

Motivation:

An investigation to establish the impact of motivational theories on employee performance and satisfaction and to determine key factors towards the motivation of employees.

Graeme Foran

A dissertation submitted in partial fulfilment

for the award of MSc in Management

National College of Ireland

Submitted to the National College of Ireland, September 2015

Abstract

This investigation is to determine the impact of seminal motivational theories and practices on employee performance and job satisfaction in addition to determining the existence and significance of specific motivational factors for the successful improvement of employee performance and job satisfaction in the modern business world.

The research draws on various secondary data and literature to explore and critically analyse the constructs, models and principals of several key motivational theories whilst primary research is conducted through a web-based survey to develop a comprehensive investigation into possible determinants of employee motivation.

The subsequent findings found age to be a significant factor with regard to the five types of motivation and can offer practical implications for managers today. Furthermore, Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory and Gallup's (2015) employee engagement practice is further examined as a possible hybrid for the successful motivation of employees and greater levels of performance and job satisfaction.

The findings show that further research is required to address gaps in the literature surrounding the topic of motivation, specifically the constructs of introjected, identified and integrated motivation.

Keywords: Motivation, performance, satisfaction, constructs, age, hybrid.

Submission of Thesis and Dissertation

National College of Ireland
Research Students Declaration Form
(*Thesis/Author Declaration Form*)

Name:

_GRAEME FORAN_____

Student Number:

_11408572_____

Degree for which thesis is submitted:

_MSc in MANAGEMENT_____

Material submitted for award

(a) I declare that the work has been composed by myself.

(b) I declare that all verbatim extracts contained in the thesis have been distinguished by quotation marks and the sources of information specifically acknowledged.

(c) My thesis will be included in electronic format in the College Institutional Repository TRAP (thesis reports and projects)

(d) *Either* *I declare that no material contained in the thesis has been used in any other submission for an academic award.

Or *I declare that the following material contained in the thesis formed part of a submission for the award of

(State the award and the awarding body and list the material below)

Signature of research student: __Graeme Foran_____

Date: _31-08-15_____

Submission of Thesis
to Norma Smurfit Library,
National College of Ireland

Student name: _____ GRAEME FORAN _____ Student number: _____ 11408572 _____

School: _____ BUSINESS _____ Course: _____ MSc IN MANAGEMENT _____

Degree to be awarded:

_____ A MASTER OF SCIENCE DEGREE IN MANAGEMENT _____

Title of Thesis:

Motivation:

An investigation to establish the impact of motivational theories on employee performance and satisfaction and to determine key factors towards the motivation of employees.

One hard bound copy of your thesis will be lodged in the Norma Smurfit Library and will be available for consultation. The electronic copy will be accessible in TRAP (<http://trap.ncirl.ie/>), the National College of Ireland's Institutional Repository. In accordance with normal academic library practice all theses lodged in the National College of Ireland Institutional Repository (TRAP) are made available on open access.

I agree to a hard bound copy of my thesis being available for consultation in the library. I also agree to an electronic copy of my thesis being made publicly available on the National College of Ireland's Institutional Repository TRAP.

Signature of Candidate: _____ Graeme Foran _____

For completion by the School:

The aforementioned thesis was received by _____

Date: _____

This signed form must be appended to all hard bound and electronic copies of your thesis submitted to your school

Acknowledgements

I would like to begin by acknowledging the guidance, time and assistance I have received from my supervisor James Nix during the course of this thesis.

I would like to thank every individual who took the time to participate in my research, you provided me with essential data that made this research possible. I would also like to thank Robert Fox for his time and valued assistance with SPSS and analysing my results.

Finally, I would like to take the opportunity to thank Karolina Ruseckaite for her continued support and assistance and my family for all their encouragement during this research.

Table of Contents

Abstract	2
Declaration	3
Acknowledgements	5
Chapter 1 Introduction	8
Chapter 2 Literature Review	10
2.1 Introduction	10
2.2 The five types of motivation	11
2.2.1 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation	11
2.2.2 Introjected motivation	13
2.2.3 Identified motivation.....	14
2.2.4 Integrated motivation	15
2.2.5 Conclusion.....	15
2.3 Self-Determination Theory	16
2.4 Needs-based theories.....	18
2.4.1 Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory	18
2.4.2 Alderfer's ERG theory	20
2.5 Opposing attribute theories.....	22
2.5.1 McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y	22
2.5.2 Herzberg two-factor theory	24
2.6 Employee Engagement	26
2.7 Conclusion	30
Chapter 3 Research Question	32
3.1 Proposed research question	32
3.2 Primary objective	32
3.3 Sub-objectives	33
Chapter 4 Research Methodology	34
4.1 Introduction	34
4.2 Qualitative research.....	34
4.3 Quantitative research.....	36
4.4 Research design.....	37

4.5 Questionnaire	38
4.6 Validity of questionnaire.....	39
4.7 Data analysis	40
4.8 Population and sampling	41
4.9 Ethical considerations	42
4.10 Research limitations	42
Chapter 5 Results and Analysis	44
5.1 Introduction	44
5.2 Descriptive statistics	44
5.3 Correlation	45
5.4 ANOVA	46
5.5 Summary of key findings	47
Chapter 6 Discussion	48
6.1 Introduction	48
6.2 Determining age as a motivating factor	49
6.3 Determining industry as a motivating factor.....	51
6.4 Determining employment status as a motivating factor	52
6.5 Maslow's hierarchy of needs in perspective.....	53
6.5.1 Application of hierarchy of needs theory	53
6.5.2 Employee life-cycle and age demographic perspective.....	54
6.6 Most fundamental motivation theory	55
Chapter 7 Conclusion.....	57
References.....	59
Appendices.....	71
Appendix A	71
Appendix B	71

Chapter 1 Introduction

Motivation has existed as a theoretical construct for almost a century, and simply refers to the direction, intensity and initiation of a person's behaviour. Even to this day, following countless research, theories, journal articles and various applications, motivation still remains a concept, a highly revised concept, but one nonetheless. It would be incorrect to state that we do not understand motivation, because in reality we do, however, the ability to successfully initiate and control the motivation of others in a business environment for example has proved to be quite a challenge (Ozguner and Ozguner, 2014).

To managers motivation is probably one of the most important aspects they can target in order to effectively improve employee performance and job satisfaction which is of course crucial to the success of both profit and non-profit organisations and companies (Pfeffer and Sutton, 2006). Over the course of several decades, numerous research has been put forward in an attempt to address the various complexities surrounding the area of motivation, however to this day there has been little research conducted that specifically investigates the genuine impact these motivational theories have on employee performance and satisfaction (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2002). Similarly, little research has been done to explore the demographics of age, employment status and industry to determine their significance and relevance as possible factors to employee motivation.

The primary objective of this research paper will ultimately address the gaps identified in the literature by first critically analysing several seminal motivation theories and practices through the utilisation of secondary data in order to provide managers with a critical insight and comprehensive conclusion regarding their impact on employee performance and job satisfaction. Subsequently, primary data will be conducted and analysed to investigate and determine whether an employee's age, employment status and industry have any significance or association with their level and type of motivation. This research was conducted using a deductive approach and a quantitative methodology to ensure a critical and systematic investigation was carried out.

The researcher feels that this research is important and necessary to ensure that managers of all spectrums are presented with the most relevant, accurate and critically analysed information and findings which will enable them to make more informed decisions about enhancing employee performance and satisfaction through motivation.

Chapter 2 Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

Managers are increasingly reminded of the importance and essential need for motivation in the workplace today. In recent years, companies have had to endure fiercely persistent competition in the global business environment due to a variety of factors such as the vast expansion of technology. Furthermore, the occurrence of the global economic crisis in 2007 has wiped out household names, brands and large corporations amongst others, therefore companies have been forced to undergo drastic re-evaluations and transformations in order to survive (O'Shea, Monaghan and Ritchie, 2014). However, the problem with these drastic actions is that it negatively impacts employees in all aspects of their lives thus diminishing their motivation, job satisfaction and ability to perform effectively. As a result, managers must ensure that employee motivation is at the centre of attention, as only then can they be confident that their employees will be committed, hard-working, satisfied and harnessing their own potential to successfully achieve company objectives (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2002).

Despite the substantial catalogue of literature that already exists regarding the area of motivation, many aspects remain unexplored or largely limited, as a result it opens up the opportunity for more extensive forms of study. As made evident by the variety of theories, practices and models, motivation can take many forms from extrinsic and intrinsic to introjected and so on that reflect the various behaviours or attitudinal phases that humans may experience given certain circumstances (Sadri and Bowen, 2011). However, the impact these motivational theories and practices have had on employee performance and job satisfaction remains largely inconclusive, although that's not to say that the evidence doesn't exist it just so happens that no research has yet attempted to specifically address this specific subject (Cho and Perry, 2012).

The aim of this literature review is to critically analyse the seminal theories, management practices and journal articles that envelop the core academic area of

motivation in order to gain a comprehensive understanding of the extent to which they influence and directly or indirectly impact employee performance and job satisfaction. Furthermore, research conducted regarding the seminal theories and practices by various sources will be examined to establish its relevance today as well as to identify any correlations and associations that exist between different theoretical constructs (Steel and König, 2006). Moreover, the validity of these constructs will also be determined through contrasting findings, arguments and perceptions. The literature analysed will also be inspected to determine if any gaps are present regarding theory principals, frameworks, ideas and/or suggestions so that a rich and unambiguous conclusion can be reached (Locke and Latham, 2004).

The literature review will begin by critically analysing the five types of motivation to determine the impact they have on employee performance and satisfaction. It is also important to begin with a review of the five types of motivation in order offer a firm understanding and evaluation of the major constructs that underline and form the premise of almost every motivational theory, practice, model and framework.

2.2 The five types of motivation

2.2.1 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation

Intrinsic motivation is internal and has been defined by Mirabela-Constanta and Maria-Madela (2011) as a person's willingness to pursue and execute an activity or task solely as a result of an inherent fulfilment or satisfaction that will arise from such an action. In contrast, extrinsic motivation refers to a person's behaviour that is being driven by external and generally tangible motivating factors or rewards such as a promotion or a salary (Cerasoli, Nicklin and Ford, 2014).

Li, Wei, Ren and Di (2015) believe it is the managers responsibility to encourage intrinsic motivation and in doing so will improve the dedication and innovation of his/her workforce. Furthermore, this type of motivation has also been found to enhance an employees' perception of their work, promoting an inherent feeling of value in the company, which Li et al. (2015) argue will result in the improvement of

a company's effectiveness. Similarly, Fullan (2011) also supports intrinsic motivation, strongly believing that it is the only 'sure thing' when compared to extrinsic rewards and punishments which he claims are "short lived". His findings suggest that a manager can only tap into an employee's intrinsic motivation indirectly, through what is known as realised effectiveness. Realised effectiveness essentially involves providing employees with new experiences, ones in which they will find intrinsically engaging and fulfilling. As such, Fullan (2011) believes that only through these genuine experiences can employees actually cultivate a behaviour that is intrinsically motivated, a behaviour that will be built upon in order to achieve greater performance.

Managers from a variety of industries still rely heavily on the application of extrinsic motivation through the endorsement of various incentive based models as they are convinced that providing employees with desirable incentives will in turn encourage them to perform better (Greene, 2011). Mafini and Dlodlo (2014) are in agreement with this way of thinking, suggesting that extrinsic motivation can improve job satisfaction, increase commitment and enhance employee innovation due to the positive correlation that has been found to exist between job satisfaction and extrinsic motivation (Chen and Fu, 2011). However, Fullan (2011) points out that these improvements will be short-lived unlike those offered by intrinsic motivation. Even so, Chen and Fu (2011) emphasize that in order to actually generate these improvements, a company must choose the appropriate incentives that correspond with its strategy.

Despite the popularity of extrinsic motivational elements, Panagopoulos (2013) as well as Benabou and Tirole (2003) argue that despite extrinsic motivation being easier to implement than intrinsic, extrinsic factors fail to provide any significant benefit, satisfaction or long-term motivation since once an employee expends his incentive for example, his motivation will also be expensed (Park and Word, 2012). Furthermore, Risher (2013) acknowledges that not all employees are similarly motivated, some may only respond to extrinsic motivating factors, whereas others its intrinsic motivation that prevails. Therefore, it is important for managers to

realise the type of motivation that corresponds with that individual employee in order to enhance their performance and satisfaction more effectively.

