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ABSTRACT

by

Yvonne Michelle Guthrie

Dr. Anthony J. Ferri, Examination Committee Chair
Professor of Communication
University of Nevada, Las Vegas

Quantitative and qualitative analyses of employee motivation, satisfaction, and productivity at a Las Vegas office supply company were conducted. The purpose of the analyses was to determine if there were differences in perception of motivational variables and "hygiene factors" between employees and management. Also, the analyses were conducted to assess if there were differences in perception of the same motivational variables and "hygiene factors" between male and female employees. Motivation and management theories were used as historical reference and potential approaches for improving motivational levels of employees. The results of the study indicate that there were differences in perception regarding good wages between both management and employees and male and female employees.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

Since the early 1920s, attempts have been made to help organizations run more efficiently by understanding the dynamic relationships between employee and employer. Elements such as employee motivation, satisfaction, commitment, and productivity have all been deemed essential and detrimental to the survival and success of an organization. However, society's knowledge concerning work motivation has been rather poor (Kosmarski, 1991).

The survival and success of an organization is directly related to its ability to remain competitive. Companies, worldwide, have been economically and competitively connected since the advent of the industrial age. However, with the transformation from the industrial age to the information age, it is necessary for U.S. companies to devise more effective ways of remaining economically and globally competitive. According to Lawrence Perlman (1995), president and chief executive officer of Ceridian Corporation, one of the primary ways of affecting change in this manner is to ensure that corporate America recognizes that, due to current technology, the more traditional hierarchical approaches to organizations are quickly becoming obsolete.

Many of the employees working in today's organizations are required to perform duties much more sophisticated than the mindless work required in the industrial age. For example, it no longer takes four people to produce a single straight pin. Modern
companies use machines for such tasks, and it is the employee who is operating these machines (Perlman, 1995). Perlman asserts that:

In the company of the year 2000, the worker will be expected to manage interactive data processing, computer-integrated manufacturing, statistical process control, inventory control, order processing and customer relations. Far from performing simple, repetitive tasks, this worker must be a sophisticated technologically capable problem solver, empowered to meet customer requirements. The manager, if there is one, may be just another member of the team, earning little more in pay and status, and functioning as more of a coach than a supervisor or boss. The hierarchical approach to management was based on the division and specialization of labor and the control of information by managers. Today, technology means much less division and specialization (p. 3).

It is necessary to train employees to be competitive in the new technological era, which in turn, will most likely keep companies competitive and profitable (Perlman, 1995).

Justification

Because most societies adhere to capitalism, and the majority of most individuals’ waking hours are spent working within an organization (Perlman, 1995), strategies must be developed to create positive work environments for employees. While retraining employees to be more technologically capable is a key strategy to corporate success, organizations must depend upon two other components (Perlman, 1995). First, the workforce must take advantage of “an increasingly diverse talent pool” which may simultaneously decrease discrimination. Perlman (1995) asserts that, “persistent discrimination undermines both social progress and business competitiveness” (p. 2). Secondly, workers must be afforded the power to make decisions concerning their everyday work. In other words, a new approach to management must be taken.
Purpose of the Study

With the strategic development of a positive work environment in mind, the purpose of this study was to analyze employee attitude and propose practical, possible solutions for enhancing motivation and satisfaction levels of individuals employed at Office Plus, an office supply company, located in Las Vegas, Nevada. One of the reasons for choosing Office Plus employees as participants in this study was that there are a variety of job descriptions to focus on, such as warehouse personnel, drivers, order takers, and office personnel.

Another reason for choosing Office Plus employees as participants was the traditional structure of the organization. For instance, women only work in the office area, whereas the men only work as drivers and warehouse personnel. Lastly, an interview with the general manager of Office Plus indicated that there is low motivation among the employees which may account for low performance. Hence, once employee motivation and satisfaction are increased, there should be an improvement in the organizational working environment.

In order to assess employee attitudes and management’s perception of employee attitudes, separate, individual interviews for each manager and each employee was conducted. The questions on the interview schedule, which were derived from Martin Patchen’s (1965) Some Questionnaire Measures of Employee Motivation and Morale, were designed to determine employee motivation and satisfaction levels. In addition to the interviews, employees and management were required to rank Herzberg’s (1968) list of motivators and “hygiene factors” which helped to determine if there were differences between management’s and employees’ perceptions of motivational/hygiene factors.

The outcome of the interview sessions, in addition to the surveys, provided knowledge of the job situation and a necessary frame of reference which aided in the development of possible solutions for motivation enhancement.
The goals of the employee interviews and survey questionnaire were to provide information and encourage workplace harmony, which in turn, should have provided incentive for the employees and managers of Office Plus to increase employee motivation and satisfaction.

The following list of motivators and “hygiene factors” was used as a means of determining employee motivation. However, it is important to note that Herzberg’s (1968) motivators and “hygiene factors” are discrete in that the proper implementation of each concept is designed to enhance different human needs.

Employee Survey

Please rank the following list in order of importance, with “one” being the highest and “ten” being the lowest.

Appreciation for work done
Feeling “in” on things
Good wages
Good working conditions
Interesting work
Job security
Management loyalty to workers
Promotion and growth with company
Tactful disciplining
Understanding of personal problems

The variables “appreciation for work done,” “feeling in on things,” “interesting work,” and “promotion and growth with the company” are considered motivators, while the variables “good wages,” “good working conditions,” “job security,” “management
loyalty to workers,” tactful disciplining,” and “understanding of personal problems” are considered hygiene factors. There are two conditions distinguishing motivators from “hygiene factors.” First, motivators are used to do precisely as the word denotes which is to motivate. Hygiene factors, on the other hand, create satisfaction or dissatisfaction for individuals in the workplace. However, hygiene factors do not enhance motivation levels in employees.

Secondly, motivators stem from intrinsic, inherent needs most human beings possess. For instance, most individuals require being told that they and their efforts are appreciated. When appreciation is expressed to employees, it may produce higher levels of employee motivation. However, when employers and management do not indicate to workers that their efforts are appreciated, individuals begin to doubt and question their worth within the organization, thus decreasing employee motivation.

The list of motivators and hygiene factors was designed to determine management’s perceptions of employee needs and employees’ perceptions of their own needs by asking the participants (management and employees) to list the motivators and “hygiene factors” in order of importance. If management’s perceptions of important motivators vary significantly from that of the employee, there is an obvious breakdown in communication which may significantly reduce employee motivation.

Also, the survey was designed to assess sex differences concerning motivational attitudes between women and men. In other words, would women rank Herzberg’s (1968) motivators/hygiene factors differently than men? Questions addressing demographic data were also included on the questionnaire.

Following is the interview schedule which was used in conjunction with the survey to assess employee motivation and satisfaction levels.
Interview Schedule

1. What is your company’s take on teamwork?

[important]
[who stresses]
[motivated]

This question was designed to determine the extent to which employees identify with their organization. If the employee perceives his or her organization as team-work oriented, and s/he feels a part of the team, then the concept of team-work may be considered a motivator. On the other hand, if the employee perceives the organization as lacking the team-work concept, s/he may not identify with the organization, and consequently, lack motivation.

2. How does management communicate to employees a job well done?

[nonverbal]
[verbal]

This question was designed to assess the extent to which management effectively communicates a job well done to employees. If employees are not aware of their performance, be it positive or negative, they won’t know if they should be motivated to continue to perform in the same manner or motivated to improve their performance. If employees are left in limbo, so are their motivational levels.

3. How does management reward employees for finding new ways of improving work performance?

[pay raise]
[awards]
[letters]
This question was designed to assess the extent to which employees strive to improve job performance. Since motivation can not be directly measured, a high level of job performance, in conjunction with other factors such as pay, recognition, etc., may indicate a high level of motivation.

4. How does the company show flexibility to employees’ needs?

[childcare]
[eldercare]
[health needs]

This question was designed to determine the organization’s sensitivity to its employees’ needs. For instance, is the company tailored to allow individuals who have needs such as childcare or eldercare to take care of those responsibilities? Or does the company discourage or ignore employees who have such responsibilities?

5. How are employee grievances handled at the company?

[ignored]
[recognized]
[S.O.P]

This question was also designed to determine the organization’s sensitivity to the employees. For instance, ignoring an employee’s grievance may communicate to the employee that his/her complaints are unimportant or invalid to the organization. By ignoring the employee’s complaint, a disconfirming message may be sent. “Disconfirming communication implicitly says, ‘you don’t exist; you are not valued’”(Adler, Rosenfeld, Towne, & Proctor, 1998, p. 358). Even though management may send unintentional disconfirming messages, the employee’s perception of disconfirming messages may help to create individual low motivational levels. On the other hand, addressing employee complaints accordingly may send confirming
messages which may lead employees to view themselves as valued members of the organization (Adler, et al., 1998). Management’s attempt at sending confirming messages may help to promote higher motivational levels.

6. How does management communicate trust toward employees?

[delegate]
[empowerment]

This question’s function was to determine if management delegates responsibilities to employees and trusts that employees are capable of carrying out said tasks. This is important to the concept of motivation, because often, with responsibility comes success. If the employee is given the responsibility to perform a task and completes the task successfully, s/he may perceive the achievement as his or her own success and not management’s success. Since the workforce places high emphasis on achievement and success, employees who are able to perceive themselves as successful may have increased levels of motivation.

7. How are daily goals communicated to employees?

[meetings]
[S.O.P.]

8. How do employees communicate to management when they are unsure of daily goals?

[clarify]
[ignore]
[pretend]

9. How important is goal setting to this organization?

Questions seven, eight, and nine were designed to assess company communication effectiveness as well as the importance of goal-setting. Clear communication of daily goals and expression of unclear goals is extremely important for maintaining
organizational harmony. When employees have a clear understanding of expected goals, there is a sense of purpose, which may aid in increasing motivation and satisfaction.

10. What happens to motivational levels after raises are received?

[decreases]
[increases]

This question was designed to determine the extent to which pay is a key motivational factor for employees. For instance, are employees motivated to perform better after they have received their raises, or are employees motivated to perform better hoping to receive raises? Perhaps the prospect of receiving a raise does not appeal to the employee, because s/he is motivated by other means. It is imperative for management to establish the role money plays in an employee’s life. If management perceives money as a primary source of motivation and uses it as such, but the employee does not perceive money as a primary source of motivation, using money may be mute when trying to increase motivational levels.

11. How do employees communicate to management their dissatisfaction?

[dirty looks]
[work less]
[verbal expression]

This question was designed to determine if workers perceive open lines of communication in the workplace. When there are open lines of communication, employees may feel more satisfied, thus more motivated.
12. What is the company’s take on people who change their usual way of doing things at work? Explain.

[discouraged]
[encouraged]

13. What is the company’s take on people who try out their own ideas before checking with management first?

[discouraged]
[encouraged]

Questions 12 and 13 were designed to assess employee interest and initiative levels while working. These questions were beneficial to this project in that determining the levels of interest and initiative on the job may also indicate the level of motivation the employee has for the job.

14. What positive things can be said about this organization?

15. What negative things can be said about this organization?

Questions 14 and 15 were designed to elicit the employee’s overall perception of the organization.

Definitions

During the course of this study, some of the following terms may be unfamiliar to the reader.

**Confirming Messages** are messages the receiver conveys to the sender which express caring and/or respect (Adler, Rosenfeld, Towne, & Proctor, 1998).

**Content Theories** explains certain needs influencing human behavior and motivation. In other words, content theories explain what factors motivate people. These factors include, but are not limited to, social needs, economic needs, and self-worth needs. Content theories are at the core of understanding human motivation.
Disconfirming Messages, unlike confirming messages, are messages conveyed which express a lack or respect or caring for another individual (Adler, Rosenfeld, Towne, & Proctor, 1998).

Distributive Power is when one individual is able to carry out his or her objective by using force, control, pressure or aggression over another individual (Wilmot & Hocker, 1998). Distributive power is particularly useful when trying to identify or recognize the autocratic style of leadership which is outlined in Blake & Mouton’s (1978) Managerial Grid.

Employee Empowerment is the act of enhancing employee self-efficacy through the elimination of conditions that foster powerlessness and lack of control (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Elmuti, 1997).

Expectancy is believing that the probability of change in effort will lead to changes in performance (Yoder & Henneman, 1975). Expectancy is one of the characteristics of Victor Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory and helps to determine if an individual will direct his/her efforts toward higher performance (Cummings, 1973).

Feedback is responding, either verbally or nonverbally, to a sender’s message.

Goals are the objects or conditions with respect to which the behavior of individuals or groups is directed (Katzell, 1975) and are conscious activities of people. McAfee & Poffenberger (1982) state that goals are important because “without some kind of definition of where it is we want to arrive we cannot tell if we are progressing nor can we tell if we have arrived” (p. 129).

