

PERCEIVED IMPORTANCE OF DIFFERENT FACTORS RELATED TO MOTIVATION

A. Khaleque

& M. M. Hossain

Department of Psychology
University of Dhaka
Dhaka, Bangladesh

Department of Management
Islamic University
Kushtia, Bangladesh

In order to investigate the perceived importance of different factors related to motivation of different groups, 50 managers, 50 supervisors, and 100 industrial workers selected from four different organisations on a random sampling basis were given a questionnaire for assessment of relative importance of different factors of motivation. The results reveal that each factor is not equally important to all the three groups of subjects in relation to their motivation at work in industry. Sound management principles have been considered as the most important factor for motivation by the managers. On the other hand, job security has been assigned as the most important factor by both the supervisors and workers in their motivation. While wage has not been considered as an important factor for high motivation but, it has been assigned the most important factor for low motivation by all employees. Level of job in the industrial set up seems to correspond distinctly with various motivating factors.

Motivation at work is important from the point of view of efficiency and productivity. It is an internal force which motivates the people to work. Various researches reveal that a good number of factors act as motivations among the employees at work in industry, such as wage, job security, recognition for good work, feed back, competition, common goal, participation in decision making, promotional opportunity, good relations with co-workers, training facility, application of sound management principles, encouragement for creative work (e.g., Blum & Russ, 1942; Coch & French, 1948; Habibullah, 1975; Lowler, 1969; Sims, 1928; Stagner, 1950). But these factors differ in terms of their relative importance to motivation for different levels of employees in an industrial organization. (e.g., Blum & Russ, 1942; Habibullah, 1975; Locke & Whiting, 1974; Porter & Mitchell, 1967).

A large number of studies have been conducted in the Western countries, but little information is available in this realm regarding developing countries like Bangladesh. Due to dissimilar socio-economic context, the studies carried out in the West cannot be generalized in other countries.

The present study was designed to investigate in Bangladeshi context the importance of different factors related to high and low motivations as perceived by three major groups in any industrial set up, namely, the managers, supervisors, and workers.

METHOD

Subjects

The subjects of the study consisted of 50 managers, 50 supervisors, and 100 workers, who were selected on a random sampling basis from four organisations located in and around the Dhaka city of Bangladesh. The mean ages of managers, supervisors, and workers were 36, 34, and 32, respectively. The educational level of the managers was higher than that of the other groups. It ranged from higher secondary to Ph.D. levels. The educational level of the supervisors varied from secondary to post-graduation level. The educational level of the workers was comparatively poor. Most of them were below secondary level.

Instrument

A questionnaire consisting of 16 items was used to measure the relative importance of different factors for motivation as perceived by the different levels of occupational groups. It has a 7-point scale, ranging from the least important (1) to the most important (7).

The questionnaire was developed partially on the basis of the items taken from the relevant literature on the factors for motivation (Blum & Russ, 1942; Habibullah, 1975; Locke & Whiting, 1974; Lowler, 1969; Stagner, 1950), and partially on the basis of a pilot survey of opinions concerning different factors for motivation of different groups of employees working in industry. Before final selection of the items, the questionnaire was presented to a number of subjects and the opinions of the experts were also taken about each item. The questions which appeared difficult or confusing to the respondents were dropped. The reliability of the questionnaire was tested by a split-half technique, where the reliability coefficient was found to be .61.

An open-ended question was also asked to find out the most important cause of low motivation at work.

Procedure

The questionnaire was administered to managers and supervisors in groups but to workers it was administered individually as most of them were illiterate.

RESULTS

In order to examine the perceived importance of various factors for high and low motivation of different occupational groups, the mean ranks and rank orders of the ratings of the three groups were computed separately. The important factors of low motivation as perceived by the different occupational groups were also studied.

The results of the study have been summarised in Tables 1 to 4.

Table 1

The mean ranks and rank orders of the managers', supervisors', and workers' ratings of the specific factors related to motivation

	Managers		Supervisors		Workers	
	Mean Ranks	Rank Orders	Mean Ranks	Rank Orders	Mean Ranks	Rank Orders
Application of sound management principles	6.40	1	6.51	1	6.16	8
Autonomy in work	6.35	2	6.00	9.5	6.17	7
Promotional opportunity	6.30	3	6.30	3	6.20	6
Job security	6.17	4	6.42	2	6.85	1
Justice and equity	6.11	5	5.86	12	6.21	5
Favourable attitudes of boss	6.09	6	6.19	5	6.29	3
Recognition for good work	6.07	7	6.27	4	6.27	4
Participation in decision making	5.96	8	5.98	11	5.79	14
Open communication	5.90	9	6.10	7	5.75	16
Wage	5.91	10	6.09	8	6.15	9
Feed back	5.87	11	5.67	14	5.85	13
Good relations with co-workers	5.85	12	6.00	9.5	6.38	2
Training facility	5.78	13	6.12	6	6.02	10
Removal of hindrances	5.75	14	5.81	13	5.89	11
Encouragement for creative work	5.52	15	5.53	16	5.86	12
Competition	5.51	16	5.65	15	5.77	15