Cho and Perry (2012) warn that careful consideration is required when determining the type of motivation for each employee because if managers attempt to extrinsically motivate an intrinsically stimulated employee it can be detrimental to that employee's motivation and can also diminish their satisfaction. Furthermore, Cerasoli, Nicklin and Ford (2014) found that that employees who respond to extrinsic incentives are only extrinsically motivated to the degree at which this incentive is paramount to them acquiring other things they deem valuable. It is therefore imperative that managers understand what stimulates each employee, as in doing so will avoid offering individuals counterproductive stimulus (Cho and Perry, 2012).

2.2.2 Introjected motivation

Introjected motivation essentially describes an employee who is driven by their belief that they "should" perform a certain work-related task or activity despite not truly embracing the values of such a task or activity. Furthermore, employees who are stimulated by this type of motivation, do so in order to feel good or to enhance their ego for instance by constantly abiding by their inherent "shoulds". Introjected motivation is a relatively new type of motivation that is considered to be more self-determined than extrinsic motivation but not to the same degree as intrinsic motivation (Deal, Stawiski, Graves, Gentry, Weber, and Ruderman, 2013).

Burton, et al. (2006) argues that ego has a strong involvement in those that are introjectively motivated as they frequently self-evaluate themselves, are often competitive and tend to avoid any judgement that may be negative. However, Deal et al. (2013) suggests that this ego-driven nature and motivation has meant that they are often considered workaholics with a high level of commitment and continually strive to perform better so that they can reach higher company positions. Furthermore, it also seems that the higher an employee is in the company hierarchy, the more it positively impacts how much they are introjectively motivated. Therefore, Mirabela-Constanta and Maria-Madela (2011) suggest that

introjected motivation could possibly be a more robust and effective means to motivate an employee, especially with regards to improving their performance and satisfaction.

Due to introjected motivation being relatively new, it still requires more research in order to truly understand its impacts and correlations with employee performance and job satisfaction. Nevertheless, Deal et al. (2013) and Burton et al. (2006) have provided arguments and findings surrounding this type of motivation that can prove insightful and useful to managers today.

2.2.3 Identified Motivation

An individual that exhibits identified motivation has personally identified that a specific behaviour is important or essential towards the acquisition or achievement of something they deem valuable like a promotion for example. What an employee considers to be of value is generally an external reward that they have then internalised as being valuable. The behaviour needed to achieve this reward doesn't necessarily have to be enjoyable or fulfilling nor does there have to be an immediate outcome (McLachlan, 2011).

Assor, Vansteenkiste, and Kaplan (2009) suggest that identified motivation promotes personal values in an employee and can be responsible for boosting their well-being and attitude towards work thus increasing job satisfaction. Additionally, Deal et al. (2013) discovered that employees in higher company positions with fewer restrictions and more opportunities have been known to facilitate identified motivation and could therefore enhance their work performance.

There is a correlation between identified motivation and intrinsic motivation according to Burton, Lydon, D'Alessandro and Koestner (2006) who also argue that both types of motivation share little distinction with regard to the outcome associated with implementing either type. Garn and Jolly (2014) believe it is important for managers to consider identified motivation when establishing goals for employees. The associations between a goal and identified motivational factors

can result in a range of positive outcomes such as increased adaptive functioning in the workplace.

2.2.4 Integrated motivation

An individual who evaluates themselves in order to incorporate and internalise the reasons for performing a certain task is known to have integrated motivation. This type of motivation means that the individual has carefully evaluated various factors of a job or task and has determined that it is compatible with their personal values and beliefs. Therefore, this compatibility influences and regulates the individual's behaviour resulting in motivation to perform (Deci and Ryan, 2008).

Ke and Zhang (2010) argue that employees who perceive that performing a task or activity as fulfilling and worthwhile, i.e. integrated with their personal values will positively impact their performance. Furthermore, they suggest that according to empirical research and theory, it is indicated that integrated motivation is responsible for having the largest positive impact on an employee's performance, followed closely by identified motivation, then introjected and finally extrinsic (Ke and Zhang, 2010).

Although integrated motivation looks promising, researchers have yet to make conclusive findings that offer a robust and comprehensive understanding of its impact on job satisfaction and performance as well as how to implement it (McLachlan, 2011).

2.2.5 Conclusion

Following years of empirical research and seminal articles, there still remains unanswered questions relating to the five types of motivation discussed and their impact on employee job satisfaction and performance (McLachlan, 2011).

Managers increasingly need the tools and knowledge to determine the most effective form of employee motivation, with introjected and integrated motivation still lacking significant research it can disrupt managers efforts of effectively motivating employees especially if they don't have a comprehensive understanding of the specific constructs behind each type and how to recognise it in an employee (Ke and Zhang, 2010).

The review of the literature still seems to suggest that intrinsic motivation is superior with Fullan (2011) even supporting its relevance in modern business. However, the effectiveness of a type of motivation is still almost entirely dependent on how an individual responds to it, for example an employee who needs money will not be motivated intrinsically regardless whether it is superior and longer lasting (Risher, 2013). Therefore, the significance of each type of motivation is dependent on a managers ability to identify and implement the type of motivation that is most suited to each of their employees so that job satisfaction and performance are improved to the benefit of the entire company (Cho and Perry, 2012).

The seminal self-determination theory will now be critically analysed and discussed to determine its impact on employee performance and job satisfaction in order to coincide with the findings mentioned above regarding the five types of motivations.

2.3 Self-Determination Theory

The self-determination theory was developed by Deci and Ryan (1985) to analyse and evaluate the conditions that improve or diminish the three categories of motivation; namely controlled, autonomous and amotivation which are considered predictors of satisfaction and performance. Furthermore, the theory also proposed that an individual's basic psychological needs of competence, autonomy and relatedness are to varying degrees supported or thwarted by the strength and type of motivation (Deci and Ryan, 2008).

According to Burton, Lydon, D'Alessandro and Koestner (2006) the five types of motivation are considered an important aspect of the self-determination theory since they set the premise for three motivational categories proposed. Autonomous motivation more or less consists of intrinsic and identified motivation where an individual pursues an activity with a sense of willingness and choice whereas controlled motivation is almost opposite, instead consisting of extrinsic and introjected elements with which an individual responds to contingencies of punishments or rewards. Amotivation simply refers to the lack of motivation and

intention. Furthermore, Vallerand, Pelletier and Koestner (2008) strongly believe that the self-determination theory possess a distinctive "heuristic power" allowing managers to easily understand the constructs, determinants and principals of the theory's proposed motivational categories and psychological needs.

Oostlander, Güntert, Schie and Wehner (2014) support the theory, arguing that managers who incorporate autonomous motivation will in turn promote individual initiative, innovation and inherent perspectives as a result of increased independence and intrinsic elements. In contrast, Wilson, Mack, and Grattan (2008) argue that managers which encourage autonomous motivation will do so at the expense of those stimulated by controlled motivation since there is a negative correlation between the two categories of motivation.

The validity of the measures used in the self-determination theory have been questioned by Schwartz (2000) who claims that there is a possibility that the method used for the theory's research may be biased since it is common with that chosen method. Therefore, the principals proposed may not be completely representative of a real company context. Standage (2005) disagrees, arguing that the self-determination theory is a valid model and has remained relevant due to its ability to predict the impact different categories of motivation will have on employee's performance, well-being and satisfaction.

Gagné and Deci (2005) acknowledge that since the self-determination theory was first developed it has undergone numerous refinements and elaborations by various parties somewhat due to criticism but largely to ensure it remains fundamentally robust and of course, relevant. Nevertheless, the heart of the theory has never been altered, just reinforced with Sheldon and Schuler (2011) believing that it is a blueprint that continues to offer managers a comprehensive understanding of human processes as well as guiding their efforts to implement precise interventions. O'Donnell and Brown (2012) outline that the self-determination theory has enabled managers to specifically target the needs of their employees and have shown on numerous occasions to be the key that enables

employees to achieve a greater level of self-motivation, resulting in improved employee performance which translates to a better functioning company.

The needs-based motivational theories will now be critically examined and discussed to determine the impact employee needs can have on their motivation with specific relation to their job satisfaction and performance.

2.4 Needs-based theories

2.4.1 Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory

Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory (Maslow, 1943) has become one of the most influential and highly scrutinised motivational theories to date. Furthermore, it has provided researchers, employers and managers alike with five fundamental principals or "needs", which Maslow (1943) believes are crucial to successfully motivating individuals to achieve greater performance and satisfaction. Sadri and Bowen (2011) support the theory claiming that the motivational hierarchy has enabled countless companies to introduce benefit packages which have been specifically developed to resonate with their employees' individual level of needs, thus generating gradual improvements to productivity, motivation and overall revenue.

It has been more than 70 years since the hierarchy of needs theory was proposed and although it has remained largely relevant, Rouse (2004) questions its validity today, arguing that current society has meant that most employees usually only ever satisfy physiological needs and safety needs, which are the two lowest initial levels of the hierarchy. On the other hand, Koltko-Rivera (2006) believes that despite never reaching a higher level of needs, employees have still attained a level of satisfaction and motivation which has, in some cases, surpassed those seeking higher needs, merely by emphasising these lower needs.

An employee's satisfaction or dissatisfaction towards their job can alter their behaviour which ultimately impacts a company's operations to some degree, particularly if this behaviour is common amongst all staff (Rossiter, 2009). For that

reason, Udechukwu (2009) highly recommends the utilisation of Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory as he believes it has and will continue to shape the understanding of job satisfaction in all companies, regardless of industry. Furthermore, as a result of this improved understanding, managers can ensure employees' individual level of needs are adhered, thus improving job satisfaction and eventually performance (Udechukwu, 2009).

It is understandable to assume that money is associated with an individual's hierarchal needs to varying degrees and even contributes to the satisfaction and progression of the five levels of needs. Nevertheless, Oleson (2004) discovered, when analysing the application of this theory, that as an employee begins climbing higher in the hierarchy of needs, money becomes less of a concern to that individual. Hence, Oleson (2004) suggests that in order to effectively implement this hierarchy and improve employee performance and job satisfaction, managers must concentrate on providing more intrinsic incentives and less tangible elements.

Sengupta (2011) presents a contrasting view of the hierarchy of needs theory, in which she argues that upon closer analysis, there seems to exist inconsistencies, particularly in relation to the gratification of the hierarchy's 'basic needs'. The existence of these inconsistencies may offer a false impression that one need in the hierarchy must be one hundred percent fulfilled before the emergence of higher needs. Moreover, Goebel and Brown (1981) found applying the theory to a company context to be exceedingly difficult since guidance of its incorporation was absent. Additionally, they claim that the theory's concepts and language is too ambiguous and that any company's hoping to incorporate Maslow's findings must be prepared to play a "guessing game".

It is unquestionable that the hierarchy of needs theory has stood the test of time and is at the very least an influential motivational framework. Moreover it has evidently served an immeasurable amount of companies over several decades whilst at the same time withstanding numerous critiques and criticism (Sadri and Bowen, 2011). Maslow's (1943) classifications of basic human needs have resulted in improved employee motivation, stemming to enhanced job satisfaction and

increased performance. Furthermore, it continues to function as a backbone to major and more recent theories and concepts as a result of its strong core principals, validity and heuristic nature (Udechukwu, 2009).

Alderfer's ERG theory will now be critically reviewed to determine its impact on employee performance and satisfaction as well to present an alternative perspective that largely contrasts the views surrounding Maslow's hierarchy of needs.

2.4.2 Alderfer's ERG theory

The ERG theory as proposed by Alderfer (1969) was essentially founded on the shortcomings of Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory according to Arnolds and Boshoff (2002). Furthermore, they describe the ERG theory as a simpler conceptual model that represents three fundamental groups of needs; Existence, Relatedness and Growth which they argue is supported by empirical evidence despite sharing similarities with Maslow's (1943) theory when compared. Chang and Yuan (2008) concur but indicate that the ERG theory has distinctive differences, firstly it suggests that several different needs may be simultaneously active and secondly, that the hierarchal order of an individual's needs is irrelevant as they differ from person to person. The significance of the ERG theory lies in the fact that it challenges Maslow's (1943) seminal views and propositions, offering a contrasting angle to the debate on motivation as it tries to offer a realistic and evidence based view of individual needs, satisfaction and how they contribute to improving employee performance (Pate, 1987).