Groupthink is when a group becomes too tight-knit and tries to maintain group relations at all costs sacrificing critical thinking in order to promote group agreement (Trenholm & Jensen, 1996).

Integrative Power is the joining of forces to achieve mutually acceptable goals (Wilmot & Hocker, 1998).
Nonparametric Design is a research design in which the independent variable levels are represented by differing categories in lieu of differing amounts (Bordens & Abbott, 1996).

Nonverbal Communication is the act of expressing messages through the use of facial expressions, gestures, and anything other than linguistic means.

Ordinal Scale is a scale of measurement in which variables have different names and can be ranked according to quantity, for example, high, medium, and low. “However, the distance between low and moderate, and between moderate and high, is not known” (Bordens & Abbott, 1996, p. 86). All that can be said for sure is that low is less than moderate and moderate is less than high.

Parametric Design “refers to the systematic variation of the amount of an independent variable” (Bordens & Abbott, 1996, p. 226).

Process Theories explain the process of choosing certain courses of action which lead to certain outcomes (Vaught, et al, 1985) and are also at the heart of understanding motivation.

Self-Efficacy has been conceptualized as “task-specific self-confidence” which determines performance “through such mechanisms as effort, persistence, high personal goals and effective analytical strategies” (Latham, et al., 1994, p. 51).

Valence is the amount of attractiveness a goal or outcome offers (Cummings, 1973) and is also one of the components of Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory. Valence serves as a strong motivational forces when coupled with “expectancy”.

Verbal Communication the means of expressing a message through the use of language either with words or without words.

Work Motivation the internal “push” to perform well on the job, as it is related to the desire for achievement or successful accomplishment (Patchen, 1970). Work motivation, is perhaps, the entire essence of this project.
Hypotheses

Theoretical frameworks posed for understanding motivation have been in the making for nearly a century. All of the theories regarding motivation proposed during this paper are tried and true measures that build off of one another, which is why they were appropriate for this project.

There are two hypotheses stemming from this project. The first hypothesis is associated with determining differences in male/female perceptions of motivators, as well as determining which motivators appeal more to women than men, and vice versa. Therefore, it is hypothesized that men and women will rank Herzberg’s (1968) “hygiene factors” and motivators differently from one another.

The second hypothesis is related to management’s perception of the employees’ perception of motivational variables. Often, management attempts to motivate employees with factors they believe will facilitate motivation instead of determining which motivational factors are important from the employees. When managers assume that they correctly perceive the foremost motivational factors for their employees, it may be due to the traditional hierarchical structures of organizations.

Since hierarchical structures in organizations are the accepted norm among organizations and there is a distinct division between management and workers, it is presupposed that management’s motivational attitudes and expectations differ from that of workers’ motivational attitudes and expectations. Using Victor Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory should provide a means of determining if management’s “obvious” expectations for workers is in conjunction with the workers’ expectations of themselves.

For example, management may believe that an employee will view a promotion in title only as positively valent and also may believe that the employee will be motivated to increase performance to receive the promotion. However, if the worker views a promotion with an increase in responsibility and pay as positively valent, it is likely that the motivation needed to increase performance in order to receive the promotion may
decrease significantly. If it is established that there is a problem with differing expectations among management and workers, it is possible that a lack of effective feedback and communication are contributing factors.

Also, Lawrence Lindahl (1949) conducted a study to determine “whether supervisors are motivated by the same things that motivate rank-and-file workers” (Smith, 1997, p. 45) by asking management and workers to rank assigned motivators based on Herzberg’s (1968) “hygiene factors”. Lindahl discovered that management’s perception of motivational factors did indeed differ from workers. This same study was replicated by Hersey and Blanchard in the 1980s, where again, it was determined that management and workers’ perceptions do differ. Therefore, using Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory and Herzberg’s (1968) ten motivators and a scale of one to ten, it is hypothesized that management will rank these motivators differently than workers.

The recognition of these differences is particularly important to managers and/or supervisors, because it may be counterproductive for managers to select motivators/hygiene factors based on his/her list of the factors instead of the employees’ lists.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

During the literature review, various theories such as process and content theories of motivation and management theories will be discussed. These theories are directly associated with motivation and implementing the most effective organizational structure. Also, research suggests that the sex of an individual may dictate what s/he considers important in terms of factors that spur motivation and/or satisfaction (Hulin & Smith, 1964; Brief & Oliver, 1976; and Forgionne & Peeters, 1982). It is important for management to recognize these differences so as not to handle all situations concerning employee motivation and satisfaction in the same manner.

Theories of Motivation

Understanding motivation is complex. It is difficult for theorists to agree upon a single theory incorporating all of the dimensions of motivation. Perhaps the reason an all encompassing motivational theory has not been developed is because empirical research has yet to yield definitive answers concerning human motivation.

Since there is no one theory identifying the motivational process, theorists have categorically divided the concept of motivation into process theories and content theories. Vaught, et al (1985) assert that, “process theories attempt to explain how a person goes through the process of choosing a course of action that leads to outcomes with the greatest total utility. Content theories attempt to specify certain needs that influence behavior” (p. 65). The content and process theories serve as historical
references which will (1) aid in analyzing the results of the administrated surveys, (2) illustrate the importance of understanding motivation and the individual, and (3) illustrate the impact motivation, or lack thereof, has on the employee, and ultimately, the organization.

**Process Theories of Motivation**

Process theories attempt to explain why employees become motivated. While there are a variety of theories developed to explain the motivational process, Victor Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory and Edwin Locke’s (1968) Goal-Setting Theory will be analyzed during this portion of the review of literature.

**Expectancy Theory**

Victor Vroom’s (1964) Expectancy Theory is particularly important in terms of process theories because it exemplifies its usefulness in determining employee motivation versus motivation in general. When employees are surveyed and it is determined that they are performing in conjunction with expectancy theory, the outcomes are (1) employees perform tasks according to their preconceived expectations of either negative or positive outcomes and (2) employees exhibit subjective probability, which means that employees believe that “a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome” (Vaught, et al, 1985, p. 65).

Although “subjective probability” is perhaps one of the most dominant characteristics of Vroom’s theory in terms of employee motivation, expectancy theory is also contingent upon three other elements. These elements are value, which is the “attractiveness of rewards or outcomes that performance could lead to,” instrumentality, which “refers to feelings concerning the likelihood that performance will lead to certain results,” and expectancy, which is the “employee’s estimation of the
probability that change in effort will lead to changes in actual performance” (Yoder & Henneman, 1975, p. 6-4n).

Expectancy theory works well when job advancement is expected to motivate employees. For instance, consider the three elements of expectancy theory with respect to job advancement. First, the prospect of job advancement must be positively valent in that the promotion must be worth the effort put forth to obtain the position. Second, in order for the prospect of job advancement to act as a motivator, the employee must believe that his/her job performance must outshine the average performer as a basis for receiving the promotion. In other words, there must be an element of competition for the sought after position. Lastly, the employee must believe that changing work efforts will probably lead to higher performance, thus, job advancement.

It must be noted that removal of any of these elements will result in an absence of motivation (Cummings, 1973; McAfee and Poffenberger, 1982; Smith, 1997). For instance, if an employee believes that s/he will not receive a job advancement, regardless of how much effort s/he puts into performing a particular task, s/he may perform with little or no motivation. “If work outcomes lose their meaning, motivation to achieve them ceases” (Smith, 1997, p. 23).

Conversely, even if all of the elements of expectancy theory are met, employees may still lack motivation. There may be situations where high job performance leads to outcomes such as debilitate relationships, social seclusion, worker friction, etc. These outcomes are considered negatively valent (Carroll & Tosi, 1977; Vaught, et al, 1985; Yoder & Henneman, 1975).

Goal-Setting Theory

Expectancy theory is essentially concerned with assessing employee motivation that is not essentially influenced by management’s feedback. Edwin Locke’s (1968)
Goal-Setting theory, however, establishes an important link between employee motivation, goal-setting, and feedback.

Through extensive research, Locke(1968) and his colleagues demonstrated the importance goal-setting has on employee motivation. Locke’s research indicates that, through the use of organizational goal-setting, productivity can be improved (Patchen, 1970; Pritchard, 1980). Goal-setting theory’s main function is to attempt to predict employee performance behavior (Cummings, 1973). Before conducting his research, Locke focused on the following questions concerning goal-setting and employee performance behavior:

1. How do the conscious goals and intentions of the people who execute a task affect that task performance (McAfee & Poffenberger, 1982)?

2. Are more difficult goals better or worse for the organization that easier goals in obtaining the maximum performance level from the employee (McAfee & Poffenberger, 1982)?

3. Is it better to use goals that are general or goals that are more specific in terms of performance (McAfee & Poffenberger, 1982)?

After careful observation, Locke surmised that specific goals that are more difficult and challenging produce better performance that general, less challenging goals (Locke, 1968). Locke also determined that when employees participate in setting their own goals it has a positive effect because employees may then fulfill a need to be influential in decision-making (Locke, et al., 1981).

Another finding of goal-setting theory is that people seem to derive more enjoyment from goals that are perceived as moderately difficult than goals that are perceived as extremely easy or extremely difficult. It should, however, be kept in mind that the employee’s social and personal characteristics can change the perception of the level of
difficulty of a particular goal (Carroll & Tosi, 1977). According to a study Carroll and Tosi (1977) conducted:

Managers low in self-esteem reported diminished effort expenditures when given goals that were perceived to be difficult, while managers high in self-esteem reported increased effort expenditures when given what they perceived to be difficult goals (p. 234).

The notion that the level of self-esteem is consistent with high or low performance regarding goal-setting was expounded upon by Bandura's (1986) Social Cognitive theory. The social cognitive theory explains how individuals exert influence over personal motivations and actions through self-regulation techniques such as self-efficacy (Woods, et al, 1990). Bandura and his associates suggest that motivated employees generally have positive perceived self-efficacy. According to Bandura (1986):

> Perceived self-efficacy refers to peoples' beliefs in their capabilities to execute the activities required to achieve different levels of performance. Peoples' beliefs in their efficacy affect what courses of action they choose to pursue, how much effort they put forth in a given endeavor, how long they will persevere in the face of obstacles and failure experiences, whether their thought patterns in taxing situations are self-aiding or self-hindering and how much stress and depression they experience in coping with environmental demands (Woods, et al., 1990, p. 182).

Employee self-efficacy may be enhanced by the proper feedback. Feedback is one of the most essential elements of goal-setting, especially dealing with organizational goals. For without feedback, employees would be unable to gauge how well or poorly a task has been performed. Feedback provides the employee with direction and stability and should be derived directly from the task as soon as possible.
However, past studies designed to assess the relationship between feedback and goal-setting demonstrated that feedback alone was deficient as a catalyst for improving task performance (Jablin, et al., 1987; Locke, Courtledge, & Knoeppel, 1968; Myers, 1970; Pritchard, 1990). Subsequent goal-setting studies revealed that, even though feedback alone is deficient in increasing performance, feedback, in addition to goals, produces enhanced performance (Bandura & Simon, 1977; Jablin, et al., 1987; Locke, et al., 1981).

Employee performance and productivity affects organizational success and prosperity. With this in mind, measurable company objectives and goals should be clearly stated. Since an employee’s performance is said to be commensurate with tasks that can be measured, implementing goal-setting systems that accurately represent organizational goals is necessary in order to maximize employee productivity (Pritchard, 1990). All employees require feedback from management on their job performance if employees are expected to improve and excel (Koonce, 1998).

**Content Theories of Motivation**

Content theories attempt to explain what factors are necessary to promote employee motivation. Although many theorists assert that money is the primary factor needed to motivate employees, theories proposed by Abraham Maslow (1943), Frederick Herzberg (1968), and The Hawthorne Experiments offer many other factors as motivators.

**Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg’s Motivator-Hygiene Theory**

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs challenged classical management theories by including motivation as a social need rather than an economic need. Maslow (1943) asserts that individuals satisfy their motivational and self-worth needs by striving to
attain physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, esteem needs, and 
self-actualization needs. According to Maslow, individuals must fulfill lower level 
needs such as food, water, security, and love and acceptance, before the self-esteem and 
self-actualization needs can be fulfilled. For instance, “a person who has reliable and 
stable means of meeting physiological and safety needs will become motivated to fulfill 
social needs, while a starving, homeless individual is preoccupied only with finding 
food and shelter” (Daniels & Spiker, 1987, p. 65).

Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs and Frederick Herzberg’s (1968) motivator-hygiene 
theory offer “prescriptions for influencing or gaining others’ compliance” (Daniels & 
Spiker, 1987, p. 200). Herzberg’s theory is modeled after Maslow’s hierarchy of needs 
concept, however, Herzberg incorporates the concepts of satisfaction and 
dissatisfaction.