Note: Spearman's rank correlations between:

1. managers and supervisors: $\rho = .72$ ($p < 0.01$)
2. managers and workers: $\rho = .59$ ($p < 0.05$)
3. supervisors and workers: $\rho = .67$ ($p < 0.05$)

The results in Table 1 reveal that application of sound management principles has been assigned as the most important factor for motivation, and competition as the least important factor for motivation by the managers. The other 14 items have been assigned in-between the two positions. The supervisors have rated application of sound management principles as the most important for high motivation, and encouragement for creative work has been rated as the least important for their motivation. The other 14 items have been assigned in-between the two positions. On the other hand, job security has been rated as the most important, and open communication as the least important for their high motivation at work. The other 14 factors have been rated in-between the two positions.

Table 2

The important factors for low motivation as perceived by the managers

Factors for causes of low motivation	Percentage of managers who hold the view
Poor management	20%
Lack of coordination	16%
Meagre salary	16%
Lack of autonomy in work	14%
Lack of recognition for good work	10%
Lack of promotional opportunity	4%
Lack of scope for utilisation for specialized knowledge and skill	4%
Lack of proper control over the workers	2%
Lack of job security	2%
Monotony	2%

The results in Table 2 reveal that highest number of the subjects (20%) mention poor management as the most important factor for low motivation. Whereas 16% of them consider lack of coordination, and another 16% of them consider meagre pay, while 14% of them consider lack of autonomy as the most important factor for their low motivation at work.

Table 3

The important factors for low motivation as perceived by supervisors

Factors for causes of low motivation	Percentage of supervisors who hold the view
Poor wage	36%
Lack of fair treatment	24%
Poor management	16%
Lack of promotional opportunity	10%
Lack of autonomy in work	6%
Lack of open communication with boss	4%
Lack of recognition for good work	2%
Lack of job status	2%

The results in Table 3 show that supervisors have mentioned eight different factors as related to their low motivation. However, the highest percentage (36%) of the supervisors have considered poor wage as the most important for low motivation as followed by lack of fair treatment from the management (24%), poor management (16%), and lack of promotional opportunity (10%), respectively.

Table 4

The important factors for low motivation as perceived by the industrial workers

Factors for causes of low motivation	Percentage of workers who hold the view
Poor wage	44%
Poor working condition	20%
Unfavourable attitudes of boss	14%
Poor management	10%
Lack of promotional opportunity	6%
Lack of job security	4%
Lack of fair treatment from management	2%

The results in Table 4 suggest that workers mention seven different factors for their causes of low motivation. The response

pattern in Table 4 further elicits that the highest percentage of the respondents mention poor wage (44%) as the most important factor for low motivation. Whereas 20% of them consider poor working condition, and 14% of them consider unfavourable attitudes of boss as the most important factors for low motivation.

DISCUSSION

The results of both the managers' and supervisors' ratings about the relative importance of different factors for high motivation reveal that application of management principles has been rated as the most important for their motivation. Habibullah (1975) reported that application of sound management principles, job security, promotion based on merit and efficiency, participation in decision making, pay according to their contribution, and specific and common goal boost up work motivation. Several other studies also reported that application of sound management principles is one of the important factors for motivation (Ali, 1979; Habibullah, 1975). All these studies confirm the findings of the study.

Job security has been assigned as the most important factor for high motivation as perceived by the workers, while supervisors rated job security as the second most important factor for high motivation. On the other hand, managers rated job security as the fourth most important factor for their high motivation at work. It indicates that job security is one of the most important factors for high motivation for all categories of employees in industry. But job security is more important at the lower tier of the industrial set up, i.e., workers, than the higher level, e.g., supervisors, and managers.

Promotional opportunity has been assigned as the third, third, and sixth important factor for high motivation by the managers, supervisors, and workers, respectively. It seems that promotional opportunity is more important to the higher level than the lower level. Dill, Hilton, and Raitman (1962), and Habibullah (1975) also found similar results which is consistent with the present findings.

Autonomy in work has been perceived as the second, ninth, and seventh important factor for high motivation by the managers, supervisors, and workers, respectively. It indicates that autonomy in work is more important at the higher level than the lower level. Several investigators have found similar results (Center & Bugenthal,

1966; Locke & Whiting, 1974; Porter & Mitchell, 1967) which corroborate the findings of the present study.

The results of the workers' ratings about the relative importance of specific factors for high motivation reveal that good relations with co-workers has been rated as the second most important factor for high motivation. Mayo (1945) claimed that an individual's job satisfaction is influenced by his desire to be associated with his fellows in a work situation. Recently, several studies reported that existing relation among the co-workers is one of the important factors for job satisfaction and motivation at work (e.g., Khaleque, 1979; Mustafa & Sylvia, 1976).

Justice and equity, and favourable attitude of the boss have been considered as the fifth and sixth important factor for high motivation by the managers, while supervisors have rated as the twelfth and fifth important factor for their high motivation. On the other hand, workers have considered them as the fifth and third important factor for their high motivation.