The contrasting differences between both theories becomes even more apparent when analysing the nature of the ERG theory. According to Dinibutun (2012), the ERG theory describes the needs of an individual as being similar to a continuum rather than a hierarchy like Maslow (1943) believed. Furthermore, unlike Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs, the ERG theory proposes unique elements such as the "Frustration-Regression phase" which it advises managers must acknowledge if they are to stand a chance of successfully motivating their employees to greater performance. Essentially, this phase implies that an individual may revert back to a

previous, lower need in order to achieve satisfaction if faced by an obstruction preventing the fulfilment of a higher need (Ko, Rhee, Walker and Lee, 2014).

The empirical evidence approach utilised by the ERG theory enabled it to identify that an employee's self-esteem can have a major influence on their ability to perform a job effectively which applies to managers also (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2002). Furthermore, Chang and Yuan (2009) argues that these findings in addition to Alderfer's (1969) ability to explain unique yet realistic behavioural actions such as the "Frustration-Regression phase" shows that the ERG theory is a superior model that provides invaluable insight into human motivation (Ko et al., 2014).

Unfortunately, due to the lack of an extensive critique the ERG theory has not been subject to much criticism therefore this gives the impression that the theory has no faults and is fully supported, however that most likely is not the case (Yang, Hwang and Chen, 2011). Caulton (2012) for instance argued that despite the ERG theory being able to identify correlations and draw conclusions it has neglected to offer any reliable method capable of actually satisfying any of the needs proposed. Furthermore, the findings presented by Arnolds and Boshoff (2002) argues that fulfilling the theory's Relatedness needs does not result in a positive improvement to employee performance as suggested.

The significance of the ERG theory lies in the fact that it challenges Maslow's (1943) seminal views and propositions, offering a contrasting angle to the debate on motivation as it tries to offer a realistic and evidence based view of individual needs, satisfaction and how they contribute to improving employee performance (Pate, 1987). Nevertheless, seeing as the theory's relevance has yet to be determined it cannot rightly be considered superior or equivalent to Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory. Hence, the most it can be regarded as is a construct. A construct that has offered managers a different perspective on the types of conditions and needs that may alter employee behaviour (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2002). Therefore, until the ERG theory has been systematically analysed and critiqued by various sources, its true nature and results remain questioned as

to whether it might improve employee performance and/or job satisfaction (Caulton, 2012).

Opposing attribute theories will be critically reviewed and discussed next to identify their relevance and influence on employee performance and satisfaction. As the premise for these theories are distinct from the needs-based theories, it will offer a further comprehensive analysis of motivation, performance and job satisfaction.

2.5 Opposing attribute theories

2.5.1 McGregor's Theory X and Theory Y

Theory X and Theory Y is a motivational framework that was first conceptualised by McGregor (1960) to address the assumptions he believed managers make about their employees. The assumptions in question are represented by two opposing categories and simply denoted by the Letter X and Y. Russ (2013) describes, in accordance with McGregor's (1960) views, that managers with a Theory X disposition believe that their employees possess a negative attitude towards work and responsibility and thus must be coerced into performing tasks. On the other hand, Theory Y managers hold the view that, given the opportunity and appropriate conditions, their employees will be self-motivated, fully committed and eager to build work relationships as a result of the enjoyment and satisfaction their work brings to them (Kopelman, Prottas and Falk, 2010).

Despite McGregor's (1960) theory having been developed half a century ago, it remains surprisingly absent of any empirical research or reliable measures in which to examine and support the theory's findings. Furthermore, the general consensus is that the theory is both undeveloped and lacking comprehensive findings in relation to improving one's job satisfaction or performance. This was possibly as a consequence of the theory's narrow-minded focus and disregard for environmental factors according to Gürbüz, Şahin and Köksal (2014). Additionally, Kopelman, Prottas and Davis (2008) argue that upon analysis of McGregor's (1960) theory it is evident that there was no attempt made to ensure the variables presented would in any way be applicable to measurement or real life

implementation. Moreover, McGregor himself also failed to provide any conclusive research to support his own proposed formulations (Kopelman, et al., 2008).

Regardless of the criticism and general consensus surrounding McGregor's (1960) Theory X and Y, Burke (2011) argues in support, claiming that the theory deserves some recognition especially since it is responsible for many aspects of today's management practices and without it the formation of Organisational Development (OD) may not have occurred. Furthermore, Sorensen and Minahan (2011) believe that Theory Y in particular, has encompassed many of today's major motivating factors which have been the result of ideas and job characteristics first proposed by McGregor's (1960) theory. For example, Theory Y advocated job enlargement which was later enhanced by the findings proposed in Herzberg (1966) two-factor theory to form job enrichment which still remains a relevant and crucial motivating practice today (Sorensen and Minahan, 2011).

Various analyses of McGregor's (1960) theory suggests that it has served researchers, academics and companies better when viewed as a cognitive framework, offering detailed explanations and rationale of managers assumptions and employee behaviour (Sorensen and Minahan, 2011). Although it has not yielded any direct results in improving employee performance and job satisfaction, it has instead served as a premise for theories and management practices that have followed such as Herzberg (1966) two-factor theory, Organisational Development and various intrinsic based principals. Finally, the ideas and beliefs of McGregor (1960) have remained pivotal, if not seminal to companies today by offering management an alternative viewpoint and set of values from which leadership and employee development can strive (Lerner, 2011).

Herzberg's two-factor theory will be discussed next as it offers a unique perspective of what it believes to be crucial motivating factors. These factors will then be analysed and discussed to determine the impact, be it positive or negative on employee performance and job satisfaction.

2.5.2 Herzberg two-factor theory

As knowledge and research surrounding motivation began to cultivate, Herzberg (1966) took the opportunity to enhance previous literature and findings in order to develop what is now considered a seminal motivational theory, the two-factor theory. As the name suggests, the focal point of this theory surrounds two distinct factors, hygiene factors and motivator factors. Hygiene factors are focused towards increasing employee satisfaction whereas motivator factors are concerned with improving motivation. The impact these factors have on job satisfaction and performance varies depending on different circumstances (Ong, Chang and Lee, 2013). Sachau (2007) notes that in a relatively short space of time, the two-factor theory became an established concept, one that was frequently challenged but nevertheless provided managers with the ability to gain a comprehensive understanding of employee behaviour and the factors involved in improving employee satisfaction and performance.

Carter (2006) insists that managers must understand certain key principals outlined in the two-factor theory in order to be able to successfully implement employee performance and satisfaction improvements. For instance, it is important for managers to recognise, in accordance with Herzberg's (1966) views, that the factors involved in producing satisfaction in an individual are instinctively different to those that bring about dissatisfaction and that they must not be considered opposites of one another. Similarly, Sachau (2007) believes that understanding the two-factor theory is incredibly important since misinterpretation of the theory is common and can lead managers to seek alternative theories or initiatives. For example, many believe that hygiene factors cannot be utilised to motivate, this is simply not the case, since using factors such as tangible bonuses can motivate employees particularly if they have no inherent interest or desire to work. Having said that, Herzberg (1966) is clear in his views that motivator factors and intrinsic motivation is a far superior method of motivating employees.

Bitsch and Hogberg (2005) argue that the two-factor theory was successful in challenging various prevailing and influential theoretical assumptions that came

before. As such, the theory discovered, despite conflicting perspectives, that a continuum can be representative of both job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and that an employee could in fact be neutral, meaning they were neither dissatisfied nor satisfied. Furthermore, a weak correlation was also revealed by Herzberg (1966) to exist between financial incentives and job satisfaction. The theory therefore argued that since the premise for motivation centres around an individual's growth needs, financial incentives were not required to improve inherent motivation which evidently contrasts the concept of extrinsic motivation (Jones and Lloyd, 2005).

The application of Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory in conjunction with McGregor's (1960) theory X and Y has resulted in numerous developments to the field of management and motivation including the creation of job enrichment as previously mentioned. Lyons (2007) asserts that with the introduction of these developments, coupled with Herzberg's (1966) various suggestions and ideas, it has resulted in performance improvements, self-motivation and increased job satisfaction across various levels of companies. In contrast, Jones and Lloyd (2005) criticised the two-factor theory, stating that it is "method bound" and that the data Herzberg (1966) presented, is inconsistent with his views and lacks considerable support, especially regarding the claim that money is an ineffective motivator. Adair (2006) expressed similar but stronger criticism of the theory arguing that various empirical researchers have explicitly denied any indication of 'satisfiers' or 'dissatisfiers' existing. Additionally, he further states that despite what Herzberg (1966) proposed, there is evidence to suggest that extrinsic factors can actually improve satisfaction and that intrinsic factors can be a cause of dissatisfaction.

Since its introduction, the seminal two-factor theory has had an impact in the world of business and motivation-thought by offering an unconventional way to view common workplace situations and predicaments (Bitsch and Hogberg, 2005). Granted, the research may not be appropriate or even applicable to all employees in all companies, but that hasn't prevented the theory from offering managers and

researchers with invaluable and comprehensive suggestions and ideas. These ideas have even become the premise for more modern forms of motivational theories and practices (Lyons, 2007).

Having said that, the theory does not seem to have stood the test of time, as Adair (2007) explains, Herzberg's (1966) theory has faced increasing criticism that has continually highlighted its flaws and targeted many of the theory's fundamentals by denying they even existed. As a result, many consider the two-factor theory to be largely irrelevant today, advocating the much renowned Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory instead which they believe to be a superior model to Herzberg's (1966) (Sachau, 2007).

Employee engagement will be critically reviewed next and is distinctive to motivational theories previously mentioned by offering an alternative model and perspective to motivating employees in the modern company environment, as a result it will be examined to determine its impact on employee performance and job satisfaction.

2.6 Employee Engagement

In recent years a new motivational practice has risen in popularity, simply known as employee engagement, it aims to do what its name suggests and has been taking the business world by storm. Moreover, this modern concept has sought to challenge the foundations of existing theories, correct the views expressed by researchers and improve the management practices that have claimed to hold the solution to employee motivation. On top of this, employee engagement promises to serve companies as a lever to greater success and profitability through enhancing job satisfaction and improving performance (Strategic Direction, 2015). Currently, there exists numerous literature that has attempted to define employee engagement but due to its ambiguous nature, researchers are yet to decide on one, universal definition (Wiley, 2010). Despite this, Macey and Schneider (2008) have found that each and every one of the definitions infer that employee engagement encompasses behavioural, as well as attitudinal factors. Furthermore,

the concept represents the values of any company by instilling a shared vision and purpose in addition to enhancing the commitment, involvement, energy and passion of its employees.

Gallup is a leading pioneer in the field of psychology and has conducted vast amounts of qualitative research, in numerous industries. The initial development and subsequent establishment of employee engagement was the product of Gallup who proposed a leading tool called the Gallup Q12. The Gallup Q12 is capable of managing and measuring employees using 12 fundamental elements that have demonstrated concrete links to crucial performance results (Gallup, 2015). Below (figure 2.1) is an illustration of the employee engagement Q12 audit including its format and items list that employees would likely be given to complete.

Table 1
Items Comprising the Gallup Workplace Audit

Overall Satisfaction—On a five-point scale, where “5” is *extremely satisfied* and “1” is *extremely dissatisfied*, how satisfied are you with (Name of Company) as a place to work?

1. I know what is expected of me at work.
2. I have the materials and equipment I need to do my work right.
3. At work, I have the opportunity to do what I do best every day.
4. In the last seven days, I have received recognition or praise for doing good work.
5. My supervisor, or someone at work, seems to care about me as a person.
6. There is someone at work who encourages my development.
7. At work, my opinions seem to count.
8. The mission/purpose of my company makes me feel my job is important.
9. My associates (fellow employees) are committed to doing quality work.
10. I have a best friend at work.
11. In the last six months, someone at work has talked to me about my progress.
12. This last year, I have had opportunities at work to learn and grow.