According to Herzberg, the same factors that increase satisfaction do not decrease 
dissatisfaction. Satisfaction and dissatisfaction are two separate and distinct conditions, 
therefore, each condition requires a set of different factors that contribute to job 
satisfaction or relate to job dissatisfaction. In fact, Herzberg purports that, “failure to 
provide for workers’ hygiene needs will lead to dissatisfaction and poor performance, 
but meeting these needs does not produce motivation to improve performance” (Daniels 
& Spiker, 1987, p. 201). For instance, Herzberg’s motivator-hygiene theory offers six 
components, termed “motivators” that seem to contribute to job satisfaction. These 
motivators are as follows: achievement, recognition, advancement, the work itself, 
responsibility, and possibility of personal growth.

In the workplace, for someone to feel as though they have reached achievement, a 
task must be successfully completed, solutions must be presented to problems, and the 
end result of a task must be in sight. “Recognition is a feeling of personal 
accomplishment with a completed task; advancement refers to promotion; responsibility 
is a worker’s control over his or her job, including the ability to perform without
supervision;" (Rosenbaum, 1982, p. 21) the work itself refers to what actually happens on the job; and the possibility of personal growth is parallel to advancement. If an employee is not receiving at least one of these motivators, it does not matter if there is job security, a large salary, etc., the employee is not likely to be motivated by the job, and may perhaps, perform poorly.

Herzberg’s (1968) factors that promote dissatisfaction are termed “hygiene factors.” These factors are as follows: company policy and administration, technical supervision, relationship with supervisor, work conditions, relationships with peers, relationships with subordinates, salary, job security, personal life, work conditions, and status. Before developing the motivator-hygiene factors, Herzberg conducted a series of interviews to determine the nature of work motivation.

For the interviews, Herzberg posed two questions designed to assess what made employees feel good about their jobs and what made employees feel bad about their jobs. The answers regarding issues that made employees feel bad about their jobs dealt primarily with company policies and administration, missing or unfair grievance procedures, poor performance appraisal methods, rigid attendance rules, and impractical vacation schedules. Other complaints about work included safety hazards, lack of personal comfort at work stations, noise levels, etc (Smith, 1997).

These complaints led Herzberg to compile the above list of hygiene factors. However, even if these hygiene factors were adequately dealt with, employees would not necessarily be motivated to perform more productively at work. According to Herzberg’s theory, motivation derives from meeting the identified “motivators” and dispensing the identified “hygiene factors.”

The Hawthorne Experiments and Elton Mayo

As early as 1924, increased interest in work efficiency, employee motivation, and productivity, led a team of researchers to explore what factors may or may not
contribute to worker productivity. In 1924, efficiency experts conducted an experiment at Western Electric Corporation of Hawthorne, Illinois to determine the effects of illumination upon individual work productivity. An experimental group and a control group were selected in order to test the hypothesis that increased illumination would yield higher productivity.

The experiment took place in four phases over a period of four years, and the results were as follows: (1) higher employee satisfaction and motivation does indeed result in higher employee productivity; (2) if a positive relationship between workers exist, productivity will increase; (3) individual employees have different levels of satisfaction and have different reactions to their experiences; (4) positive socialization among workers influence productivity (Roethlisberger & Dickinson, 1939).

The Hawthorne studies directly challenged the classical theories of organizational management and are relevant because findings suggest that interpersonal communication, values and attitudes, and group cohesion are more important than strict organizational work structures offered by traditional work environments. These studies paved the way for the development of the human relations theories (Daniels & Spiker, 1987).

As a result of the findings of the famous Hawthorne experiments, scientist, Elton Mayo (1947) conducted further experiments introducing other variables such as more rest breaks, more comfortable working conditions, and paid lunches to the chosen experimental groups (Smith, 1997). However, it was determined that the control groups produced just as much, if not more, than the experimental groups.

Because of these findings, Mayo and his team decided to eliminate the independent variables from the experimental groups, hypothesizing that work productivity would decrease among the test groups. However, the test groups produced more than they had previously. These findings encouraged Mayo and his team to determine that any group "singled out for special attention, even for control purposes, will usually respond by
increased motivation" (Smith, 1997, p.41). These workers were aware that they were being displayed, and putting their best faces forward, performed accordingly.

Applicable Management Theories

The human relations movement is responsible for the direction management has taken regarding meeting employee needs. Although management in many organizations still incorporate traditional methods into company values, organizations no longer *solely* rely upon using traditional, scientific methods to motivate and encourage today's employees to put forth maximum effort. The following section emphasizes management theories many organizations have attempted to use in order to meet employee requirements for motivation.

Management by Science

Frederick Taylor (1919), who is credited with being the father of scientific management (Levering, 1988), participated in a series of observations designed to understand human behavior in an organizational structure. Although Taylor’s experiments were not conducted using empirical methods, he formulated several principles concerning organizational efficiency which later become known as scientific management. Taylor’s concept is relevant because his “philosophy is almost universally accepted in practice, if not in theory, by managers throughout the world” (Levering, 1988, p. 80).

Taylor was concerned with discovering the personal qualities of the ideal worker as well as discovering ideal working conditions (Schoorman & Schneider, 1988). In essence, Taylor sought to discover how to get people to work harder. One of Taylor’s solutions was to create desirable working conditions, thus increasing productivity through developing “harmonious cooperation between workmen and the management”
Taylor was one of the first to propose employee/management communication as a necessity for production enhancement.

Taylor’s second solution required management to scientifically analyze every pending and completed task in order to counter any forthcoming remarks or arguments from employees. “The scientific manager subjects every task in the workplace to dispassionate scientific inquiry to eliminate any dispute about whether someone is goofing off,” thereby creating a “one best way” (Levering, 1988, p. 82). According to Taylor, creating an organizational structure implementing a “one best way” using scientific methods would free the employee from the unnecessary strain of worrying about what to do. Employees, instead, would be free to concentrate on becoming more efficient at how to complete a task.

Another of Taylor’s solutions was to scientifically select personnel according to his/her potential to complete a task. In conjunction with this principle, Taylor sought to divide task functions into management and workers, thus maintaining the hierarchical structure (Daniels & Spiker, 1987). Assigning individuals to tasks according to ability would, perhaps, foster an organized workplace (Levering, 1988). According to Levering:

As Taylor put it, ‘one type of man is needed to plan ahead and an entirely different type to execute the work.’ In short, the manager provides the brain, the worker provides the brawn. This conception of management has dominated the workplace since Taylor’s day (p. 84). The concept of dividing managers and employees allowed Taylor to introduce upward communication from employee to manager and downward persuasive strategies from managers to employees (Jablin, et al., 1987).

Lastly, Taylor suggested financially compensating employees according to the amount of work s/he produced. According to Taylor, providing piecework incentive pay plans, which means the more you produce, the higher the wage, would motivate
employees to work harder (Myer, 1970). However, it must be noted that there is evidence suggesting that “the more people are motivated by a need to be wealthy, the less robust their psychological framework becomes. Money may matter to people, some more than others, but this does not necessarily amount to motivating them” (Kohn, 1998, p.27).

It is obvious that Taylor’s influence is prevalent in today’s society. As Myer (1970) states:

Taylorisms and expressions of its philosophy linger on in many of today’s organizations in the forms of engineered standards, time and motion study, piecework incentives, paid suggestion plans, and a myriad of manipulative programs for communication, zero defects, attitude measurement, merit rating, motivation, and morale (p. 60).

Myer’s use of the word “manipulative” stems from the school of thought criticizing management’s ability to successfully motivate workers by incorporating policies based on psychological insights and theories (Levering, 1988). However, according to Jablin, et al (1987), Taylor was highly concerned with the welfare of employees and was not merely concerned with manipulating employees. Taylor displayed a desire to reduce arbitrary capricious treatment of workers through scientific selection and training. Taylor’s main objective was to create an environment where everyone would benefit under scientific management (Daniels & Spiker, 1991).

It is important to recognize that Taylor’s concepts, alone, produced ephemeral goals and gains at best. However, if these concepts are coupled with dimensions of job enrichments (Walker, 1965) such as enhanced employee attitude, intellectual stimulus, encouraged creativity and initiative, facilitative interpersonal relationships with co-workers, and positive personal development, an employee’s purpose may become more meaningful. This newfound meaning may also result in more productivity.
The Managerial Grid

Robert R. Blake and Jane S. Mouton (1978) were also concerned with factors contributing to worker motivation and developed the Managerial Grid which offers different managerial styles. The managerial styles are comprised of concern for production and concern for people. Low concern for people yields a “one,” while high concern for people yields a “nine;” low concern for production yields a “one,” while high concern for production yields a “nine” (Rosenbaum, 1982).

Based on the Managerial Grid, Blake and Mouton determined that a manager exhibiting a 9,1 (high concern for production and low concern for people) on the grid displays an auto-cratic style of leadership relying heavily on threats for increased production. On the other hand, a manager exhibiting a 1,9 (low concern for production, high concern for people) on the grid displays laissez faire style of leadership produces apathy and groupthink among workers. Managers who display 5,5 (medium concern for people and production) produce mediocrity on the job.

Blake and Mouton assert that managers who strive for a 9,9 (high concern for people and production) on the Managerial Grid “insists on excellence in both areas by integrating a maximum of sensitivity to people with a maximum of concern for production” (Rosenbaum, 1982, p. 15). Blake and Mouton’s grid is particularly useful to managers who are concerned with creating positive working environments which, in turn, create motivating environments (Rosenbaum, 1982).

Theory X and Theory Y

Theory X and Theory Y is another theory proposed to enhance employee motivation and productivity through effective management. Douglas McGregor (1960), a professor at MIT, proposed that if better understanding of employee motivation is to come about, managers must view motivation from a behavioral scientific standpoint. According to McGregor, management’s behavior toward workers stems from two views, hence
Theory X and Theory Y. From traditional management's perspective, Theory X suggests that workers are generally lazy and have "an intrinsic aversion to work and will avoid it if possible" (Rosenbaum, 1982, p.16). Managers who subscribe to Theory X believe that employees abhor responsibility and willingly leave any decision making up to management (Daniels & Spiker, 1987). According to Theory X, a manager views the average person as lazy, unproductive, and uncooperative. Theory X managers also assume that, if a goal is to be accomplished, s/he must resort to coercion and threats in order to gain any form of compliance from workers (Daniels & Spiker, 1987; Korman, 1971; Korman, 1977; Rosenbaum, 1982).

Theory Y is the polar opposite of Theory X, and states that, "if workers are lazy and lackadaisical, it is not because they are inherently that way, but because management creates their ennui through excessive control" (Rosenbaum, 1982, p. 16). Theory Y suggests that, on the whole, people desire self-control and self-motivation, which is realized in participatory environments. According to McGregor (1960), participatory environments are created when managers abstain from manipulation tactics.

McGregor's theory has helped to implement managerial styles that are in direct contrast to traditional leadership styles. These managerial styles of leadership include democratic leadership, decision-making leadership, and participatory leadership (Korman, 1977). Leadership styles such as these are credited with promoting productive work environments.

Motivation and Satisfaction Through Empowerment

Despite the fact that it has been difficult for management scholars to conceptualize adequate processes of employee empowerment (Conger & Kanungo, 1988), management researchers continue to work diligently at developing process models which effectively communicate empowerment to employees. Although agreeing on a single empowerment construct has proven to be an arduous task, accordingly, theorists
are identifying empowerment as the "the concept of enabling subordinates to have the authority and capacity to make decisions and to act for the organization in order to improve both individual motivation and organizational productivity" (Elmuti, 1977, p. 233).

However, one cannot truly grasp the gist of empowerment without incorporating the notions of power and self-efficacy, especially since these terms are so intricately related to the empowerment construct. Thus, empowerment is also defined as the enhancement of self-efficacy through the elimination of conditions that foster powerlessness and lack of control (Conger & Kanungo, 1988; Elmuti, 1997). These definitions, taken together, underscore the fundamental need for globally competitive organizations to initiate employee empowerment tactics.

When considering power, one of the root constructs of empowerment, the term should be characterized organizationally and interpersonally. Organizationally, the term power refers to an individual's attempts to influence control over the environment and workers (Mowdry, 1978) while providing instrumental performance valued by the organization (Conger & Kanungo, 1988). Interpersonally, power may be specified as either distributive or integrative. The concept of distributive power is based on "force, control, pressure, or aggression . . . one individual is able to carry his or her objective over the resistance of another" (Wilmot & Hocker, 1998, p. 83).