Recognition for good work has been considered as the fourth important factor for high motivation by the workers. Stagner (1950) found that recognition for good work increases motivation among the employees at work, which is consistent with the findings of the present study.

Participation in decision making has been considered as the eighth, eleventh, and fourteenth important factor for motivation by the managers, supervisors, and workers, respectively. It indicates that participation in decision making is more important to the higher level than the lower level. Habibullah (1975) also reported that participation is more important to the higher level than the bottom level managers in Bangladesh.

It is interesting to note that none of the occupational groups considers wage as the most important motivational factor, rather they rated wage as one of the least important for their high motivation (i.e., wage was rated as tenth, eighth, and ninth important factor for their motivation by the managers, supervisors, and workers, respectively). Hertzberg, Mausner, and Synderman (1959) found that in terms of importance to satisfaction, wage was rated as the seventh rank. But, when they asked the employees to describe what made them satisfied and dissatisfied with their job, wage was found to be the most frequent source of dissatisfaction but least frequent source of

satisfaction. Thus, they concluded that wage is a stronger source of job dissatisfier rather than a satisfier. The results of the present study show that 16% of the managers, 36% of the supervisors, and 44% of the workers (see Tables 2,3, & 4) consider wage as the most important factor for low motivation. Thus, the present study seems to indicate that wage is a stronger source of low motivation rather than a high motivation for the industrial employees of Bangladesh.

Moreover, the study suggests that quite a number of factors have been considered by all the three categories of the respondents as sources of both high and low motivations. So, it appears from the present study that motivational variables are not unidirectional in their effects. They can be sources of both high and low motivations, depending on, among other factors, the type of jobs, employees, and socio-economic factors of that society.

However, some specific factors such as job security, promotional opportunity, favourable attitudes of boss, justice and equity, recognition for good work, and application of sound management principles seem to be stronger sources of high motivation for all categories of the respondents (see Table 1). On the other hand, job security, recognition for good work, are stronger sources for high motivation but weaker sources of low motivation for all categories of the respondents. While poor management and unfavourable attitudes of the boss are considered as the stronger sources of low motivation but weaker sources of high motivation by all categories of respondents.

From the above theme emerge the psychodynamics of job satisfaction and motivation of different levels of employees in industry in Bangladesh. This study reveals that factors vary in terms of their relative importance to motivation with the different occupational levels. Job security, good relations with co-workers, and desire for recognition of their work traditionally serve as strong motivating factors for the worker as against autonomy and several management principles for the managers and supervisors. This supports the theory that level or position of an industrial employee is the prime determiner of his job perspective and motivation to work, and different sources or shades of motivation vary with the levels. Still, there are some common factors which are perceived by all categories of employees as important for their high motivation, such as job promotional opportunity, justice and equity, and favourable attitudes of boss, etc. However, motivational variables are not unidirectional in their effects.

The present findings indicate the dimensions of various motivators in Bangladeshi industrial set up. One could utilize the same for the workers, supervisors, and managers for improving their efficiency and productivity in the industry.

REFERENCES

- Ali, M. R. (1979). *Achievement motivation and productivity in Bangladesh*. Dhaka: University of Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Blum, M., & Russ, J. (1942). A study of employees attitudes towards various incentives. *Personnel Psychology*, 4, 438-444.
- Center, S. A., & Bugenthal, D. E. (1966). Intrinsic and extrinsic job motivations among different segments of working population. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50, 192-197.
- Coch, L., & French, J. R. P. (1948). Overcoming resistance to change. *Human Relations*, 1, 512-532.
- Dill, W. R., Hilton, T. L., & Raitman, W. R. (1962). *The new managers: Patterns of Behaviour and Development*. Printice-Hall: Englewood.
- Habibullah, M. (1975). *Motivation mix*. Dhaka: Bureau of Economic Research. University of Dhaka, Bangladesh.
- Hertzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Synderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation of work*. New York: John Wiley.
- Khaleque, A. (1979). Performance and job satisfaction in short-cycle repetitive work. In R. G. Sell & P. Shipley (Eds.), *Satisfaction in work design: An ergonomics approach*. London: Taylor Francis.
- Locke, E. A., & Whiting, R. J. (1974). Sources of satisfaction and dissatisfaction among solid waste management employees. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 59, 145-156.
- Lowler, E. E. (1969). Job design and employee motivation. *Personnel Psychology*, 22, 426-435.
- Mayo, E. (1945). *The social problems of an industrial civilization*. Boston: Harvard University, Graduate School of Business Administration.

- Mustafa, H., & Sylvia, R. D. (1976). A factor analysis of job satisfaction. *Public Personnel Management, 4*, 165-172.
- Porter, L. W., & Mitchell, V. F. (1967). Comparative study of need satisfaction in military and business hierarchies. *Journal of Applied Psychology, 31*, 139-144.
- Sims, C. M. (1928). Relative influence of two types of motivation on improvement. *Journal of Educational Psychology, 19*, 430-484.
- Stagner, R. (1950). Psychological aspects of industrial conflict: II. Motivation. *Personnel Psychology, 1*, 1-16.