Figure 2.1 (Harter, Hayes and Schmidt, 2002).

According to Harter et al. (2002), Gallup has consistently worked on ensuring that the concept of employee engagement remains relevant, providing managers with superior comprehensive findings and associations that are supported by robust empirical evidence, detailing the most reliable performance, motivational and satisfaction factors which can then be incorporated into result driven action plans.

The harsh economic climate and recessions that companies have had to experience has driven them to pursue methods, practices, theories and concepts in

a drastic attempt to improve employee motivation in the hope it will lead to a significant enhancement to performance (Nolan, 2011). Wiley (2010) is an advocate of employee engagement, arguing that it is the solution companies have been searching for. Moreover, he states that it comes as no surprise that this concept has garnered huge support from professionals and managers alike, claiming it excels at engaging employees to offer the finest quality of service united with greater productivity that results in outstanding company performance and profitability. Additionally, Bhuvanaiah and Raya (2014) stress that implementing employee engagement is imperative, not only to the performance of the company but to employee overall wellbeing. This is supported by the strong correlations that have been found to exist between an employees work life and their overall satisfaction. If an individual's work life was to diminish it would negatively impact their level of engagement, willingness to assimilate with their specified role and lead them to eventually burnout from exhaustion.

Employee engagement should be at the forefront of a company's agenda according to Millar (2012) who suggests ways for implementing this modern concept. Firstly, he advises that companies should begin making employee engagement an integral part of training and introduction. Following on from this, managers should turn their attention to increasing employee commitment through designed interventions as well as maintaining constant yet effective communication. Moreover, Hazelton (2014) also asserts that continuous demonstration of appreciation to employees is essential to ensure they feel valued and vital to the company's success. If the concept of employee engagement is entirely and continuously incorporated into the work environment of any company, it will have positive implications on employees' lives, both work life and personal resulting in a highly motivated, fully engaged, determined and high performing workforce (Strategic Direction, 2015).

Despite the obvious support shown by many managers, researchers and professionals, employee engagement is almost equally criticised with some

criticism directly contrasting the views previously proposed. In particular, Newman and Harrison (2008) strongly argue that the concept of employee engagement is not new, modern or innovative, it is only a reimagining of elements and characteristics that have come long before, essentially a "new blend of old wines". Furthermore, Christian, Garza and Slaughter (2011) contrast the views of Wiley (2010) and others, claiming that regardless what is argued about engagement being a performance improver and variable of motivation, little is truly known about whether employee engagement improves performance. Lawler (2012) raises more criticism of employee engagement, by instead targeting the concept's premise. He argues that various studies have concluded that little or no correlation exists between performance and job satisfaction and that employees were only recorded as being satisfied if they performed well and not the other way round. As the business world gets increasingly competitive and while many of the world's economies remain in turmoil, survival has become more difficult than ever. Therefore, having a fully engaged workforce ready to face these ever-increasing challenges could be a definitive competitive advantage and more importantly, the solution to survive (Macey and Schneider, 2008). Regardless of the arguments for and against this concept, both sides can agree that incorporating employee engagement is a difficult task, one that will require adhering to the fundamental elements and principals outlined by Gallup (2015) in order to ensure employees achieve exact behavioural and attitudinal state. To this day, employee engagement still lacks a comprehensive meaning and a definitive, universally accepted definition, what's more is that the debate over its effectiveness and relevance as a concept continues to gather traction with researchers on both sides of the fence offering valid and robust arguments. Nevertheless, there are two aspects that are unquestionably known; the first is that performance has shown a correlation with employee engagement and secondly, it is measurable. Essentially, employee engagement boils down to a tool, an intricate tool that when properly implemented can serve as the crucial step to company success (Wallace and Trinkka, 2009).

2.7 Conclusion

The literature review presented a variety of sources that offered insightful arguments, views and findings surrounding the core area of motivation and the seminal theories, management practices and concepts that encompass it. Furthermore, through critical analysis and examination of the various sources, several assumptions and indications can be made regarding the relevance of the theories and practices today as well as their impact on employee performance and job satisfaction (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2002).

A review of the various seminal motivational theories and practices has found that the literature seems to consider intrinsic motivation to be one of the most important constructs with regard to improving employee performance and/or job satisfaction (Burton et al., 2006). Furthermore, there are also several sources such as Mafini and Dlodlo (2014) who have argued that extrinsic motivation and incentive based models are a particularly beneficial solution to employee performance enhancement, however this looks to be changing especially with the introduction of more modern types of motivation and more specifically, employee engagement practices (Gallup, 2015).

It is well documented by numerous sources such as Sadri and Bowen (2011) that Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory still continues to dominate the area of motivation focusing primarily on the importance of intrinsic motivation or 'self-actualisation' to positively impact an employee's motivation and thus performance and satisfaction. Nevertheless, the hierarchy's positive impact hasn't discouraged various other academics and researchers from continuing to challenge the approach and clarifications of Maslow's (1943) hierarchy such as Herzberg's (1966) theory and later Alderfer ERG in 1969.

The literature review demonstrates that motivational theories have to some extent positively impacted employee performance and job satisfaction but that this impact is almost entirely based on the managers ability to implement these theories successfully. Analysis of each theory has revealed that it is the actual motivational constructs that are considered to be the most important aspect of any motivational

theory, such as intrinsic or extrinsic (Udechukwu, 2009) Furthermore these various different constructs, perfectly described by the self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985) as the five types of motivation are somewhat evident in each motivational theory. Therefore managers should in fact be utilising the motivational constructs to physically improve employee performance and job satisfaction and refer only to the theories as comprehensive hindsight before their implementation.

Chapter 3 Research Question

3.1 Proposed research question

An investigation to establish whether motivational theories and practices have had a positive impact on employee performance and job satisfaction and to determine the existence and significance of specific motivational factors for the successful improvement of employee performance and job satisfaction today?

3.2 Primary objective

The primary objective of this research paper is to investigate and explore the seminal theories and practices that encompass the core academic area of motivation with the aim of establishing whether or not they have had a profound positive impact on the performance and/or job satisfaction of employees.

Furthermore, the research aspires to identify the existence of specific motivational factors and to determine their significance in successfully improving the performance and level of job satisfaction of employees in today's modern business environments.

The purpose of this primary objective is to provide managers of all industries and backgrounds with a critical insight into the principal seminal theories and practices they have been accustomed to in order to draw attention to the main arguments and findings surrounding their impact. The result of which will therefore assist managers in effectively assessing which theories or practices are the most reliable method of improving employee performance and job satisfaction. Furthermore, the purpose of determining specific motivational factors through primary research is so that managers are presented with the most relevant observation of the key factors that employees believe have and will motivate them today. This will therefore establish the aspects and type of employee motivation that is considered by the employees themselves, to be vital in improving their individual performance and job satisfaction.

3.3 Sub-objectives

1. Compare and contrast seminal motivational theories and practices to determine their significance, effectiveness and possible relation to one another.
2. Determine what factors affect job satisfaction and performance and whether any trends exist.
3. Identify motivational techniques that managers have applied both past and present.
4. Determine the relevance of motivational theories and practices today.
5. Conclude whether a single motivational theory or practice exists that will be successful in every company.

Chapter 4 Research Methodology

4.1 Introduction

The primary research objective of this paper is an investigation into the positive impact of motivational theories and practices on the performance and satisfaction of employees. Additionally the primary research seeks to critically determine the existence and significance of specific motivational factors for successfully improving employee performance and job satisfaction today. To ensure the successful accomplishment of the primary and sub objectives the appropriate research methodology was chosen and will be discussed beginning with an analysis of qualitative and quantitative research for the purpose of illustrating the rationale behind the chosen research design. Subsequently, the research design, questionnaire, validity and data analysis will be discussed alongside the population and sampling, ethical considerations and finally the limitations of this research.

4.2 Qualitative research

Qualitative research explores through observation, the perceptions individuals make about certain events in a natural environment. It typically involves a process of inquiry that aims to understand a particular human or social issue (Khan, 2014). Motivation is a common yet complex social problem that many researchers have attempted to address by means of a qualitative methodology (Soydas and Aleti, 2015). For this reason, the researcher has considered the possibility of utilising qualitative analysis to address the social issue outlined in the primary objective since according to Muqtadir, Haque and Anam (2012) it would offer a rich and conclusive understanding of the problem. There exist numerous qualitative analytical instruments capable of deciphering how and why employees are motivated to greater levels of performance and satisfaction (Khan, 2014).

For the purpose of this investigation, the researcher has chosen to only consider interviews and focus groups for data collection as they are the most appropriate for the analysis of motivation in this case. According to Qu and Dumay (2011), interviews are an effective qualitative instrument and a comprehensive means of

data collection. They also argue that it enables the acquisition of complex individual data that would have been impossible to acquire otherwise. Furthermore, a recent study was conducted by Williams and Manias (2014) in which they utilised interviews to acquire data on a specific motivational problem similar to the investigation proposed by this research paper. The interviews were structured in accordance with their objective and comprised of sequential questions and short phrases that sought to investigate various aspects of motivation. In addition, Bell (2013) argues in support of interviews, suggesting it provides the researcher with the unique opportunity to develop a relationship with the participant through physical communication therefore enabling the ability to gathering richer, more comprehensive data.

Focus groups as a qualitative research method is considered by Farnsworth and Boon (2010) to be largely coherent, offering the researcher a rapid means of data collection which can then be compiled and compared to illustrate themes, traits and the behaviour of that group. The researcher considered implementing this qualitative approach since it is an appropriate method for analysing behaviour related to motivation. Furthermore, Ivey (2012) argues that focus groups are particularly effective when used in research that seeks to investigate the needs of a given population since ideas, emotions, experiences and opinions of the group are variables that can be measured using this method.

Whilst a qualitative methodology can investigate social problems such as employee motivation, performance and satisfaction in considerable depth, the collection of data and in particular the analysis involved in qualitative research is deemed by Coule (2013) to be expensive, time-consuming and dependant on the skills and experience of the researcher. Furthermore, Staller (2014) argues that many issues are raised relating to anonymity and confidentiality when utilising qualitative methods of research and Gerrish (2011) also suggests that the results gathered from focus groups, interviews etc. are usually more difficult to interpret and illustrate than quantitative research. Therefore, the researcher has opted not to pursue qualitative research as the chosen methodology due to the issues

mentioned. Additionally as interview/focus group participant sizes are relatively small, the researcher considers this an insufficient sample size for the determination of whether there exist any key factors relating to the specific improvement of motivation, performance and satisfaction of employees today.

4.3 Quantitative research

Quantitative research is a conclusive systematic investigation that is utilised for the measurement of frequencies and observations made about a specific subject such as motivation. The methods involved are used to test the hypotheses of a particular study and to examine relationships and determine causation among variables (Hoe and Hoare, 2012). On this basis, the researcher has considered utilising a quantitative methodology for the purpose of investigating the primary objective of the research paper. According to Shaw (2012), quantitative research is also traditionally considered to be a more accurate and analytical methodology compared to qualitative (Hoe and Hoare, 2012). Furthermore, Sogunro (2002) considers quantitative instruments such as questionnaires and surveys to be the most practical and feasible method for data collection. Additionally, he suggests that it provides logical statistical conclusions that can be easily interpreted.

In an attempt to develop a situational measure of motivation, Guay, Vallerand, and Blanchard (2000) conducted quantitative research via a five-point scale questionnaire intended to measure various constructs of motivation, similar to the primary objective proposed by this research paper. It resulted in the collection of precise and accurate numerical data that facilitated the opportunity to identify correlations and make comparisons between the different variables. Furthermore, Miller et al. (2011) argues that quantitative research offers a rigorous, systematic illustration of an empirical problem providing the researcher with greater precision to critically analyse and propose findings.

Bell, DiStefano and Morgan (2010) warn that researchers must be considerate and careful when deciding to implement a quantitative methodology since the instruments involved are inflexible and therefore cannot be altered once the

research commences. Furthermore, Tacq (2011) argues that the instruments involved in quantitative research are standardised and thus open to misinterpretation by participants, what's more is that managing to acquire a sufficient amount of responses can prove to be strenuous.