The integrative view, which is ultimately best when instituting empowerment constructs, is based on power with or the sharing of power (Wilmot & Hocker, 1998). When management practices distributive power, employees may suffer from a lack of self-efficacy, which is an intrinsic belief in one's self that s/he can accomplish tasks with successful results (Bandura, 1986). Thus, incorporating integrative power tactics may increase employee self-efficacy which may ultimately lead to higher motivational levels.
According to Latham, et al (1988), Bandura's (1986) conceptualization of self-efficacy has impressive cognitive benefits associated with employee participation and increased motivational levels. Empowering employees with a participatory environment and the opportunity to make decisions enhances employee motivational levels by granting workers a forum with which to exhibit their abilities to solve problems (Tjosvold, 1998). However, employees who exhibit low self-efficacy or no self-efficacy may not be eager to participate in the decision making process and may exhibit poor levels of motivation which may affect performance and or productivity. It is for these reasons that management theorists have worked so diligently to understand the empowerment process.

Conger & Kanungo (1988) submit that management theorists recognize the impact empowerment has on organizational effectiveness. The authors assert that,

First, studies on leadership and management skills suggest that the practice of empowering subordinates is a principal component of managerial and organizational effectiveness. Second, analysis of power and control within organizations reveals that the total productive forms of organizational power and effectiveness grow with superiors' sharing or power and control with subordinates. Finally, experiences in team building within organizations suggest that empowerment techniques play a crucial role in group development and maintenance (p. 471).

However, before the development of empowerment tactics, management and/or leaders must first identify the problems associated with low self-efficacy and powerlessness. Secondly, leaders must have a clear understanding of the requirements for self-efficacy enhancement.

Once the problems are identified and the requirements ascertained, the process of empowerment may commence. Congo & Kanungo (1988) submit that the empowerment process is comprised of five stages which include: (1) recognizing the
four primary conditions (organizational factors, supervision, reward system, and nature of the job) which may affect the psychological state of the powerless; (2) the implementation of managerial strategies and techniques such as participative management, goal-setting, and feedback systems; (3) the provision of self-efficacy information through enactive attainment, verbal persuasion, and emotional arousal; (4) recognizing the results of the enforced empowerment strategy; (5) and lastly, recognizing the behavioral effects of the implemented strategy. Congo & Kanungo (1988) go on to espouse that:

The first stage is the diagnosis of conditions within the organization that are responsible for feelings of powerlessness among subordinates. This leads to the use of empowerment strategies by managers in Stage 2. The employment of these strategies is aimed not only at removing some of the external conditions responsible for powerlessness, but also (and more important) at providing subordinates with self-efficacy information in Stage 3. As a result of receiving such information, subordinates feel empowered in Stage 4, and the behavior effects of empowerment are noticed in Stage 5 (p. 474).

It is important to note that the manager/leader must possess effective interpersonal communication skills. For instance, management must be able to effectively communicate to the employee that s/he is aware of the conditions which are responsible for creating powerless environments. By that same token, management must be able to effectively communicate to the employee that there are solutions to the problems, as well as how the solutions will be implemented.

Therefore, effective interpersonal communication skills, in conjunction with effective utilization of the organization in its entirety by incorporating empowerment tactics, is likely to motivate workers to strive toward high work performance (Oldham, 1976).
Sex Differences in Motivation and Satisfaction

It is widely understood that job satisfaction and motivation are among the chief contributors of employee performance (Forgionne & Peeters, 1982). It is also widely understood that, as the new millenium approaches, women are steadily becoming more and more prominent figures in the workplace. Since society has recently began accepting the notion that men and women process information differently and are, perhaps, driven by different ideals, many management theorists have found it necessary to ascertain if there are sex differences when determining which factors may influence motivation and satisfaction levels among employees.

Although some past and current studies do not provide definitive proof of sex differences and motivation/satisfaction factors, and results vary from one study to the next, several sex differences have been identified. For instance, there have been sex differences noted among such motivational factors as pay satisfaction (Hulin & Smith, 1964; Ronan & Organt, 1973; Sauser & York, 1978; Schuster, Clark, & Rogers, 1971; Varca, Shaffer, & McCaulley, 1983; Weaver, 1977), pay satisfaction in conjunction with occupational level (Bartol & Wortman, 1975; Centers & Cantril, 1946; Salyeh & Lalljec, 1969; Sauser & York, 1978; Varca, Shaffer, & McCaulley, 1983), and opportunities for advancement, coworkers, supervision, and the work itself (Sauser & York, 1978; Smith, Kendall, & Hulin, 1969).

With respect to sex differences and pay, Varca, et al (1983) conducted a study designed to assess the sex differences in pay among low level workers (food and beverage servers, factory work, etc.) and high level workers (management, social workers, etc.). The authors found that women employed in low level positions and employed in high level positions tend to be more satisfied with pay. However, the authors also found that women working in high level positions tend to be less satisfied with pay than women employed in low level positions and less satisfied than their male...
counterparts. As a result of these findings, Varca et al. (1983) concluded that the occupational level of the employee may dictate his/her satisfaction with organizational pay.

The authors offer that differences in standard operating procedures among low level organizations and high level organizations may explain the varying results. For instance, Varca, et al. (1983) assert that:

At lower occupational levels, the relationship between a worker, his/her organization, and pay or promotion is somewhat standard, with initial hourly wages set and time periods between raises fixed. At higher levels, however, the criteria for advancement are not as concrete, and salaries can vary considerably within the same job position. Consequently, the lack of formal rules concerning allocation or pay and advancement opportunities at higher occupational levels could promote greater variability in individual perceptions of fair or just treatment (p. 349).

Since perception is such a vital component of societal behavior and consequently constitutes an individual's reality, it is imperative that employees perceive the workplace as a fair and just environment if their motivation levels are to increase.

In addition to Varca, et al.'s explanation regarding women employed in low level occupations and their satisfaction with pay, Sauser & York (1978) use Vroom's (1964) expectancy theory as a means of explanation. The authors offer that since women in low level occupations expect to be paid less, they are more apt to be satisfied with low pay. Varca, et al., further explain that individuals may use social comparison and reference groups as a means of determining pay satisfaction. "In other words, low level females may appear satisfied with smaller salaries because they make comparisons only within their group, thereby keeping expectations low" (Varca, et al., 1983, p. 352). Conversely, women in high level positions may use men employed in high level
positions as reference groups which may explain their dissatisfaction with pay, especially since men traditionally receive higher pay than women.

Regarding the opportunity for advancement, the work itself, co-workers, and supervision, which are other motivational factors, theorists have reported that men are more satisfied than women (Forgionne & Peeters, 1982; Hulin & Smith, 1964; Sauser & York, 1978; Shapiro & Stern, 1975). Sauser and York (1978) offer that men have a significant advantage over women relative to pay, and perhaps, education level which may explain why men are more satisfied in those areas.

Sauser and York (1978), however, do appear optimistic in that they assert that, “there is no compelling reason to believe that, given equal educational, employment, and advancement opportunities, and an equal chance to apply their skills to appropriate challenges, women should be any less satisfied than men with their jobs.” The authors go on to say that, “there has, of course, been a strong movement of late to eliminate barriers to equal employment of women . . . this movement will result in the diminution of sex differences in satisfaction” (p. 544).

Whatever the findings suggest, be it sex differences with pay, recognition, advancement, supervision, etc., it is necessary to recognize these differences if an organization is to run smoothly with motivated employees. The practical benefit of conducting studies focused on sex differences is that once a motivating factor is uncovered, it gives the company an advantage by allowing managers to use relevant factors instead of irrelevant factors as motivational tools.
CHAPTER 3

METHODOLOGY

Instrument Design

A survey questionnaire consisting of ten motivational hygiene factors, along with demographic questions inquiring about job title and sex, was developed. In addition to the questionnaire, an interview schedule, which was used to conduct individual interview sessions with each manager and employee, was developed. The ten motivational variables are identical to the variables Lindahl (1949) used. The questions from the interview schedule were modeled after questions Patchen (1965) used. Each participant was given a survey to fill out before the interviews began. The survey was administered first so as not to allow the subsequent interview to influence potential decisions when ranking the variables.

Separate and distinct instructions for both management and employees were included on each supplemental survey. The employees were asked to rank the motivators from one to ten in order of importance with one being the most important and ten being the least important. The supervisors/managers were asked to rank the ten motivators in order of important from one to ten with one being the most important and ten being the least important as well. However, the supervisors/managers were asked to rank the motivators according to how they thought their subordinates would rank each variable.
Participants in the Study

Thirty individuals volunteered to participate during this project. Both female and male subjects were surveyed. Of the 25 participants eight are female and 17 are male. Employee positions include seven drivers, five warehouse personnel, three order takers, one data entry position, four managers, and five others. The participants surveyed were asked to describe their attitudes toward motivation in the workplace. It is assumed that the individuals working at Office Plus have developed some frame of reference for motivation in the workplace as a result of previous work experiences, and can therefore, sufficiently rank the variables according to their wants and needs or what management perceives as employee wants and needs.

Volunteers were not paid for their participation and were treated in accordance with the UNLV Office of Sponsored Programs' standards of operating procedure.

Survey Measurement

The survey consists of the following ten variables used as motivational factors: appreciation for work done, feeling “in” on things, good wages, good working conditions, interesting work, job security, management loyalty to workers, promotion and growth with company, tactful disciplining, and understanding of personal problems. Since the purpose of this survey was to determine whether there were sex differences among employees when ranking motivational factors as well as differences in perception between management and employees when ranking the variables, it was necessary to incorporate both qualitative and quantitative methods.

The interview schedule consists of 15 questions. Question one asked the participants to describe the organization’s view on teamwork. This question was designed to illicit responses focusing on the extent to which employees identify with the organization. Question two asked the participants to describe their perception of management’s
ability to effectively communicate to them a job well done. This question’s purpose was to determine if there is a need to improve communication efforts and patterns when management conveys job performance and ability to employees.

Question three asked participants to describe management’s reward system for employees who exhibit initiative on the job. Here, the purpose was to determine the level of work performance as a means of determining motivational levels. Questions four and five asked the participants to describe company flexibility and policies regarding grievances and complaints. These questions were designed to assess company sensitivity toward employees. Question six asked the respondent to describe their perception of management’s ability to communicate trust to their employees. This question was designed to assess employee opportunity for success through management’s delegation of company responsibility.

Questions seven, eight, and nine asked the participants to describe the method in which daily goals are communicated, their ability to effectively communicate to management when they are uncertain of daily goals, and their perception of the organization’s view of goal-setting. These questions focused primarily on ascertaining company and employee communication effectiveness. Question ten asked the participants to describe how their motivational levels are affected after receiving an expected raise. This question was designed to determine the extent to which money plays a role in increasing or decreasing employee motivational levels.

Question 11 asked the participant to describe his/her ability to communicate dissatisfaction to management. This question was also designed to assess the level of effective communication within the organization. For instance, are there open lines of communication from management to employees and from employees to management?

Questions 12 and 13 asked the respondents to describe the company’s view of people who change their usual ways of doing things and people who try out new ideas without first consulting management. Here, the objective was to assess initiative and interest.
levels among employees. Questions 14 and 15 asked the participants to describe, as a whole, the organizations positive and negative aspects so as to determine the employees’ overall perception of the company.

Research Procedure

The survey instrument was piloted by introducing a pilot survey to colleagues at the University of Nevada, Las Vegas in order to ascertain which method of distribution would be more effective and appropriate. One group was instructed verbally as to how to complete the survey. The other group was given written instructions without verbal accompaniment. The objective was to test the effectiveness of written instructions versus verbal instructions. In either case, there was no difference in effectiveness, and the surveys were all completed successfully.

Colleagues were also interviewed using a duplicate of the interview schedule in order to assess length and consistency of the interview, as well as question comprehension. Once it was established that the instructions on the survey and the questions on the interview schedule were clearly understood, employees at Office Plus were each given a survey to fill out and subsequently interviewed over a period of four days. A microcassette recorder was used for the interviews in order to ensure accuracy when analyzing the data. The completion of the surveys and interviews were contingent upon prior agreement with the owner and general manager of Office Plus.

Herzberg’s fully-ordered ranked variables were entered into the Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) statistical program. The data were then sequenced by mean and ranking order of groups in order to allow for comparison between female and male employees and comparison between management and employees. Since there were only two levels of the independent variable, the t-test for independent samples, which is parametric in nature, was used to determine differences in the ranking of the ordered
variables. Also, in order to determine a frequency count, such as how many participants listed which motivators in what order, a chi-square test, which are non-parametric in nature, was used.
CHAPTER 4

RESULTS

This study has two hypotheses. The first hypothesis asserts that male and female participants will rank Herzberg’s (1968) ten “hygiene factors” and motivators differently from one another. The second hypothesis asserts that management will perceive the employees’ perceptions of the survey questionnaire differently than employees and will rank the motivators accordingly.

