job satisfaction has on productivity. I kindly request you to provide me with information. It will be treated as confidential and used for academic purposes only. The questionnaire should only take 10-15 minutes to complete and please make sure that you don't skip any questions. Thank you for your participation.

SECTION A: BACKGROUND INFORMATION ABOUT STAFF *(tick (✓) the right option or fill the right answer in the spaces provided)*

1) Position of respondent.....

2) Gender

Gender	Male	Female

3) What is your age range? (Please tick under only one of them).

Age Group	18-31yrs	32 - 45yrs	Above 46 yrs

4) How long have you worked for this organization? (Please tick under only one of them)

1-3 years	4-6 years	7-9 years	Above 10 years

Part B. General Questions

1) Please put a tick mark

Factors	Which of the following factors contributes to your satisfaction in your work? Please put a tick mark next to the one factor that you consider to motivate you to the highest	Which of the following factors cause dissatisfaction in your work? Please put a tick mark next to the one factor that you consider to cause dissatisfaction the most
Remuneration		
Recognition		
Interpersonal relation		
Supervision		
Achievement		
Growth		
Work itself		
Working condition		
Responsibility		
Organization policy and administration		

2) My achievement on the current job is satisfactory

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Neutral
- d) Agree
- e) Strongly agree

3) I am satisfied with the flexibility in scheduling

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Neutral
- d) Agree
- e) Strongly agree

4) I feel comfortable with the location of the workplace

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Neutral
- d) Agree
- e) Strongly agree

5) My Manager/supervisor motivates me

- a) Strongly disagree

- b) Disagree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Agree
 - e) Strongly agree
- 6) I feel positive about my future in my organization
- a) Strongly disagree
 - b) Disagree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Agree
 - e) Strongly agree
- 7) My total remuneration package matches the responsibilities I have
- a) Strongly disagree
 - b) Disagree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Agree
 - e) Strongly agree
- 8) I am satisfied with the relationship I have with co workers.
- a) Strongly disagree
 - b) Disagree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Agree
 - e) Strongly agree
- 9) I am satisfied with the recognition I get for the work I accomplished
- a) Strongly disagree
 - b) Disagree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Agree
 - e) Strongly agree
- 10) Do they provide you support for additional training and education?
- a) Strongly disagree
 - b) Disagree
 - c) Neutral
 - d) Agree
 - e) Strongly agree
- 11) I believe the job I do is important to the organization

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Neutral
- d) Agree
- e) Strongly agree

12) I am satisfied with the degree of independency associated with my work role

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Neutral
- d) Agree
- e) Strongly agree

13) I am satisfied with the opportunity provided to utilize my skill and talent

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Neutral
- d) Agree
- e) Strongly agree

14) How much of your time is spent being productive. Please put a mark (√) next to the percentage with the time you spend.

	Percentage	
a)	0-20%	
b)	21-40%	
c)	41-60%	
d)	61-80%	
e)	81-100%	

15) I am given enough work to fill my work day

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Agree
- d) Strongly agree

16) I perform work related activities to a 100% of my capability

- a) Strongly disagree
- b) Disagree
- c) Agree
- d) Strongly agree

Part C

Kindly respond to the below questions if you have one or more staff member reporting to you directly

17) In your experience as a manager, indicate how important the below factors are for the staff to be motivated by ranking from 1-4 where 1 being the highest and 5 being the lowest mark?

- a) A high basic salary
- b) Due recognition at work
- c) Achievement on the current job
- d) Getting authority to do their job
- e) Good relationship

Thank you

APPENDIX 2
INTERVIEW QUESTION FOR SENIOR MANAGEMENT TEAM (SMT)

1. What is your opinion regarding employees productivity at head office level
2. What is your opinion on why performance is unsatisfactory or satisfactory,
3. What do you recommend should be the action that needs to be taken to improve motivation of the employee