For the purpose of critically investigating and analysing the area of motivation to determine the existence of specific motivating factors, a quantitative methodology seems to be the most logical and appropriate choice for this research paper (Hoe and Hoare, 2012). However, it can't be ignored that various considerations and issues regarding the instruments and research approach of a quantitative methodology need to be addressed upon implementation as Bell et al. (2010) argued. Having said that, a quantitative methodology provides the researcher with numerous advantages and very few drawbacks. On the premise that a quantitative methodology will offer the researcher a robust and precise method of systematically investigating the research paper's primary objective and due to time constraints in completing this research, it has been chosen to be the most suitable and ideal method of research. Furthermore, the ability to clearly illustrate with great precision, any specific correlations and causation between various motivational variables only enhances the reliability and effectiveness of this chosen methodology.

4.4 Research design

The research design will comprise of a cross-sectional quantitative methodology aimed at gathering primary data in order to perform a conclusive systematic investigation to identify whether there exist specific factors considered to be crucial for the successful improvement of motivation, performance and satisfaction in employees (Hoe and Hoare, 2012). The utilisation of a quantitative methodology ensures to the researcher that the primary and sub objectives of this research paper will be rigorously analysed and examined resulting in clear illustrations and possible correlations. From this, the researcher can then draw comprehensive conclusions regarding which factors and types of motivation are most significant and relevant today (Miller et al., 2011).

In addition to conducting primary quantitative research, a deductive approach will be utilised to analyse and evaluate the aims proposed in the primary and sub objectives, chiefly focused on the various seminal motivational theories and practices (Xu et al., 2011). The aim of this is to present a further comprehensive understanding of the area of motivation, as well as the significance and relevance of the theories and factors today (Arnolds and Boshoff, 2002). Furthermore, the combination of substantial primary and secondary data offers the researcher the ability to identify and determine key correlations and causations. The result of which will present comprehensive and conclusive findings aimed at answering the objectives proposed by this research paper (Hoe and Hoare, 2012).

To address the issues outlined by Bell et al. (2010) and Tacq (2011) regarding quantitative methodology, the researcher will target a greater sample size in order to yield larger and more consistent research data so to be more representative of the wider population (Bertrand and Fransoo, 2002). Furthermore, pilot tests of the quantitative research instrument chosen will be implemented to ensure participants aren't faced with unambiguous questions or statements.

4.5 Questionnaire

This research paper utilised a cross-sectional web-based survey to collect primary data for the analysis and evaluation of motivation, behaviour and attitudes of a population in order to determine correlations, relevance and significance of specific motivational factors (Hoe and Hoare, 2012). While there currently exists numerous websites and programs providing survey-creation tools and services, Survey Monkey (2015) was chosen due to its practicality and feasibility in developing a survey and subsequent data collection. Furthermore, the researcher chose a well-known brand to increase the rate of participant responses, believing a recognised brand would instil a sense of security among respondents.

The researcher is fully aware of the weaknesses associated with the utilisation of a survey for quantitative research and thus sought to address them by implementing pilot tests to ensure that the questions and statements were unambiguous and

concise (Bertrand and Fransoo, 2002). Despite the apparent weaknesses of this chosen research method, a survey provided the researcher with the ability to conduct thorough research in a practical and feasible manner whilst under time constraints (Sogunro, 2002).

The Motivation Measure questionnaire developed by Moran, Diefendorff, Kim and Liu, (2012) assessed five distinct aspects of motivation; extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation, introjected motivation, integrated motivation and identified motivation in order to determine what motivates Chinese employees to work. The Motivation Measure questionnaire was adapted and implemented by this research paper principally due to its demonstration as being a modern and reliable quantitative research instrument that has been carefully reviewed for conceptual clarity as a measurement of motivational factors.

The questionnaire proposed the question "Why are you motivated to do your work?" and contained 15 items (Cronbach's alpha= .82) with each item being measured using a 4-point Likert-scale ranging from 1(Strongly Disagree) to 4(Strongly Agree). This was to determine the types and factors of motivation that best represented how they felt they have been and would be motivated. An illustration of the questionnaire that was distributed to the participants is displayed in *Appendix A* and *Appendix B*.

4.6 Validity of questionnaire

As discussed the questionnaire was adapted from the Motivation Measure questionnaire developed by Moran et al. (2012) which had already demonstrated reliability and conceptual clarity, however since the researcher has adapted several questions as well as targeted a different population sample, it was essential to re-evaluate the questionnaire to once again determine its validity.

The overall validity of the questionnaire was established using Cronbach's alpha (DeVellis, 2003) and was determined to have an overall Cronbach's alpha of .82. According to DeVellis (2003) Cronbach's alpha requires the values to be above 0.7 to be able to ascertain its reliability, therefore the overall motivation scale of the

questionnaire is reliable. Furthermore, the subscales of the questionnaire; Intrinsic, Introjected, Integrated and Identified had Cronbach's alpha values greater than 0.7, however the subscale Extrinsic was determined using Cronbach's alpha to be an unreliable scale according to DeVellis (2003) as it was lower than the 0.7. The Cronbach's alpha values are presented in table 4.1 below.

Table 4.1

Scale	Cronbach's Alpha
Intrinsic	.74
Introjected	.82
Extrinsic	.39
Integrated	.8
Identified	.83
Total Motivation	.82

4.7 Data analysis

The research data of 189 total responses was analysed using the Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) program. This involved compiling the data collected using Survey Monkey (2015) into an Excel format which was then efficiently transferred by the researcher to SPSS for analysis. Subsequently, in accordance with Jankowicz (2005), the researcher eliminated any response data that was determined unusable as a result of unanswered questions or failure to complete the questionnaire.

Following the transfer of data to SPSS and subsequent elimination of unusable data, the researcher conducted a re-evaluation of the questionnaire's validity as discussed in *section 4.6*. With the validity established, a comprehensive inferential statistical evaluation was conducted to determine the results of the quantitative research.

4.8 Population and sampling

The primary aim of this research paper is to determine the existence and importance of specific motivational factors for the improvement of performance and satisfaction in employees. Therefore in order to arrive at a comprehensive conclusion surrounding the existence and importance of these motivational factors the researcher required a population sample that represented several different variables needed to meticulously investigate this proposed research. The particular variables used for conducting the research consisted of age, employment status and industry with each offering multiple options for participants choose from, thus broadening the scope of the population sample. Gender was excluded from the list of variables as it didn't amount to any significance in answering the primary or sub objectives.

The target population consisted of participants who were unemployed, a student and or a full/part-time employee in any industry, age from over 18 to over 65. Any participants who were identified as being under the age of 18 were immediately withdrawn from the research for ethical purposes. Furthermore, the researcher aimed to acquire a target population size of no less than 100 participants to ensure it resulted in more conclusive and robust findings. The web-based survey was conducted over a period of two months, largely through the use of the college email database and to a lesser extent on social network websites; Twitter (2015) and LinkedIn (2015).

Aghili (2011) argues that regardless of the type of research methodology and design, achieving a true random sample will always remain a complex task. Therefore, researchers must choose a sampling technique that is most suitable to their specific circumstance. Due to the limitations of this research, primarily time constraints, the researcher implemented a convenience sampling technique. According to Schillewaert, Langerak, and Duhamel (1998) convenience sampling involves choosing population samples simply because they are readily accessible. Furthermore, it is considered the most feasible and practical sampling technique for quantitative research.

4.9 Ethical considerations

The prospect of ethical issues remained a top priority of this research paper due to the nature of this research methodology, design and the domain in which information was gathered. Hence, the researcher remained persistent in ensuring that the rights of each and every participant involved in the research process was protected with the highest care and consideration. Ethical standards and principals according to Fox, Murray and Warm (2003) were meticulously upheld through the use of a professionally validated questionnaire that comprised of carefully considered questions that guaranteed the total anonymity and confidentiality of participants involved. Furthermore, the researcher provided participants with prior knowledge of the intended research and sought consent for the use of their information, this ensured the integrity of the research and that participation was completely voluntary.

The specific design of the questionnaire meant that participants were only expected to provide information that was necessary for research purposes, nevertheless participants always had the option to choose "Prefer not to say" to ensure any information provided was entirely voluntary. Furthermore, due to the nature of a web-based survey, it provided an additional layer of anonymity as no physical interaction was required for the collection of data, in addition the researcher made certain that the IP address of each participant was not recorded.

Most importantly, throughout the entire research process the researcher ensured that no harm or discomfort was caused to any individual during their voluntary participation of this research and that the information collected was stored securely and treated with the highest care and consideration.

4.10 Research limitations

According to Miller et al. (2011) quantitative research conducted utilising a questionnaire provides the researcher with a rigorous and precise method of data gathering and illustration of responses. However, a robust and well-structured questionnaire still cannot avoid the various limitations of this research design. It

has been argued by Eack, Greeno and Lee (2006) that questionnaires lack the means to distinguish truthful responses from false responses therefore limiting the accuracy and significance of the results. Furthermore, Kirk-Smith (1998) argues that since questionnaires can only measure the current given state of a sample population, the results are limited and incapable of determining how the participants arrived at that particular given state.

Due to the research being conducted largely via a college email database the subsequent results may have been subject to response bias since most participants will ultimately be students thus limiting the questionnaires findings (Tacq, 2011). Furthermore, the researcher attempted to acquire a larger quantity of participants to yield greater results, however as a result of time constraints this was not achievable (Bertrand and Fransoo, 2002). Despite this the researcher is confident that the results gathered are an accurate representation of the key motivating factors of the larger population.

Chapter 5 Results and Analysis

5.1 Introduction

The aim of this chapter is to present the analysis and subsequent results of the research paper's descriptive statistics, correlations, and one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA). As discussed in the research design (section 4.4), a cross-sectional web-based survey was used to collect the primary data with which this analysis was conducted and results composed. Firstly, the researcher will present illustrations of the descriptive statistics for all continuous variables.

5.2 Descriptive statistics

The research paper's descriptive statistics show a summary of the data analysed and are illustrated according to group and corresponding sample size. Age is presented in table 5.1, employment in table 5.2 and finally industry in table 5.3.

Table 5.1

Age	n
Group 1	92
Group 2	64
Group 3	26

Table 5.2

Employment	n
Full-time Student	53
Part-time Employed	79
Full-time Employed	52

Table 5.3

Industry	n
Finance	30
IT	37
Hospitality	47
Other	64

Table 5.4 illustrated below shows the descriptive statistics for all continuous variables; intrinsic, introjected, extrinsic, integrated, identified and total motivation.

Table 5.4

Variable	n	Mean	Median	SD	Range
Intrinsic	153	8.46	9	1.95	3--12
Introjected	153	8.79	9	2.2	3--12
Extrinsic	151	8.58	9	1.58	5-- 2
Integrated	154	7.92	8	2.26	3--12
Identified	152	8.53	9	2.04	3--12
Total motivation	147	42.22	43	6.58	20--58

SD = Standard Deviation

5.3 Correlation

It is reasonable to suggest that a total score for motivation could be used to indicate high levels of motivation, therefore a total motivation score was created by totalling the aforementioned subscales. Prior to creating this total score, it was of great importance to conduct a bivariate correlation analysis to ascertain the relationship between the five subscales of motivation.

A Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient was used to investigate this relationship, these results presented in table 5.5 below, shows that correlations were both positive and negative and range from small effect to large effect, ranging from $r = -.11$, $p = .20$ (extrinsic/integrated) to $r = .72$, $p = .001$ (integrated/identified).

Table 5.5 (for displaying correlations between variables):

Correlations between all continuous variables

Variables	1	2	3	4	5
1. Intrinsic	1				
2. Introjected	.18*	1			
3. Extrinsic	-.16	.35***	1		
4. Integrated	.57***	.20*	-.11	1	
5. Identified	.70***	.27**	-.13	.72***	1

Note. Statistical significance: * $p < .05$; ** $p < .01$; *** $p < .001$

5.4 ANOVA

Three individual one-way between groups analysis of variance (ANOVA) and one multiple ANOVA were conducted to separately examine age, employment status, industry and the five subscales of motivation in order to critically evaluate their impact on total motivation scores.