The results and statistical analysis of the data collected from the motivational survey questionnaire wherein participants were asked to rank Herzberg’s (1968) “hygiene factors” and motivators are presented. Also, a thematic analysis of the results from the employee interviews is presented. First, the codes used to assist in identifying questionnaire variables are presented (see Table 1). Secondly, the statistical results of the study are presented. The results are presented as follows: crosstabulation statistics for percentages, t-test for independent samples statistics in order to test hypotheses, the ranking of Herzberg’s (1968) “hygiene factors” and motivational variables for both male and female comparison and employee and management comparison, and interview theme analysis. For all statistical tests, an alpha level of .05 was used.

Demographic Data Results

The demographic information for the participants is as follows. Results of this study show that 25 individuals participated and completed the questionnaire. Thirty-two
Table 1

Demographic Categories and Codes

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Codes</th>
<th>Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>Appreciation for work done</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>Feeling “in” on things</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>Good wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting</td>
<td>Interesting work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>Management loyalty to workers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Promotion and growth within the company</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>Tactful disciplining</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>Understanding of personal problems</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
percent of the participants are female with 68% male. Of the 25 participants, 28% are drivers, 20% are warehouse personnel only, 12% are order takers, 4% are data entry specialists, and 16% are management. Twenty percent of the employees listed “other” as their job description.

Crosstabulation Results
of Male / Female Perceptions

This study has two hypotheses. The first hypothesis asserts that male and female participants will rank Herzberg’s (1968) ten “hygiene factors” and motivators differently from one another. A ranking scale of one to ten was used with one being the most important and ten being the least important. The crosstabulations for sex, the independent variable, and the dependent variables “appreciation” \( (\chi^2 = 4.64, \text{df} = 7) \), “interest” \( (\chi^2 = 14.12, \text{df} = 8) \), “security” \( (\chi^2 = 3.88, \text{df} = 6) \), “loyalty” \( (\chi^2 = 4.93, \text{df} = 7) \), “growth” \( (\chi^2 = 9.87, \text{df} = 6) \), “discipline” \( (\chi^2 = 9.62, \text{df} = 6) \), and “understanding” \( (\chi^2 = 4.45, \text{df} = 4) \), indicate that there are no significant relationships. Also, crosstabulations for sex, the independent variable, and the dependent variables “feeling in” \( (\chi^2 = 7.46, \text{df} = 8) \), “wages” \( (\chi^2 = 7.80, \text{df} = 6) \), and “working conditions” \( (\chi^2 = 9.91, \text{df} = 8) \), indicate that there are no significant relationships. While these findings were not empirically significant, it is interesting to note that several differences regarding frequency did occur. With regard to “sex” and “feeling in,” 100% of the female participants ranked the variable between six and ten, which indicates that the female participants perceive “feeling in” as having moderate to low importance. However, only 59% of the male employees ranked the variable between six and ten, which means that the other 41% of the male participants ranked “feeling in” between one and five, indicating high to moderate importance.

Further, with regard to “sex” and “wages,” it is interesting that 100% of the female participants ranked the variable between one and three which indicates high importance,
whereas only 47% percent of the male employees ranked the variable between one and three. Also, 29.4% of the male participants ranked “wages” between four and five which indicates moderate importance. Lastly, concerning “sex” and “working conditions” over 82% of the male participants ranked the variable between one and five, indicating high to moderate importance, whereas, only 37.5% of the female participants ranked the variable accordingly (see Table 2).

Crosstabulation Results of Employee / Management Perceptions

The second hypothesis asserts that management will perceive the employees’ perceptions of the motivators differently than the employees do and will rank the motivators accordingly. A crosstabulation was conducted to determine if management would correctly predict employee perceptions of the “hygiene factors” and motivators. Employees were asked to rank the survey in order of importance using a scale of one to ten, with one being the most important and ten being the least important. Management was also asked to rank the “hygiene factors” and motivators in order of importance, using the same scale, according to how they believed the employees would rank the survey.

Crosstabulations for job title, the independent variable, and the dependent variables “appreciation” ($\chi^2 = 2.29$, df = 7), “interest” ($\chi^2 = 7.81$, df = 7), “security” ($\chi^2 = 10.36$, df = 5), “growth” ($\chi^2 = 4.58$, df = 6), “discipline” ($\chi^2 = 9.37$, df = 6), and “understanding” ($\chi^2 = 9.28$, df = 4), indicate that there are no significant relationships.

Regarding the dependent variables “feeling in” ($\chi^2 = 9.37$, df = 8), “wages” ($\chi^2 = 6.14$, df = 6), “working conditions” ($\chi^2 = 6.25$, df = 7), and “loyalty” ($\chi^2 = 10.83$, df = 6), and job title, the independent variable, a crosstabulation revealed no significant relationships. However, there are differences between management and employee
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(1-3) High Imp.</th>
<th>(4-5) Mod. Imp.</th>
<th>(6-8) Mod. low Imp.</th>
<th>(9-10) Low Imp.</th>
<th>Total (1-5)</th>
<th>Total (6-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Female Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Cond.</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>87.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>37.5</td>
<td>62.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>62.5</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>87.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male Perceptions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>47.1</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>23.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>58.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>76.4</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Cond.</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>82.3</td>
<td>17.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>17.6</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>70.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>53.0</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>82.4</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>29.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>52.9</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>35.3</td>
<td>64.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>41.7</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>41.1</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>58.9</td>
<td>41.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>41.2</td>
<td>47.0</td>
<td>11.8</td>
<td>88.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>23.5</td>
<td>70.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>94.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
perceptions which warrant discussion. For instance, none of the managers predicted that employees would rank “feeling in” between one and five (high to moderate importance). Quite the contrary, management predicted that employees would rank “feeling in” between six and ten (moderate to low importance). Nonetheless, 31% of the employees ranked “feeling in” between one and five.

Another difference worth mentioning is that 100% of the managers expected that employees would rank the “wages” variable between one and three, which would indicate high importance for the employees. However, only 50% of the employees ranked “wages” between one and three, while the other 50% ranked “wages” between four and five (moderate importance).

Also, 75% of the managers anticipated that employees would rank “working conditions” between one and three, which indicates that management assumes employees perceive working conditions as highly important. However, only 31.4% of the employees ranked “working conditions” between one and three, while 37.6% of the employees ranked the variable between four and five, indicating moderate importance.

Lastly, none of the managers predicted that the employees would rank the “loyalty” variable between one and five. Yet, 50% of the employees did rank the variable between one and five, which indicates at least moderate importance for the employees (see Table 3).

T-tests for Independent Samples

Results of Male and Female Perceptions

Employee attitudes and perceptions toward motivation in the workplace were also analyzed using t-tests for independent samples. The purposes for applying the t-tests were to determine statistical significance between groups and mean and sum of ordered ranks of female perceptions vs. male perceptions, as well as employee perceptions vs. management perceptions.
### Table 3

**Job Title Perceptions of Variables by Percentage**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>(1-3)</th>
<th>(4-5)</th>
<th>(6-8)</th>
<th>(9-10)</th>
<th>Total (1-5)</th>
<th>Total (6-10)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>High Imp.</td>
<td>Mod. Imp.</td>
<td>Mod. low Imp.</td>
<td>Low Imp.</td>
<td>(1-5)</td>
<td>(6-10)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.5</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Cond.</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
<td>50.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>0.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
<td>25.0</td>
<td>75.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Management Perceptions

| Appreciation       | 37.5   | 37.5   | 25.0   | 0.0    | 75.0        | 25.0         |
| Feeling in         | 12.5   | 18.8   | 25.0   | 43.7   | 31.3        | 68.7         |
| Wages              | 50.0   | 25.0   | 25.0   | 0.0    | 75.0        | 25.0         |
| Working Cond.      | 31.4   | 37.6   | 25.0   | 6.0    | 69.0        | 31.0         |
| Interest           | 12.5   | 12.5   | 43.8   | 31.2   | 25.0        | 75.0         |
| Security           | 56.3   | 31.2   | 12.5   | 0.0    | 87.5        | 12.5         |
| Loyalty            | 43.8   | 6.2    | 37.5   | 12.5   | 50.0        | 50.0         |
| Growth             | 50.0   | 6.2    | 31.3   | 12.5   | 56.2        | 43.8         |
| Discipline         | 6.2    | 18.8   | 37.5   | 37.5   | 25.0        | 75.0         |
| Understanding      | 0.0    | 6.2    | 37.5   | 56.3   | 6.2         | 93.8         |

### Employee Perceptions

| Appreciation       | 37.5   | 37.5   | 25.0   | 0.0    | 75.0        | 25.0         |
| Feeling in         | 12.5   | 18.8   | 25.0   | 43.7   | 31.3        | 68.7         |
| Wages              | 50.0   | 25.0   | 25.0   | 0.0    | 75.0        | 25.0         |
| Working Cond.      | 31.4   | 37.6   | 25.0   | 6.0    | 69.0        | 31.0         |
| Interest           | 12.5   | 12.5   | 43.8   | 31.2   | 25.0        | 75.0         |
| Security           | 56.3   | 31.2   | 12.5   | 0.0    | 87.5        | 12.5         |
| Loyalty            | 43.8   | 6.2    | 37.5   | 12.5   | 50.0        | 50.0         |
| Growth             | 50.0   | 6.2    | 31.3   | 12.5   | 56.2        | 43.8         |
| Discipline         | 6.2    | 18.8   | 37.5   | 37.5   | 25.0        | 75.0         |
| Understanding      | 0.0    | 6.2    | 37.5   | 56.3   | 6.2         | 93.8         |
The t-tests revealed that male and female employees ranked “wages” differently. Women ranked “wages” first, with a mean score of $M = 2.125$, while the men ranked “wages” third, with a mean score of $M = 4.058$. Thus, the t-tests indicate that there is a significant relationship, $(t = 2.985, df = 23, p = .008)$.

With regard to “sex” and the variables “appreciation,” $t = -.570, df = 23, p > .05$; “working conditions,” $t = -1.426, df = 23, p > .05$; “interest,” $t = .318, df = 23, p > .05$; “security,” $t = .720, df = 23, p > .05$; “loyalty,” $t = .233, df = 23, p > .05$; “growth,” $t = -.627, df = 23, p > .05$; “discipline,” $t = .580, df = 23, p > .05$; and “understanding,” $t = 1.033, df = 23, p > .05$, t-tests indicate that there are no other significant relationships. However, t-tests indicate that “sex” and “feeling in” approaches significance, $t = -1.933, df = 23, p = .066$ (see Table 4).

T-tests for Independent Samples
Results of Employee and Management Perceptions

The t-tests confirmed that management’s predictions concerning workers’ perceptions of the motivational factors differ only in terms of placement of “wages.” Management expected that employees would rank “wages” first, giving the variable a mean score of $M = 1.750$. However, employees ranked “wages” second, giving the variable a mean score of $M = 4.000$. Therefore, t-tests indicate that there is a significant relationship, $t = 2.267, df = 18, p = .036$.

Regarding management’s predictions of the employees’ perceptions of the importance of the variables “appreciation,” $t = .580, df = 18, p > .05$; “feeling in,” $t = .089, df = 18, p > .05$; “working conditions,” $t = 1.564, df = 18, p > .05$; “interest,” $t = .047, df = 18, p > .05$; “security,” $t = -.422, df = 18, p > .05$; “growth,” $t = .444, df = 18, p > .05$; “discipline,” $t = -.540, df = 18, p > .05$; and “understanding,” $t = .133, df = 18, p > .05$, the t-tests revealed that there are no significant relationships. However, it must
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Male Mean</th>
<th>Female Mean</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>-0.570</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.574</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>6.529</td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td>-1.933</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.066</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.008</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Cond.</td>
<td>3.764</td>
<td>5.125</td>
<td>-1.426</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.167</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6.588</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>.318</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.753</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.352</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>.720</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.479</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>5.764</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>.233</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.818</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>-.627</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.537</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>7.764</td>
<td>7.250</td>
<td>.580</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.568</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>9.058</td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td>1.033</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>.312</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
be noted that management predicted that employees would rank "loyalty" eighth, giving it a mean score of $M = 8.000$, while employees ranked "loyalty" sixth, giving it a mean score of $M = 5.000$. Therefore, the t-test results indicate that management's predictions of employees' perceptions regarding "loyalty" approach significance, $t = -2.061$, $df = 18$, $p = .054$ (see Table 5).

Ranking Results of

Male and Female Perceptions

The male employees ranked "security" first and "working conditions" second. There was a tie between "wages," "appreciation," and "growth" for third, fourth, and fifth rankings. The female employees ranked "wages" first, "security" second, "appreciation" third, "growth" fourth, and "working conditions" fifth (see Table 6).