Firstly, a one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to investigate the affect age has on total motivation scores. Participants were separated according to their age into three distinct groups (Age group 1= 18-25; age group 2 = 26-40; and age group = 41-60). The results of this analysis illustrates that there was not a statistically significant difference in the level of total motivation scores for the three age groups $F(2, 140) = 2.165, p = .12$. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .03, indicating a small effect according to Cohen (1988).

A further investigation of relationship between age and the five subscales of motivation was evaluated using multiple ANOVA's and is displayed in table 5.6 below.

Table 5.6

Subscale	P	Eta Squared
Intrinsic (F2, 146)	0.015	0.06
Introjected (F2, 146)	0.73	0.004
Extrinsic (F2, 144)	0.001	0.09
Integrated (F2, 147)	0.002	0.08
Identified (F2, 145)	0.002	0.08

A one-way between groups analysis of variance was performed to examine the impact employment status has on total motivation scores. Participants were divided and three groups were formed according to their employment status (Full-time student; employed part-time and full-time employed). The results of this analysis illustrates that there was not a statistically significant difference in level of total motivation scores for the three groups of employment status $F(2, 142) = .112, p = .89$. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .002, indicating no effect according to Cohen (1988).

A one-way between groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore the impact of industry on total motivation scores. Participants were divided into four separate groups according to their industry (Finance; information technology; hospitality and other). The results of this analysis illustrates that there was not a statistically significant difference in level of total motivation scores for the four industry groups $F(3, 139) = .112, p = .94$. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .003, indicating no effect according to Cohen (1988).

5.5 Summary of key findings

Upon investigation of the correlation between these five subscales of motivation the results indicated that the subscales were suitably correlated with each other in order to commute a total motivation score or 'total motivation'. Furthermore, the Pearson product-moment correlation coefficient illustrated a small effect between extrinsic and integrated motivation and a large effect between integrated and identified motivation.

Three separate, one-way between groups ANOVA analysed the impact age, employment and industry had on total motivation scores which resulted in no statistical significance being found. For further analysis, a single multiple ANOVA was conducted to examine relationship between age and the five subscales of motivation which was found to have no statistical significance. However, a further investigation was conducted through a post-hoc analysis and is discussed in *chapter 6*.

Chapter 6 Discussion

6.1 Introduction

The primary objective of this research paper sought to investigate and explore through secondary research the seminal motivational theories and practices that have become a fundamental element in the process of motivating employees to greater levels of performance and job satisfaction. Despite there being a significant number of motivation literature currently available, many aspects surrounding the area of motivation and its constructs still require further investigation in order to accurately determine their significance and impact on employee performance and job satisfaction. This need for further investigation prompted the researcher to conduct primary research specifically targeting those constructs and factors associated with motivational theories and practices.

The aim of the paper's primary research was to supplement the findings of the secondary research by further analysing and measuring the motivational constructs and factors to offer more conclusive results and precise inferences. These inferences and findings could then be used to identify and determine the significance, relevance and effectiveness of motivational theories, practices and constructs towards the successful improvement of employee performance and job satisfaction.

To achieve the primary objective discussed in *section 3.2* a total motivation score was developed to measure the impact age, employment status and industry can have on an individual's level of motivation. Furthermore, five motivational subscales were utilised to test and measure the major constructs and factors of motivational theories and practices in order to effectively determine their significance and relevance in successfully improving employee motivation and subsequent performance and satisfaction.

The researcher will begin the discussion with a comprehensive understanding of the results related to age as a factor in motivating employees.

6.2 Determining age as a motivation factor

Motivation remains a core academic area and a subject that seems to endlessly grow as time progresses with numerous researchers, academics and even organisations like Gallup (2015) for instance, proposing new or revised practices and theories. Understandably, employee needs, values and their susceptibility to different types of motivation has also been subject to change over time which may or may not be due to the age of that individual. The researcher therefore felt it was both necessary and important to analyse age as a factor in one's level of motivation.

A one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to determine the significance of age as a factor in an employee's level of motivation. The research found that the relationship between age and motivation is not statistically significant, however one could argue that the value was approaching statistical significance and therefore a further investigation was required. This investigation involved performing a post-hoc analysis (using Tukey HSD) on the relationship between age and the five subscales of motivation, see *table 5.6* to determine their statistical significance.

The post-hoc analysis on intrinsic motivation identified a statistical significance between age group 1 (18-25) and age group three (41-60) with the latter being more intrinsically motivated. This finding specifically corresponds with the 'self-actualisation' needs proposed by Maslow (1943) in his seminal hierarchy of needs theory. Furthermore, upon application of this theory Oleson (2004) similarly discovered that the higher an employee climbs in the hierarchy, the more intrinsically motivated they become. Due to the nature of the hierarchy, it is reasonable to assume it would take an average employee several years to achieve the needs of 'self-actualisation' therefore supporting age group (41-60) statistical significance in being more intrinsically motivated.

As discussed in the literature review, introjected motivation is a recent discovery and therefore lacks the extensive research and analysis that the likes of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation have received (Burton et al., 2006). The results of the post-hoc analysis found introjected motivation to have no statistical significance across

the three different age groups, it could therefore be inferred that employees driven by their belief of "shoulds" to perform an activity is not determined by age (Deal et al., 2013). However, due to the current lack of research and measures surrounding introjected motivation as previously mentioned, it is difficult to accurately determine the significance of this finding and thus the researcher acknowledges that further investigation is required.

The extrinsic motivation subscale was approaching statistical significance ($p=.09$) according to the post-hoc analysis which determined that employees in age group 1 (18-25) are more extrinsically motivated than age group 2 (26-40) and age group 3 (41-60). From these results it is reasonable to infer that younger employees are more extrinsically motivated due to their inexperience and need for security (Maslow, 1943) as they begin their new careers. Furthermore, in comparison with the principals outlined in Deci and Ryan's (1985) self-determination theory, these results seem to resemble the premise of controlled motivation with employees in age group 1 (18-25) being more responsive to rewards or punishment in the pursuit for security and opportunity (Lydon et al., 2006).

Ke and Zhang (2010) conducted research on integrated motivation and discovered that employees who respond to integrated motivation do so because they determine an activity or task to be fulfilling and worthwhile. The post-hoc analysis interestingly found that there is a statistical significance between age group 1 (18-25) and age group 2 (26-40) with the latter being more responsive to integrated motivation. Furthermore, a statistical significance was also found between age group 1 (18-25) and age group 3 (41-60) with age group 3 being more receptive to integrated motivation. This finding suggests that personal values and beliefs are considered by employees to be more important the higher their age and would therefore be more responsive to autonomous motivation (Lydon et al., 2006). These results provide practical implications for managers since according to Ke and Zhang (2010) integrated motivation is responsible for having the largest positive impact on an employee's performance and should therefore be promoted.

Post-hoc analysis on identified motivation resulted in a statistical significance between age group 1 (18-25) and age group 3 (41-60) with employees of age group 3 being more responsive to identified motivation. This finding corresponds with the study conducted by Deal et al. (2013) who found employees in higher company positions and therefore in a higher age category, with more freedom and authority are more responsive to identified motivation. Furthermore, employees in age group 3 would therefore also be highly motivated by the constructs of autonomous motivation as proposed by the self-determination theory (Deci and Ryan, 1985).

The analysis and subsequent results derived from the post-hoc analysis offers practical implications for managers today, specifically with regard to motivational constructs and theories. The results of this research are testament to constructs and principals proposed by Maslow (1943) in his seminal hierarchy of needs theory and Deci and Ryan's (1985) self determination theory which according to this research are still relevant today. Furthermore, the results also provide managers with the practical implication that age is an identifier to the type of motivation an employee responds to and should therefore consider it a specific factor in determining the type of motivation that corresponds to individual employees to ensure the successful improvement of performance and job satisfaction (Risher, 2013).

6.3 Determining industry as a motivation factor

Regardless of industry, every employee is motivated in some way, shape or form, but determining exactly what factors motivate an individual has always been a difficult task for managers (Cerasoli et al., 2014). Several theories such as Herzberg's (1966) two-factor theory and Alderfer (1969) ERG theory have analysed employee motivation and claim that the factors they propose will enhance it and lead to performance enhancement and increased job satisfaction. However, upon analysis of the theories themselves, the researcher discovered a gap in the literature regarding the role an employee's industry may play in determining their level and form of motivation. Almost all of the motivation theories and practices

discussed in the literature review point to factors, principals and conditions as the answer to motivation and therefore performance and satisfaction. However, there is the possibility that perhaps the type of industry an employee is situated can have an impact on their level of motivation since according to Yu-chi (2011) finance industries for example are considered to be particularly stressful when compared to say I.T or hospitality industries.

To effectively determine the impact of industry on motivation a one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted on four distinct categories, representative of several common industries. The results from this analysis illustrated that there was not a statistically significant difference between the total motivation score and industry. Despite a type of industry having no influence over ones motivation, the researcher felt it was important to investigate and having done so it can now be eliminated as a factor in employee motivation.

6.4 Determining employment status as a motivation factor

As discussed in the literature review, there are numerous secondary elements or conditions that are necessary or at the very least beneficial to the implementation of employee motivation. As Risher (2013) suggested, managers need to understand that each employee responds to different motivational stimulus and should therefore be treated accordingly, however what is not mentioned in the literature is whether an individual's employment status is a determining factor. Furthermore, Deal et al. (2013) findings imply that employment status may be an important factor since introjected motivation is only common amongst permanent employees who are given promotional opportunities. The same opportunities would not be available to part-time employees which could render introjected motivation and possibly other types to be ineffective. Additionally, it is likely that individuals who are currently full-time students may also react differently to motivation stimulus.

A one-way between groups ANOVA was conducted to determine the affect employment status has on total motivation scores under three categories; Full-time

student, part-time employed and full-time employed. The findings of this analysis determined, similarly to industry, that there was not a statistically significant difference in level of total motivation scores for the three groups of employment status. This result is surprising considering it was found in *section 6.2* of this paper, that younger employees are motivated differently compared to older employees, leading one to assume that employment status would have had a similar result.

6.5 Maslow's hierarchy of needs in perspective

The various research and literature on the core academic area of motivation (as discussed in the literature review) has continually indicated that Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory is significant finding and one that remains largely relevant today. The research conducted in this paper serves as further evidence that the constructs and factors of motivating employees today are clearly still associated with the principals proposed by Maslow in 1943. However, to put the seminal hierarchy of needs theory in perspective, the researcher felt it was necessary to evaluate the theory in the context of this research by determining how it is applied to a work environment, its association with the age demographic and the life-cycle of an employee.

6.5.1 Application of hierarchy of needs theory

The application of Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory begins during the initial stages of an individual's employment since great emphasis is placed on both physiological and security needs. As this research paper discovered, individuals of a low age group (18-25) will be especially concerned of their own well-being by ensuring they have a stable and adequate income. During this period and through the application of Maslow's (1943) theory, managers will motivate these employees extrinsically (Cerasoli et al., 2014). Furthermore, according to Rouse (2004) managers must understand that it is not uncommon for employee needs to go unfulfilled, therefore to ensure continued successful application of the theory, managers efforts to motivate employees will have to be frequently adapted by using extrinsic and intrinsic techniques interchangeably as employees climb and descent the hierarchy of needs (Sadri and Bowen, 2011).

Effective interpersonal relations are a necessity when applying the hierarchy of needs theory to any work situation since according to Udechukwu (2009) higher level needs require more intrinsic elements such as acceptance and appreciation. Furthermore, managers must carefully evaluate difficult decisions since they could be detrimental to employee motivation and moral particularly if employees feel their jobs may be threatened (Cho and Perry, 2012).

As discussed in the *literature review*, Managers in the past have attempted with varying degrees of success to aggregate their employees motivation to ensure that each individual is motivated equally in an attempt to generate overall performance improvements In addition, Sadri and Bowen (2011) suggest that the key to applying Maslow's (1943) theory is to incorporate job enrichment programs, unique individual and team assignments as well as cross-training thus making work more fulfilling and rewarding to correspond with hierarchical needs. Finally, simple accolades such as bonuses, perks, meaningful job titles and awards can also be beneficial to the application of this seminal theory and successive improvement of employee motivation (O'Connor and Yballe, 2007).