Ranking Results of

Employee and Management Perceptions

The employees ranked "job security" first, "wages" second, "appreciation" third, "working conditions" fourth, and "growth" fifth. Management perceived that employees would rank "wages" first, "working conditions" second, "security" third, "appreciation" fourth, and "growth" fifth. Management's predictions of employee attitudes toward the motivators appear to be reasonably close (see Table 7).

Thematic Analysis of Interview Results

Following is a thematic analysis of the individual employee interviews. The purpose of this analysis was to find recurring themes of employee perceptions. The employee interviews offer a qualitative aspect to the study which serves to enhance the results of the statistical analyses. Each question and reply were carefully examined so as to
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Employee Mean</th>
<th>Management Mean</th>
<th>t Value</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>p</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>4.312</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>0.580</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.569</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>0.089</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.930</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>2.895</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.036</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Cond.</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>1.564</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.135</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6.812</td>
<td>6.750</td>
<td>0.047</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.963</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>-0.422</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.678</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>-2.061</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.054</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>-0.444</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.662</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>7.312</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>-0.540</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.596</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>8.625</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>0.133</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>.896</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Measure</td>
<td>Male Mean Rank</td>
<td>Male Rank of Variables</td>
<td>Female Mean Rank</td>
<td>Female Rank of Variables</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------------------</td>
<td>--------------------------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>4.500</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>6.529</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>2.125</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Cond.</td>
<td>3.764</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5.125</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6.588</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.250</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.352</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.625</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>5.764</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.500</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>4.058</td>
<td>3, 4, 5</td>
<td>4.875</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>7.764</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7.250</td>
<td>8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>9.058</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.375</td>
<td>9, 10</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 7

Ranking of Variables by Job Title

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Measure</th>
<th>Worker Mean Rank</th>
<th>Worker Rank of Variables</th>
<th>Management Mean Rank</th>
<th>Management Rank of Variables</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation</td>
<td>4.312</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3.750</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling in</td>
<td>7.125</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>7.000</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wages</td>
<td>4.000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.750</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Cond.</td>
<td>4.375</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2.500</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>6.812</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.750</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Security</td>
<td>3.000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3.500</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Loyalty</td>
<td>5.000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>4.437</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5.250</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Discipline</td>
<td>7.312</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8.000</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Understanding</td>
<td>8.625</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>8.500</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
determine relationships which may be applicable to the statistical findings. It is important to note that the quotes used throughout the study are representative of the general consensus of the participants.

The most common theme evident resulting from the question referring to the importance of teamwork and its motivational relevance was that teamwork is often stressed, but not often implemented. Since Office Plus is essentially made up of three departments consisting of office personnel, warehouse personnel, and the sales department, many of the employees perceive a division among the departments. For instance, one employee stated that “the departments are separate and wind up losing focus of the fact that we are to operate as a team.” Another employee stated that, “teamwork is important . . . it just depends on which team you’re going for . . . managers try to implement teamwork, but there is too much division in the departments. The company is divided into the boys out back and the girls up front.”

With regard to management’s ability to communicate to employees a job well done, the most common theme expressed was that management offers verbal praise. However, many employees, both management and workers, perceive the amount of verbal praise as too infrequent. One employee maintained that a job well done is not communicated at all. Further, the employee stated that, “it makes me feel very bad . . . this brings down my motivational level, because being told I’ve done a good job means a lot to me.” Another employee expressed that:

It isn’t done very well . . . I think that’s a big, big area that’s lacking - appreciation and praise for a job well done . . . things are done throughout the year, but it’s not done on an individual basis . . . it’s important because it picks you up because it’s seen by management, and then to get praised for something is great.
The employees were also asked to describe their perception of management's reward system for finding new ways of improving work performance. Virtually everyone interviewed stated that management's reward for improving work performance is in the form of verbal praise in lieu of pay raises, awards, or letters of appreciation.

However, while everyone stated that verbal praise is the norm, many of the workers are concerned that they are not recognized enough for improving their work performances. For example, one worker declared that, "we always try to find better ways to get things done. A lot of the times we let them know, and their like, oh, o.k., go with that or something, and a lot of the times it's not recognized." Another employee noted that, "as long as the job gets done, they don't care how it gets done . . . it's not recognized at all."

Management's perception of the reward system does not vary much from that of the employees' perceptions. In fact, management firmly asserted that verbal praise is the primary form of reward, in addition to the possible implementation of the employee's new idea. One of the managers expressed that, "new ways of improving work performance is implemented throughout the company if it is found beneficial for or to the company." Another manager expressed virtually the same opinion saying that, "there is no tangible reward, but sometimes the idea is implemented."

Participants were also asked to discuss their perceptions of company policy toward individuals who change their usual way of doing things on their own, without first consulting management. The purpose of this questions was to ascertain the interest and initiative levels of the employees. Employees who exhibit high interest and initiative levels on the job may also demonstrate high motivational levels.

During the interviews, many of the employees stated that, although they rarely change the method in which they complete a project or task, if they did try to alter procedures, management would encourage the change if it were beneficial to the
company. Indeed, one worker professed that "if it benefited the company, it’s all good . . . the president promotes initiative." Also, a warehouse employee stated that, "they let you do it your way . . . it’s up to the employee how they want to do a job . . . which ever is quickest - quality and quantity, that’s what counts.”

As for the company’s policy toward flexibility in the workplace, 100% of the participants, management and workers alike, appeared to be thoroughly satisfied. To illustrate this point, one employee pointedly declared that:

Because they are so flexible, I am motivated to work harder - because this is a good company . . . it shows they care and we’re not here just to be robots . . . if they take care of you, you want to take care of them. That’s what it’s all about. When they let me off to take care of things I have to take care of, I feel like they think of me as a person, and they understand.

The company’s policy toward the handling of grievances is another question employees were asked to discuss. While the majority of the participants agreed that problems and grievances were indeed recognized, many of the participants were concerned that the effectiveness with which grievances are handled is lacking. The most common complaint was that grievances are not handled in a timely manner.

One employee said that, "I don’t feel comfortable going to my manager with problems . . . my immediate supervisor doesn’t recognize problems, and it must be extreme before it gets handled, and most of the times, it’s not handled right.” It must be mentioned that this individual’s concern with being able to approach management is not shared by the majority of the employees. In fact, of the remainder of the participants, there were only two other employees who voiced the same concern.
Another employee communicated that management’s ability to handle grievances or problems is limited. This employee stated that:

Basically, I think they’re ignored a lot . . . they listen read good but then nothing ever gets done about it . . . it takes me down sometimes because it bothers me that things should be fixed and they’re not being fixed . . . why are these things being let go?

The next question asked employees to describe their perception of management’s ability to communicate trust toward the employees through the use of task delegation and empowerment. The dominant theme here was that management freely communicates trust to the employees throughout a variety of ways. For instance, once a task is delegated, employees are left to complete the job on their own, without constant supervision. Employees perceive that management trusts that tasks will be completed properly and successfully.

According to one employee, “I like being given responsibility - that’s a way to prove yourself . . . this company gives you total ability to make decisions and handle situations.” Additionally, an employee added that the method of task delegation makes him “feel good.” He further stated that, “if they know you can handle things - they don’t have to worry about you.” Even though there was agreement that management communicates trust well to employees, there was also agreement that employees basically lack trust toward management with regard to handling grievances properly and promised pay raises and/or bonuses.

The manner in which management communicates daily goals or projects to employees was another question employees were asked to expound upon. According to the majority of the employees and management, daily goals or projects are not communicated to employees. Workers have basic, implied duties and projects which are generally left to the employee’s discretion regarding task or project completion. Case in point, one employee indicated that, “we have job duties . . . we know what has
to be done, so we do it.” Another participant expressed that, “there’s a general understanding of the goals, but they aren’t communicated . . . I would like something like a meeting to motivate me for the day. It would be nice to have something to work for, because it would make working more interesting.”

It is important to recognize that while “daily” goals are not communicated to employees, long term goals such as increasing profit margin, increasing customer base, and company expansion are communicated to employees via monthly meetings. Also, during these monthly meetings, management informs employees of the company’s progress and/or pitfalls, which appears to be of importance to the employees, in particular, the male employees. Although there were no questions directly regarding the idea of monthly meetings, it merits discussion, since keeping employees abreast of company progress falls in line with one of Herzberg’s (1968) motivators, which is “feeling in on things.”

Although long term goals are communicated to employees, the method by which to obtain these goals is not clearly communicated. When employees were asked to describe the company’s policy or view toward the actual setting of goals, the most common theme expressed indicated that employees perceived company goal-setting as unimportant to management. For instance, one employee voiced that goal-setting is “not very important” to the company. Also regarding the importance goal-setting has for the company, another employee stated that, “I don’t know how the company feels about goal-setting . . . I never really paid attention or they never actually told me. I set my own goals for whatever needs to be done.”

Although there is limited direction concerning daily goals and long term goals, employees perceive management as highly approachable when they are unsure of how to perform a particular task. Case in point, one worker maintains that, “if I don’t know, I’m going to ask, because the company encourages it. If you’re not sure of something, that’s what they’re there for - to help.” Another employee proposed that, “management
wants you to ask if you don’t understand.” Employees also perceive management as approachable when needing to express dissatisfaction. Most employees, including management, feel comfortable expressing dissatisfaction verbally rather than through nonverbal communication such as dirty looks or working less. One employee shared that, “I let them know when I’m not happy with something. I talk to them a lot.”

One of the most interesting questions employees were asked to discuss deals expressly with the importance pay has on the motivational level. Accordingly, the majority of the employees offered that motivational levels decrease after raises are received. According to the participants, a collective pattern emerges approximately two or three months before raises are granted wherein employees increase work performance. Once the raises are received, employees continue to exhibit high motivation levels. However, approximately two or three months after raises are received, employee motivational levels decrease significantly. Some of the employees assert that this phenomenon occurs because there are no other goals to work toward during the course of the year. Therefore, there are no other reasons to increase motivational levels. Also, employees contend that motivational levels decrease because expected raises may not be sufficient. One employee offered that, “I get upset, because sometimes I don’t get the raise or bonus I was promised, so my motivation goes down. I start to think that I shouldn’t work so hard for so little.”

The last questions examined during the interview sessions asked participants to describe their overall perception of the organization by discussing both the positive and negative aspects of the company. There were many positive company aspects mentioned, such as the feeling of empowerment through task delegation, company flexibility, the encouragement of initiative, profit sharing when available, the dissemination of information regarding company progress, and a friendly, relaxed working environment. One of the warehouse employees stated that, “I look forward to
coming back to work after the weekend is over, because this is really a good place with really good people.”

Of the negative company aspects, the majority of the employees expressed that there are poor lines of communication especially concerning goals and goal-setting, and the proper handling of grievances.
CHAPTER 5

SUMMARY, CONCLUSIONS, AND RECOMMENDATIONS

Employee motivation is the heart of any company. For without motivated employees, companies may eventually experience high employee turnaround, deficient products and/or services, and perhaps, low productivity. Employers are fully aware of the repercussions associated with unsatisfied and demotivated employees. Nevertheless, some organizations choose to ignore signs of low motivation, while other organizations try to increase motivation by using either archaic methods or methods tailored according to traditional, hierarchical organizations.

While ignoring signs of low motivation is certainly not the solution, the question then becomes what is the solution for increasing motivation? Perhaps a starting point is the realization that contemporary organizations are comprised of diverse groups of people, requiring diverse needs. For example, the workforce is no longer comprised primarily of men, women no longer expect to be paid less than their male counterparts, and employees no longer accept the notion that they are subordinates void of the ability to make sound choices and decisions. Realizing that contemporary organizations may no longer benefit from traditional techniques will only serve as an advantage for the company in question.

In order to determine the best method for increasing employee motivation, each company must be carefully examined as a separate and distinct entity. The dynamics of the company must be explored, and employee needs, as well as company needs, must be taken into account before any definitive solutions are reached. After all, employees
essentially make the company, and therefore, their needs are valid and require careful attention and consideration. Employers who strive to sufficiently comprehend employee needs and devise apropos solutions through effective communication, may help to increase employee motivational levels.

Discussion of Statistical Results of Motivational Factors and the Differences in Perception between Men and Women

The t-test results support the hypothesis that there are differences between the sex of an individual and the perception of motivational factors. Participants were asked to rank Herzberg's (1968) ten motivational factors in order of importance from one to ten, with one being the most important and ten being the least important, so as to assess which motivational factors employees perceived as important. Of the ten variables, female employees ranked "wages" as the most important variable, while male employees ranked "wages" as the third most important variable.