6.5.2 Employee life-cycle and age demographic perspective

The research conducted by this paper and discussed in *section 6.2* established age to be an important demographic in determining one's type of motivation and was also found to specifically correspond to the hierarchy of needs theory. In terms of an employee's life-cycle, age being one factor, their level and form of motivation will alter in accordance with their level of needs (Oleson, 2004). It could be considered that an employee's life-cycle is representative of the hierarchy of needs since different stages of an individual's life will correspond to certain stages of the hierarchy. For instance, if an employee was to get married or acquire a mortgage it is highly likely they will be motivated by security needs regardless of age, position etc at that period in time (Poduska, 1992).

Despite employment status being insignificant to employee motivation as discussed in *section 6.4*, Maslow's (1943) theory would suggest otherwise with regard to employee needs and not specifically motivation. A part-time employee

will understandably have a different hierarchical level of needs compared to a full-time employee, however, as a part-time employee transitions to permanent positions in the future it is quite probable their needs and therefore motivation will alter accordingly to match that of a full-time employee (Oleson, 2004).

6.6 Most fundamental motivation theory

According to the findings of this research paper in conjunction with the literature discussed in the *literature review*, it has been determined that the most fundamental motivational theory to date is in actual fact a hybrid between the principals and constructs proposed by Maslow (1943) in his seminal hierarchy of needs theory and the techniques and initiatives put forward by Gallup (2015) in accordance with employee engagement.

A manager's main priority is his/her employees and how best to motivate them to greater performance and overall job satisfaction for both the benefit of the company and the well-being and retention of excellent staff (Sadri and Bowen, 2011). Difficult as it may seem, the ideal scenario of any workplace is to develop a working environment where employees inherently motivate themselves. Despite the complexity of such a scenario, it has been made possible as a result of the application of both Maslow's (1943) theory and Gallup's (2015) practice. As discussed in *section 6.5* and the *literature review*, the hierarchy of needs theory is a significant and superior model that has been highly influential in companies for decades, its five fundamental principals or "needs" are still relevant today and resonate with every individual employee in all spectrums of company hierarchies (Oleson, 2004). Furthermore, employee engagement has risen in recent years to be a substantial practice by instilling a shared vision and purpose in companies to enhance employee commitment, involvement and passion through the utilisation of behavioural and attitudinal factors (Wiley, 2010).

The implementation of this hybrid requires managers to apply the Gallup (2015) Q12 audit (*illustrated in figure 2.1*) to measure employees against 12 specific elements, this is to provide managers with crucial employee-related information so

that they can effectively implement training and enrichment programs as well as unique tasks targeted at fulfilling their hierarchical needs (Udechukwu, 2009). Furthermore, the age demographic of employees (as discussed in section 6.2) as well as the reasons surrounding why employees climb and decent the hierarchy will serve as determining factors (Poduska, 1992) for managers to understand and recognise at which periods to incorporate extrinsic or intrinsic incentives in accordance with employee engagement initiatives (Harter et al., 2002).

Due to the relevance of the hierarchy of needs theory (Maslow, 1943) today and the effectiveness of the practice of employee engagement (Gallup, 2015), the resulting hybrid of their combination is certain to bring managers the necessary tools and knowledge to successfully motivate employees in any industry to greater performance levels and enhance job satisfaction for the foreseeable future (Oleson, 2004).

Chapter 7 Conclusion

In today's modern business world managers have realised the importance of motivation in their workplace and thus strongly depend on the principals and constructs proposed in various seminal theories and practices believing them to be the solution towards improved employee performance and satisfaction (Sadri and Bowen, 2011). Hence, the premise of this research was to provide managers of all industries with a critical appraisal and comprehensive understanding of the ways in which the theories and practices that they have been accustomed to impact employee performance and job satisfaction. Furthermore, conducting primary research on three universal demographics; age, employment status and age would offer managers the most relevant observation of key factors that employee themselves believe will motivate them to greater performance levels and enhanced job satisfaction.

Upon critical analysis of numerous motivation-based literature surrounding these seminal theories it became apparent that although many offer some truth to their argument, the constructs or frameworks proposed by such theorists as McGregor (1960) and Alderfer (1969) were found to be impractical or inconclusive. Nevertheless, Herzberg's (1966) findings, although heavily criticised, have continued to serve managers by providing an unconventional way to view common workplace situations and predicaments and even offering some valued suggestions and ideas (Bitsch and Hogberg, 2005).

Conducting quantitative research yielded some rather surprising findings that are sure to provide implications for managers today. The most substantial finding of this research was found to be testament to the constructs and principals proposed by Maslow (1943) in that age was determined as a significant factor in ones motivation especially with regard to the intrinsic and extrinsic constructs. Surprisingly, both industry and employment status were found to have no statistically significance with ones level or type of motivation.

The research paper's findings in conjunction with the literature review has made it evident that Maslow's (1943) hierarchy of needs theory has stood the test of time, remaining a superior model of motivation in accordance with employee needs. Furthermore, the development of employee engagement by Gallup (2015) has offered managers substantial practices that can be effortlessly implemented to target and improve employee performance. Therefore, the most fundamental motivational theory and method for improving and enhancing employee performance and job satisfaction today is found to be a hybrid consisting of the principals and constructs proposed by Maslow (1943) and the techniques and initiatives put forward by Gallup (2015) in accordance with employee engagement.

The researcher proposes a future study to be conducted to explore and individualise the five types of motivation to address the various gaps in literature especially with regard to introjected, integrated and identified motivation as it would serve as an effective aid to managers in conjunction with the findings of this research paper.

References

- Adair, J. (2006) *Maslow and Herzberg*. 1st ed. London: Kogan Page Ltd.
- Aghili, S. (2011) 'Sampling Techniques'. *Internal Auditor*, 68(6): pp. 19-21.
- Alderfer, C.P. (1969). 'An Empirical Test of a New theory of Human Needs'. *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, 4: pp. 142-175.
- Arnolds, C. and Boshoff, C. (2002) 'Compensation, Esteem Valence and Job Performance: an Empirical Assessment of Alderfer's ERG theory'. *International Journal Of Human Resource Management*, 13(4): pp. 697-719.
- Assor, A., Vansteenkiste, M. and Kaplan, A. (2009) 'Identified Versus Introjected Approach and Introjected Avoidance Motivations in School and in Sports: The Limited Benefits of Self-Worth Strivings'. *Journal Of Educational Psychology*, 101(2): pp. 482-497.
- Bell, B., DiStefano, C. and Morgan, G. (2010) 'A Primer on Disseminating Applied Quantitative Research'. *Journal Of Early Intervention*, 32(5): pp. 370-383.
- Bell, K. (2013) 'Participants' Motivations and Co-construction of the Qualitative Research Process'. *Qualitative Social Work*, 12(4): pp. 523-539.
- Benabou, R. and Tirole, J. (2003) 'Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation'. *The Review of Economic Studies*, 70(244): pp. 489.
- Bertrand, J.W.M and Fransoo, J.C. (2002) 'Operations Management Research Methodologies Using Quantitative Modelling'. *International Journal of Operations & Production Management*, 22(2): pp.241-264.
- Bhuvanaiah, T. and Raya, R.P. (2014) 'Employee Engagement: Key to Organizational Success'. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, 11(4): pp. 61-71.
- Bitsch, V. and Hogberg, M. (2005) 'Exploring Horticultural Employees' Attitudes Toward Their Jobs: A Qualitative Analysis Based on Herzberg's Theory of Job Satisfaction'. *Journal of Agricultural and Applied Economics*, 37(3): pp. 659-671.

Burton, K., Lydon, J., D'Alessandro, D. and Koestner, R. (2006) 'The Differential Effects of Intrinsic and Identified Motivation on Well-Being and Performance: Prospective, Experimental, and Implicit Approaches to Self-Determination Theory'. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 91(4) pp. 750-762.

Burton, K., Lydon, J., D'Alessandro, D. and Koestner, R. (2006) 'The Differential Effects of Intrinsic and Identified Motivation on Well-being and Performance: Prospective, Experimental, and Implicit Approaches to Self-Determination Theory. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 91(4): pp. 750-762.

Carter, D. (2006) 'Great Thinkers: Frederick Herzberg (1923-2000)'. *Training Journal*, 1(1): pp. 64.

Caulton, J.R. (2012) 'The Development and Use of the Theory of ERG: A Literature Review'. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 5(1): pp. 2-8.

Cerasoli, C., Nicklin, J. and Ford, M (2014) 'Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Incentives Jointly Predict Performance: A 40-Year Meta-Analysis'. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4): pp. 980-1008.

Chang, W. and Yuan, S. (2008) 'A Synthesized Model of Markov Chain and ERG Theory for Behaviour Forecast in Collaborative Prototyping'. *Journal of Information Technology Theory and Application*, 9(2): pp. 45-63.

Chang, W. and Yuan, S. (2009) 'A Markov-Based Collaborative Pricing System for Information Goods Bundling'. *Expert Systems with Applications*, 36(2): pp. 1660-1674.

Chen, H.M. and Fu, P.C. (2011) 'Perceptions of Justice in Extrinsic Reward Patterns'. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 43(6): pp. 361-370.

Cho, E. and Kim, S. (2014) 'Cronbach's Coefficient Alpha: Well Known but Poorly Understood'. *Organizational Research Methods*, 18(2): pp. 207.

- Cho, Y.J. and Perry, J.L. (2012) 'Intrinsic Motivation and Employee Attitudes: Role of Managerial Trustworthiness, Goal Directedness, and Extrinsic Reward Expectancy'. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 32(4): pp. 382-406.
- Christian, M.S., Garza A.S. and Slaughter J.E. (2011) 'Work engagement: A Quantitative Review and Test of its Relations with Task and Contextual Performance'. *Personnel Psychology*, 64(1): pp. 89-136.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioural sciences*. 2nd ed. New Jersey: Erlbaum.
- Coule, T. (2013) 'Theories of Knowledge and Focus Groups in Organization and Management Research'. *Qualitative Research in Organizations and Management: An International Journal*, 8(2): pp. 148-162.
- Deal, J., Stawiski, S., Graves, L., Gentry, W., Weber, T. and Ruderman, M. (2013). 'Motivation at Work: Which Matters More, Generation or Managerial Level?'. *Consulting Psychology Journal: Practice And Research*, 65(1): pp. 1-16.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (1985) *Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Determination in Human Behaviour*. 1st ed. New York: Plenum.
- Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2008) 'Self-Determination Theory: A Macrotheory of Human Motivation, Development, and Health'. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3): pp. 182-185.
- DeVellis, R.F. (2003) *Scale development*. 1st ed. California: Sage.
- Dinibutun, S.R. (2012) 'Work Motivation: Theoretical Framework'. *GSTF Business Review (GBR)*, 1(4): pp. 133-139.
- Eack, S.M., Greeno, C.G. and Lee, B. (2006) 'Limitations of the Patient Health Questionnaire in Identifying Anxiety and Depression in Community Mental Health: Many Cases are Undetected'. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 16(6): pp. 325.

- Fox, J., Murray, C. and Warm, A. (2003) 'Conducting Research Using Web-Based Questionnaires: Practical, Methodological, and Ethical Considerations'. *International Journal Of Social Research Methodology*, 6(2): pp. 167-180.
- Fullan, M. (2011) 'Intrinsic Motivation'. *Leadership Excellence*, 28(12): pp. 6-7.
- Gagné, M. and Deci, E.L. (2005) 'Self-Determination Theory and Work Motivation'. *Journal of Organizational Behaviour*, 26(4): pp. 331-331.
- Gallup (2015) 'About Gallup' [Online]. *Gallup*. Available from: <http://www.gallup.com/corporate/177680/gallup.aspx> [Accessed 30th July 2015].
- Garn, A. and Jolly, J. (2014) 'High Ability Students' Voice on Learning Motivation'. *Journal Of Advanced Academics*, 25(1): pp. 7-24.
- Gerrish, K. (2011) 'Methodological Challenges in Qualitative Research'. *Nurse Researcher*, 19(1): pp. 4-5.
- Goebel, B. and Brown, D. (1981) 'Age Differences in Motivation Related to Maslow's Need Hierarchy'. *Developmental Psychology*, 17(6): pp. 809-815.
- Greene, R.J. (2011) *Rewarding performance: Guiding principles; custom strategies*. 1st ed. New York: Routledge.
- Guay, F., Vallerand, R.J. and Blanchard, C. (2000) 'On the Assessment of Situational Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: The Situational Motivation Scale (SIMS)". *Motivation and Emotion*, 24(3): pp. 175-213.
- Gürbüz, S., Şahin, F. and Köksal, O. (2014) 'Revisiting of Theory X and Y: A Multilevel Analysis of the Effects of Leaders' Managerial Assumptions on Followers' Attitudes'. *Management Decision*, 52(10): pp.1888-1906.
- Harter, J.K., Hayes, T.L. and Schmidt, F.L. (2002) ' Business-Unit-Level Relationship Between Employee Satisfaction, Employee Engagement, and Business Outcomes: A Meta-Analysis'. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2): pp. 268-279.