There are three possible explanations for the difference in perception. The first explanation may be associated with the parental status of the individual. If the women who participated in this study are single parents who provide the primary source of income for their household, it stands to reason that their first priority is to meet immediate financial needs. Therefore, "wages" would surpass the other variables in terms of importance.

Secondly, women may have ranked "wages" first because they are dissatisfied with other factors such as "appreciation for work done" and "promotion and growth within the company." Most of the female employees stated that recognition for a job well done is often overlooked, thus decreasing their motivational levels. Also, women perceive chances for promotion and growth within the company as limited, as there is only one position office personnel can aspire to attain. In light of the circumstances, if the
female participants perceive desiring these factors as impractical and/or unreasonable, they would almost certainly choose the next best thing, which is “good wages.”

Lastly, perhaps women chose “wages” as the most important motivator because they perceive an unequal distribution of pay between office personnel and warehouse personnel. If the women believe they are being paid less, they will probably be dissatisfied with their pay. Although management advises employees not to compare wages, salaries, and bonus amounts, unfortunately, many employees do not heed the advice. For example, one of the managers stated that he was aware that employees compared bonus amounts. According the manager, there were instances when employees became upset because other employees received larger bonuses than they did. Accordingly, if female participants are dissatisfied with their wages due to perceived unequal pay distribution, it is submitted that ranking “wages” most important is a way to protest the perceived infraction. In other words, female employees may be trying to assert that pay is important to them as well.

Male employees, on the other hand, may have ranked “wages” third because they are more content with their pay. Pay is obviously important to the male employees, because they ranked it third. However, “wages” may not be as important to males as it is to females, because if the men have children, they may not be the primary source of income for their household. They may have a spouse or significant other to help with financial pressures.

The t-tests also revealed that women and men differ in their perception of the variable “feeling ‘in’ on things.” Although the findings were not empirically significant, the relationship went in the direction of significance. According to the results, male employees ranked the “feeling in” seventh, whereas female employees ranked the variable ninth.

While both groups consider the variable relatively unimportant, women seem to perceive it as considerably less important than men. The question is, why? Perhaps the
answer lies in the positions many of the women fill in the organization. Since most of the women, with the exception of two female employees, hold low-level occupations such as order takers, receptionists, or data entry clerks, it is entirely possible that these positions dictate female perceptions of “feeling ‘in’ on things.”

For example, the “feeling in” variable may imply participatory decision-making and/or employee identification with the company. If the female participants perceive their positions as having no real bearing on the decision-making process, they may feel little or no desire to be kept “in” on things. Many of the female participants do not perceive their positions as particularly influential, and therefore, do not feel the need to be kept abreast of any revisions unless they are directly affected by the change.

Another reason for the difference in perceptions of “feeling in” between male and female employees is that women may not actively identify with the company as readily as men do. Women may view their positions as a temporary way to make ends meet, since there are limited chances for advancement. In other words, their jobs may simply be a means to an end. To illustrate this point, one female employee stated that, “I like it here, because I get a steady paycheck, but I don’t plan on working here forever.” If female participants do not identify with the company and view their positions as temporary, then there would be no need to exert energy trying to get “in” on things.

Also, the expectancy approach may aid in understanding why there is a difference in perception regarding the “feeling in” variable. For example, most of the female employees do not trust nor expect that there office manager will share certain information with them. Case in point, one female employee offered that, “she doesn’t give us information - it’s almost like she doesn’t want us to know as much as she knows.” It is important to note that many of the other female employees shared the same opinion. The concept of teamwork, especially in the office area, appears to be absent. Since female employees expect to receive little or no information regarding changes, etc., they will be satisfied with minimal disclosure and will require no more.
Conversely, men seem to consider the "feeling in" variable as more important than women. Perhaps, this is because men may view their jobs as possible career choices, since there are more opportunities for advancement. Also, male participants seem to identify with the company more readily than the female employees. For instance, one male employee asserted that, "we're always told that this is our company too, and I like to know what's going on . . . it makes me want to work harder and stay with this company forever - everybody works together out here." From this employee's perspective, there is a definite element of teamwork. The expectancy approach works well here, also. For example, if male employees expect to receive information, especially since they are often told that the company "belongs to them," it is clear why the "feeling in" variable is considered more important to men than to women.

Lastly, with respect to the variable "working conditions," female employees appear to perceive this variable as less significant than male employees. Only 37.5% of the female employees ranked "working conditions" between one and five (high to moderate importance), while 82% of the male employees ranked the variable between one and five.

A possible explanation for the differences in perception may revolve around the participants' view of their different working environments. It is highly likely that women perceive their working environments as highly functional and conducive to job completion, since everything they require to complete their tasks is within hands reach. For instance, order forms, computers, telephones, fax machines, and copiers are all readily available.

Also, the temperature of the working environments may influence employee perceptions. For example, in the office environment, the room temperature is changed accordingly to reflect the seasons, and the room temperature is rarely extreme unless the heating or cooling units have malfunctioned. Therefore, if female participants already
perceive their working conditions as desirable, there would be no need to assign the
variable a high ranking.

Conversely, male employees, who work primarily in the warehouse, must contend
with weather changes which adversely alter the temperature of the warehouse
environment. For instance, during the summer and winter seasons, the warehouse heats
to uncomfortable temperatures which may affect male perceptions of the variable
“working conditions.”

Although the differences between the men and women were few, there were
differences nonetheless. Now that the differences have been detected, the onus lies with
management to make sure that everyone positively identifies with the company, develop
the concept of teamwork throughout the company, and communicate to employees the
necessity for each position. Developing a sense of comraderie and ownership with
everyone in the organization may help to foster higher motivational levels.

Discussion of Statistical
Results of Motivational Factors and the
Differences in Perception between Management and Workers

On the surface, Office Plus employees appear to be extremely satisfied with their
organization. Nevertheless, upon closer examination, definite signs of low motivation
and morale are apparent. Management, it seems, is aware areas in need of
improvement, however, they are not aware of the extent to which improvement is
necessary. The t-tests results support the hypothesis that management’s perceptions of
employee attitudes toward the importance of motivational factors would differ from
employee perception.

However, management’s predictions differed from employee perceptions only in
terms of “wages.” Otherwise, management’s predictions were fairly accurate. For
instance, management predicted that employees would rank “wages” first, “working
conditions" second, "security" third, "appreciation" fourth, and "growth" fifth. Employees ranked "security" first, "wages" second, "appreciation" third, "working conditions" fourth, and "growth" fifth.

It appears as if management’s predictions and employee attitudes toward motivators are in agreement. However, an important question is why, then, are employees exhibiting low motivation and morale? First of all, management’s top three variables are what Herzberg (1968) termed as "hygiene factors" or factors that are "conducive to good business health but not the cause of it" (Smith, 1997. p. 42). In other words, "good wages," "good working conditions," and "job security" are factors that, alone, will not encourage employee motivation. These variables are extrinsic in nature in that they are "accidents of the job" and, if acted upon, "could only serve to prevent dissatisfaction but could never by themselves produce satisfaction" (Yoder & Heneman, 1975, p. 6-28).

Therefore, if management is attempting to motivate employees with these factors, they are merely providing a complaint free working environment, and not necessarily motivated employees. Herzberg (1968) contends that, in order for employee motivation to take place, workers require factors that are intrinsic in nature. Intrinsic factors include "appreciation for work done," "promotion and growth within the company," and "interesting work." Therefore, if employees perceive the absence of any of these motivators, their motivational levels may decrease. On the other hand, if these motivators are properly incorporated into the organization, employee motivational levels may increase.

It is interesting to note that workers listed "appreciation for work done" as the third most important variable. Perhaps employees ranked "appreciation" third because they feel their successes are not recognized by management. To illustrate this point, many of the employees asserted that management’s ability to communicate a job well done is
lacking. Therefore, it is safe to assume that if employees perceive a lack of appreciation in the workplace, there will be an absence of employee motivation.

Another possible explanation for low employee motivation is that there may be variances of perception concerning the inherent meanings of the ranked variables. For instance, employees may perceive “good wages” as having enough income to purchase items outside of their primary needs. Employees may believe that their pay is adequate in terms of meeting immediate financial needs, but will not cover needs or wants beyond the bare essentials. Therefore, employees may perceive their pay as insufficient.

The antithesis of this is that management’s perception of “good wages” may be based upon the fact employees are, indeed, able to meet their financial needs. Thus, management may be under the impression that employee wage earnings are fair. In addition, management provides 100% of the insurance coverage and periodic bonuses, which may also dictate management’s perceptions of “good wages.”

With regard to “job security,” which employees ranked second in terms of importance, employers may define this variable as we (management) have not fired or laid you (employees) off of work, therefore, your job is secure. However, one of the major employee concerns relates to management’s inflexible tardy policy, which, if not strictly adhered to, may result in immediate dismissal. Employees are not allowed to be one minute late without being written up for the “infraction.” Regardless of the reason, if an employee is one minute late four times within a 90 day period, the employee may either be suspended without pay for one to five days or be automatically terminated.

Employees may perceive this policy as unfair in that there may be instances when being tardy is out of their control. For instance, flat tires, accidents in route, and traffic jams are all out of the employee’s control. Management’s perception of the policy, on the other hand, is that it is completely fair. First of all, employees are informed of the policy, as well as the necessity for the policy, via the employee handbook. Also, employees are given 90 full days before any disciplinary action will be taken. In
addition, management asserts that, in 90 days, the likelihood of four separate occasions happening which may prevent prompt attendance is highly unlikely.

Whatever the case may be, if employees perceive the policy as unfair and directly related to the loss of employment, "job security" or lack thereof, may serve to create employee dissatisfaction, which, may result in lower motivational levels.

**Thematic Analysis**

Office Plus employees are generally satisfied with the organization. For example, employees praise management's ability to be flexible. If employees need to take the day off or leave early so as to take care of personal needs such as childcare, eldercare, or health needs, management is perceived as extremely understanding. Also, management's ability to communicate trust to the employees is held in high regard. Through the use of empowerment, which is a powerful motivator, Office Plus management freely delegates tasks fully expecting that the projects will be completed successfully without constant supervision. The delegation of tasks in this manner communicates trust to the employees. Also, management shares the notion of power through allowing some of the employees the ability to make decisions regarding important organizational matters. The ability to participate in the decision making process, along with the successful completion of projects, helps to enhance employee self-efficacy, thus employee motivation.

Lastly, management encourages initiative and interest on the job, however, because of the nature of most of the positions, chances for exhibiting initiative on the job are limited. For example, warehouse personnel duties include keeping the warehouse stocked and orderly, drivers' responsibilities entail filling customer orders, delivering orders to customers, and helping warehouse personnel, and office personnel is responsible for data entry, taking orders, and answering phones. However, if an
employee designs a more effective way of handling projects, the idea is implemented if it benefits the company. Thus, employees appear to be satisfied with the company.

However, satisfaction does not always connote motivation. As a result of the interviews, employees voiced two major concerns that need addressing if motivational levels are to increase. First, employees are concerned that there is a lack of communication from management to employees. Because of the breakdown in communication, there are misunderstandings surrounding the concept of teamwork; there are misunderstandings surrounding management's ability to praise employees for good performances; and there are also misunderstandings surrounding the concepts of goals and goal-setting.

Secondly, employees are concerned that the relationships between workers and management are sometimes strained due to the perceived improper handling of employee grievances and employee perceptions of management's unfulfilled promises.

Teamwork

With regard to teamwork, employees agree that it is stressed throughout the company, however, many of the employees are not aware of the true nature surrounding teamwork, even though each department is dependent upon the other. An important question is, if management stresses teamwork, why do employees perceive a lack of teamwork? First of all, it appears that the function of the team, as an organizational unit, has not been clearly defined. Each department is aware of its individual tasks, and functions as such, however, the organization's strategic business objectives have not been effectively communicated to the employees.

Another reason employees may perceive a lack of teamwork is that the flux of work is not through the team, but through the individual. For instance, order takers answer phones, drivers deliver goods, and warehouse personnel keep items in stock. While the drivers assist warehouse personnel when time permits, warehouse personnel and drivers
do not assist office personnel. Likewise, office personnel generally avoid the warehouse area. Furthermore, there is a distinct rift among the order takers which is a result of personality conflicts. Also, employees are not multifunctional. Perhaps the reason departments do not assist each other is that the departments are not well-versed regarding the multi-faceted operations of the organization. One employee stated that, “I have no idea what they do . . . I do my job, then go home.”

Lastly, performance standards for each department have not been clearly communicated, nor have effective communication channels between each department been established to explain how each station’s accomplishments maintain the course of the company. To illustrate this point, one member of the organization stated that, “the right hand doesn’t know what the left hand is doing . . . there’s no communication between management and employees . . . sometimes I don’t know who does what or why they do it.”

The concept of teamwork may serve as an effective motivator if it is implemented correctly. Since employees spend a large amount of time in an organizational setting, it is necessary to create an environment with which employees can identify. First, management must identify and establish the team’s purpose and a pathway to achieving that purpose. For instance, is the purpose of the organization to become the largest office supply company, and if so, what are the best means of achieving that goal? Secondly, management should teach employees to be multi-functional. In other words, every employee should be able to operate, at least minimally, in other departments.

Lastly, management should implement mandatory training for all employees to review the employee handbook which should include clearly stated company objectives and standards. Additionally, employees should be oriented to the importance of adhering to the standards and reaching the company objectives, and what will occur if the employees fail to do so.
Effective Praise

Regarding management's ability to effectively communicate a job well done, Office Plus employees acknowledged that, while there is verbal praise used to convey appreciation, it is given much too infrequently. Management understands the impact praise has on employee motivation and simultaneously recognizes that praise is not afforded to employees often enough. An employee's behavior is contingent upon the quality and quantity of positive reinforcement. Therefore, positive reinforcement is not an option, but a must.

According to Rosenbaum (1982), "behavior is a function of its consequences . . . people are more likely to repeat an action if its consequences are pleasant, just as they are more likely not to repeat it if the consequences are unpleasant" (p. 59). Korman (1977) asserts that this line of thinking is known as "the empirical law of effect" or "common sense" (p. 286). For example, an employee simply stated that, "they don't tell me thank you enough for doing a good job. I think if they did, I would work harder so that I could hear it again." Another employee confirmed this attitude asserting that, "there isn't enough thanks . . . they know how to tell you when you're doing bad." Obviously, these comments indicate dissatisfied, unmotivated workers. These statements also suggest that employees are feeling underappreciated, or simply, unappreciated.

Also, when management offers praise, employees assert that it does not correlate with the praiseworthy action, which lessens the impact. According to Rosenbaum (1982), "reinforcement should follow immediately after the desired response" (p. 67). In other words, it may be counterproductive to give praise too long after the fact. Case in point, one employee disclosed that, "I work hard, but they don't tell me thank you.
And when they do, it's too late, and I start to think, why bother?” Another employee stated that:

Verbal praise is rarely communicated. It makes me feel very bad, because I used to be management and it's not done that way. Once I was told that I was doing a good job and was next in line to receive a promotion. But when the time came to receive the promotion, they gave it to someone else. Now, it’s hard to believe them when they try to tell me I’m doing good.

Vroom’s (1964) expectancy theory offers one explanation as to why employees exhibit such low motivation regarding the receipt of praise from management. Consider the participant who was expecting the promotion that was given to someone else. Directly after the employee was promised the promotion, performance levels increased because the employee believed that increasing performance levels would be “instrumental” in securing the promotion.

The outcome of increasing job performance, the promotion, was perceived as positively “valent.” Furthermore, the participant “expected” that increasing job performance would lead to a promotion. However, once the position was offered to someone else, the participant’s motivational levels decreased significantly, as evidenced by the statement. The participant no longer perceives management’s attempts at verbal praise as sincere, nor does the participant perceive the prospect of a promotion as positively “valent.” Quite the contrary, the participant perceives management’s attempts at praise as insincere and perceives the prospect of receiving a promotion as “getting my hopes up for nothing.” Both of these perceptions, “insincerity” and “getting my hopes up” are negatively valent perceptions, and explain why the participant exhibits low motivation.
Goals and Goal-Setting

There is a general consensus among managers that goal-setting is clearly important. However, there is confusion and disagreement among the workers as to whether management views goal-setting as important or unimportant. For example, some of the warehouse personnel contend that goal-setting is important to management. Other participants believe that goal-setting was unimportant to management. Further still, other participants assert that they are unsure of management’s views toward goal-setting.

While management’s perception concerning goal-setting is clear, it is equally clear why the participants hold different perceptions of management’s views toward goal-setting. There is a distinct lack of communication. Perhaps, part of management’s inability to communicate clear goals and the importance of a goal-setting is not having a clear understanding of goal characteristics. For without an understanding of meaningful goal characteristics, it is impossible to inspire workers to (1) help set goals and (2) attain those goals. Pritchard (1990) states that god measures of performance should be the basis for an effective goal-setting system.

First of all, the participants do not appear to have influence over their own goals. For instance, one employee simply stated that, “I do the same thing everyday... I come in, get my orders, and deliver the stuff... I don’t have anything to do with it (goal-setting).” Employee goal influence is not to say that it is the employee who primarily sets the goals. However, it is essential that employees participate with management when company and individual goals are being set.

Secondly, since there are no daily goals, employees are not able to see the results of their efforts in terms of quality and quantity. Although management is aware of what is expected of employees in terms of company objectives, they have failed to implement a goal-setting system from which employees can accurately their job performance. For instance, one employee stated that, “they tell me my job is answering phones, but then
they tell me latter that I also have to sell to customers over the phone, but they haven’t trained me. . . I don’t know if I’m doing it right, and at this point, I don’t care.” This employee clearly has no means of measuring job performance nor does the employee exhibit motivation. If anything, this employee exhibits complacency and boredom.

Despite the fact that employees understand that the company’s fundamental objective is to sell products, employees are unclear as to how to attain that objective. For example, consider the participant who was “to sell to customers over the phone.” The employee has not been told the appropriate manner for which to approach customers when trying to sell company products. Furthermore, the employee is unaware of what quantity of which products require selling. In view of this, it is entirely possible that the employee may be doing things that counterproductive to the company’s objective.

Effective feedback, in conjunction with formulating an effective goal-setting system will, perhaps, create a path for goal attainment and ensure that the company’s objectives are met. Also, if employees have clear, defined goals, along with an effective feedback system, complacency and boredom may be replaced by motivation. Having specific, defined goals, gives employees something to look forward to. The idea of successful completion leads to achievement, and achievement, leads to motivated workers who want to experience success again. The cycle of goal completion inspires employees to set more goals, which can only serve to benefit the organization.

**Employee/Management Relationships**

One of the most essential elements involved in creating positive employee/management relationships is the perception of trust. Not only must management be able to trust employees, but employees must know that they can trust management as well. Trust is one of the most fundamental aspects involved in securing the success of an organization. Trust, however, is not freely given and should be not
taken lightly. Generally, people are not inclined to exhibit trust toward co-workers in the workplace. This inability or lack of willingness to trust often stems from negative experiences encountered at previous jobs. Therefore, trust should be carefully cultivated and requires steady attention and care.

As much as trust is an integral part of an organization, Office Plus employees have indicated that there are occasional instances when it is difficult to trust management. One of the reasons for the lack of trust is management's perceived inability to handle grievances in an appropriate, timely manner. Often, when workers approach management with issues, employees fear that their problems, albeit recognized, will be put aside until “it works itself out,” “disappears,” or “gets so bad that it's hard to work.”

Many employees no longer trust that management is willing to help resolve employee disputes. It has gotten to the point that employees believe that, “if you can work it out on your own, it's best to instead of getting management involved.”

Because of management’s perceived ineffective handling of grievances, employees sometimes view management as uncaring and unconcerned. It must be noted that it is rarely management’s intent to convey these negative messages to employees. One manager stated that, “sometimes other things come up that are more important and require our attention first.” Here, as well as all other instances, effective communication is a requirement.

If an employee approaches a manager with a problem, s/he often expects that the grievance will be handled immediately. However in the workplace, it is not always possible nor practical to put other matters aside in order to settle the employee’s issue. The onus must be placed with management to inform the aggrieved employee that other matters have momentarily taken precedence and that it is not possible to attend to their grievance straight away. If at all possible, management and the employee should immediately agree upon a convenient time to settle, or at least discuss, the issue. If
management discovers that it is impossible to adhere to the agreed upon meeting time, then assuring the employee that his/her issue has not been overlooked is necessary.

Communicate to the employee that the problem will be remedied at the earliest possible time, and if necessary, periodically reassure the employee that management, does indeed, perceive his/her grievance as important. Periodic reassurance takes but a few moments, and means a great deal to the employee.

Acknowledging employee problems in this manner may help to increase motivation and trust levels, thus enhancing employee/manager relationships. Of course, constantly “putting off” the grievance may result in creating a resentful climate. Therefore, it behooves management to rectify the problem as soon as possible.

Conclusions

Since communication is an ongoing process herein participant simultaneously exchange messages via ver and nonverbal means, rarely is the act of communication a random occurrence. While the perception of these messages is influenced by the participants’ relationships to each other as well as past experiences, it is the quality of the intended message that influences accurate message perception.

Quality communication connotes effective communication. Although communicating, in some sense, is a natural ability, effectively communicating requires constant honing and careful attention. Organizational success is contingent upon effective, clear communication practices between management and employees. For without effective communication patterns, (1) employees will be unable to identify company goals, and therefore, successfully attain these goals, (2) employees will be unable to accurately gauge their successes or failures, (3) employees will be less likely to respond appropriately to management’s requests or directions, and (4) employees may become frustrated to the point of being less motivated, thus productive.
Also, management must make an effort to encourage employees to communicate uncertainties about organizational operations. Management can encourage by creating a supportive climate that will allow employees to express a lack of knowledge about procedures or expectations.

Lastly, the ability to effectively communicate clear company objectives may facilitate high employee performance resulting more successes, thus leading to higher levels of motivation and satisfaction.

Limitations

1). The questionnaire survey items were not clearly defined for participants. For instance, the very nature of the word "things" lends to ambiguity. Because the word "things" is so ambiguous, it may have been unclear to participants as to the specific meaning of the phrase. Also, the open-ended interview questions were too broadly based, which may explain why participants either provided information that was irrelevant to the study or mistakenly omitted answers.

2). The management theories outlined in this study are often offered as primary methods for motivating employees. However, the management theories are dated and require more grounding. For instance, the Blake and Mouton's (1978) Managerial Grid offers different managerial styles comprised of concern for people and concern for production. The grid is based on a scale from one to nine with one being the lowest and nine being the highest.

According to the grid, a manager who exhibits a 5,5 (medium concern for people and production) yields mediocre productivity levels. Blake and Mouton suggest that managers who attempt to exhibit a 9,9 (high concern for people and productivity) on the grid are excellent managers. However, it is nearly impossible for human beings to constantly exert the amount of energy it takes to operate at such a level. If managers continually functioned at a 9,9 level, there could possibly be high manager turnover due
to the increased stress levels. Also, managers, who are told to strive for 9,9 but fail to reach it, may begin to feel inept or inadequate in their positions.

With regard to McGregor’s (1960) Theory X and Theory Y, managers either view employees as lazy and unproductive (Theory X) or wanting self-control and self-motivation (Theory Y). While there are managers who adhere to either end of the spectrum, McGregor’s theories fail to recognize managers who fall along the continuum. McGregor’s theories confine management techniques which, in essence, confine managers.

It would be beneficial if both the Managerial Grid and Theory X and Theory Y were applied to different organizations ranging in size and company objectives. Perhaps a more appropriate perspective regarding management theories may be reached.

3). The sample was limited in size, therefore researchers can not infer from this study. Perhaps, larger samples would have yielded more significant results.

4). Although the employee interviews were privately held in the company conference room, employee answers may have been influenced by the owner’s presence in the building.

Recommendations for Further Study

Further study should focus on determining if there are changes in attitude and values toward motivators in the workplace when an employee is advanced to management. Using the same questionnaire for each interview, researchers should, first, survey participants while they are still “workers.” Then six months after the promotion, interview the participants a second time. Compare the findings. If it is determined that there were changes in the participants’ attitudes and values toward motivators, what are the changes and why did the changes come about? It is submitted that workers who become managers change their attitude toward motivators because their organizational values change.
APPENDIX I

INFORMED CONSENT

My name is Yvonne Guthrie, and I am in the Greenspun School of Communication Graduate Program at University of Nevada, Las Vegas. I am conducting a research project as part of my thesis which is titled Employee Motivation, Satisfaction, and Productivity: A Study of the Workplace. I am asking you to describe your attitude toward motivation and satisfaction in the workplace. All of the information you provide will be kept anonymous/private. Only the statistical results of this survey will be used for the purpose of a report. If you have any questions, you may contact Dr. Anthony Ferri, Greenspun School of Communication, UNLV, at 895-1371 or you may contact the UNLV Office of Sponsored Programs (OSP) which is located in Room FDH 304, 895-1357. This office serves as a clearinghouse for all information and actions necessary for institutional compliance with federal rules regarding the use of human subjects. Your participation is voluntary and you may withdraw from participation at any time.
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