Hazelton, S. (2014) 'Positive Emotions Boost Employee Engagement'. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 22(1): pp. 34-37.

Herzberg, F. (1966) *The Motivation-Hygiene Theory*. 1st ed. New York: Work and the Nature of Man, World Publishing.

Hoe, J. and Hoare, Z. (2012) 'Understanding Quantitative Research: Part 1'. *Nursing Standard*, 27(15-17): pp. 52-57.

Ivey, J. (2012) 'The Value of Qualitative Research Methods'. *Paediatric Nursing*, 38(6): p. 319.

Jankowicz, A.D. (2005) *Business Research Projects*. 4th ed. London: Thomson Learning.

Jones, N.B. and Lloyd, G.C. (2005) 'Does Herzberg's Motivation Theory Have Staying Power?'. *Journal of Management Development*, 24(10): pp.929-943.

Ke, W. and Zhang, P. (2010) 'The Effects of Extrinsic Motivations and Satisfaction in Open Source Software Development'. *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 11(12): pp. 784-808.

Khan, S.N. (2014) 'Qualitative Research Method: Grounded Theory'. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 9(11): pp. 224-233.

Kirk-Smith, M. (1998) 'Psychological Issues in Questionnaire-Based Research'. *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 40(3): pp. 223-236.

Ko, Y.J., Rhee, Y.C., Walker, M. and Lee, J. (2014) 'What Motivates Donors to Athletic Programs: a New Model of Donor Behaviour'. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(3): pp. 523-546.

Koltko-Rivera, M.E. (2006) 'Rediscovering the Later Version of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: Self-Transcendence and Opportunities for Theory, Research, and Unification'. *Review Of General Psychology*, 10(4): pp. 302-317.

Kopelman, R.E., Prottas, D.J. and Davis, A.L. (2008) 'Douglas McGregor's Theory X and Y: Toward a Construct-valid Measure'. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 20(2): pp. 255-271,159-160.

Kopelman, R.E., Prottas, D.J. and Falk, D.W. (2010) 'Construct Validation of a Theory X/Y Behaviour Scale'. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 31(2): pp.120-135.

Kopelman, R.E., Prottas, D.J. and Falk, D.W. (2012) 'Further Development of a Measure of Theory X and Y Managerial Assumptions'. *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 24(4): pp. 450-470.

Lawler E.E. (2012) 'An Idiot's Guide to Employee Engagement' [Online]. *Forbes*. Available from: <http://www.forbes.com/sites/edwardlawler/2012/11/08/an-idiots-guide-to-employee-engagement/> [Accessed 31st July 2015].

Lerner, A. (2011) 'McGregor's Legacy: Thoughts on What He Left, What Transpired, and What Remains to Pursue'. *Journal of Management History*, 17(2): pp. 217-237.

Li, Y., Wei, F., Ren, S. and Di, Y. (2015) 'Locus of Control, Psychological Empowerment and Intrinsic Motivation Relation to Performance'. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(4): pp.422-438.

LinkedIn (2015) 'Professional Network' [Online]. *LinkedIn*. Available from: <https://ie.linkedin.com/> [Accessed 15th August 2015].

Locke, E.A. and Latham, G.P. (2004) 'What Should we do About Motivation Theory? Six Recommendations for the Twenty-First Century'. *Academy of Management Review*, 29: 388-403.

Lyons, R.G. (2007) 'Towards a Theory of Work Satisfaction: An Examination of Karl Marx and Frederick Herzberg'. *Journal Of Thought*, 42(3/4): pp. 105-113.

Macey, W. and Schneider, B. (2008) 'The Meaning of Employee Engagement'. *Industrial & Organizational Psychology*, 1(1): pp. 3-30.

- Mafini, C. and Dlodlo, N. (2014) The Relationship Between Extrinsic Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Life Satisfaction Amongst Employees in a Public Organisation. *SA Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1): pp. 1-13.
- Maslow, A.H. (1943) 'A theory of human motivation'. *Psychological Review*, 50(4): pp. 370–396.
- McGregor, D. (1960) *The Human Side of Enterprise*. 1st ed. New York: McGraw-Hill.
- McLachlan, S. (2011) 'The Development of a Scale Measuring Integrated Regulation in Exercise'. *British Journal Of Health Psychology*, 16(4): pp. 722-743.
- Millar, G. (2012) 'Employee Engagement – a New Paradigm'. *Human Resource Management International Digest*, 20(2): pp.3-5.
- Miller, V.D., Poole, M.S., Seibold, D.R., Myers, K.K., Park, H.S., Monge, P., Fulk, J., Frank, L.B., Margolin, D.B., Schultz, C.M., Shen, C., Weber, M., Lee, S. and Shumate, M. (2011) 'Advancing Research in Organizational Communication Through Quantitative Methodology'. *Management Communication Quarterly*, 25(1): pp. 4-58.
- Mirabela-Constanta, M. and Maria-Madela, A. (2011) 'Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation. An Investigation of Performance Correlation on Students'. *Economic Science Series*, 20(1): pp. 671-677.
- Moran, C., Diefendorff, J., Kim, T. and Liu, Z. (2012) 'Motivation Measure'. *Journal of Vocational Behaviour*, 81(3).
- Muqtadir, A., Haque, M. and Anam, S. (2012) 'Faculty Motivation: A Qualitative Inquest'. *International Journal of Business and Commerce*, 1(11): pp. 64-80.
- Newman, D.A. and Harrison D.A. (2008) 'Been there, bottled that: Are state and behavioural work engagement new and useful construct 'wines'?'. *Industrial and Organisational Psychology: Perspectives on Science and Practice*, 1(1): pp. 31-35.

- Nolan, S. (2011) 'Employee Engagement'. *Strategic HR Review*, 10(3): pp. 3-4.
- O'Connor, D. and Yballe, L. (2007) 'Maslow Revisited: Constructing a Road Map of Human Nature'. *Journal of Management Education*, 31(6): pp. 738-756.
- O'Donnell, E. and Brown, S. (2012) 'Brand Community Loyalty: A Self Determination Theory Perspective'. *Academy of Marketing Studies Journal*, 16(2): pp. 107-118.
- Oleson, M. (2004) 'Exploring the Relationship Between Money Attitudes and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs'. *International Journal Of Consumer Studies*, 28(1): pp. 83-92.
- Ong, C., Chang, S. and Lee, S. (2013) 'Website Satisfaction Dimensions: Factors Between Satisfaction and Dissatisfaction'. *Information Development*, 29(4): pp. 299-308.
- Oostlander, J., Güntert, S.T., van Schie, S. and Wehner, T. (2014) 'Leadership and Volunteer Motivation: a Study Using Self-Determination Theory'. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 43(5): pp. 869-889.
- O'Shea, D., Monaghan, S. and Ritchie, T.D. (2014) 'Early Career Attitudes and Satisfaction During Recession'. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 29(3): pp. 226-245.
- Ozguner, Z. and Ozguner, M. (2014) 'A Managerial Point of View on the Relationship Between Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs and Herzberg's Dual Factor Theory'. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 5(7).
- Panagopoulos, C. (2013) 'Extrinsic Rewards, Intrinsic Motivation and Voting'. *Journal Of Politics*, 75(1): pp. 266-280.
- Park, S.M. and Word, J., (2012) 'Driven to Service: Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation for Public and Non-profit Managers'. *Public Personnel Management*, 41(4): pp. 705-734.

- Pate, L.E. (1987) 'Understanding Human Behaviour'. *Management Decision*, 25(6): pp. 58-64.
- Pfeffer, J. and Sutton, R. (2006) 'Evidence-Based Management'. *Harvard Business Review*, 84(1): pp. 62-74.
- Poduska, B. (1992) 'Money, Marriage, and Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs'. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 35(6): pp. 756-770.
- Qu, S.Q. and Dumay, J. (2011) 'The Qualitative Research Interview'. *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, 8(3): pp. 238-264.
- Risher, H. (2013) 'It's Not That Simple: Extrinsic Versus Intrinsic Rewards'. *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 45(1): pp. 3-6.
- Rossiter, A.P. (2009) 'Why We Work: Maslow on the Job'. *Chemical Engineering Progress*, 105(2): pp. 60.
- Rouse, G.K.A. (2004) 'Beyond Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: What Do People Strive for?'. *Performance Improvement*, 43(10): pp. 27-31.
- Russ, T.L. (2013) 'The Relationship Between Theory X/Y: Assumptions and Communication Apprehension'. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 34(3): pp. 238-249.
- Sachau, D.A. (2007) 'Resurrecting the Motivation-Hygiene Theory: Herzberg and the Positive Psychology Movement'. *Human Resource Development Review*, 6(4): pp. 377-393.
- Sadri, G. and Bowen, R.C. (2011) 'Meeting Employee Requirements: Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs is Still a Reliable Guide to Motivating Staff'. *Industrial Engineer*, 43(10): pp. 44-48.
- Schillewaert, N., Langerak, F. & Duhamel, T. (1998) 'Non-Probability Sampling for WWW Surveys: A Comparison of Methods'. *Journal of the Market Research Society*, 40(4): pp. 307-322.

Schwartz, B. (2000) 'Self-Determination: The Tyranny of Freedom'. *American Psychologist*, 55(1): pp. 79-88.

Sengupta, S.S. (2011) 'Growth in Human Motivation: Beyond Maslow'. *Indian Journal Of Industrial Relations*, 47(1): pp. 102-116.

Shaw, I. (2012) 'The Positive Contributions of Quantitative Methodology to Social Work Research: A View From the Sidelines'. *Research on Social Work Practice*, 22(2): pp. 129-134.

Sheldon, K. and Schüler, J. (2011) 'Wanting, Having, and Needing: Integrating Motive Disposition Theory and Self-Determination Theory'. *Journal Of Personality And Social Psychology*, 101(5): pp. 1106-1123.

Sogunro, O.A. (2002) 'Selecting a Quantitative or Qualitative Research Methodology: An Experience'. *Educational Research Quarterly*, 26(1): p. 3.

Sorensen, P.F. and Minahan, M. (2011) 'McGregor's Legacy: the Evolution and Current Application of Theory Y Management'. *Journal of Management History*, 17(2): pp. 178-192.

Soydas, Y. and Aleti, T. (2015) 'Immigrant and Second-Generation Turkish Entrepreneurs in Melbourne Australia: A Qualitative Investigation of Entrepreneurial Motivations'. *International Journal of Entrepreneurial Behaviour & Research*, 21(2): pp. 154-174.

Standage, M.N. (2005) 'A Test of Self-Determination Theory in School Physical Education'. *British Journal Of Educational Psychology*, 75(3) pp. 411-433.

Steel, P. and König, C. (2006) 'Integrating Theories of Motivation'. *Academy Of Management Review*, 31(4): pp. 889-913.

Strategic Direction (2015) 'Increasing Employee Engagement: The Role of Interpersonal Leadership'. *Strategic Direction*, 31(2): pp. 34.

SurveyMonkey (2015) 'How it Works' [Online]. *SurveyMonkey*. Available from: https://www.surveymonkey.com/mp/take-a-tour/?ut_source=header [Accessed 13th August 2015].

Tacq, J. (2011) 'Causality in Qualitative and Quantitative Research'. *Quality and Quantity*, 45(2): pp. 263-291.

Twitter (2015) 'Welcome to Twitter' [Online]. *Twitter*. Available from: <https://twitter.com/?lang=en> [Accessed 15th August 2015].

Udechukwu, I.I. (2009) 'Correctional Officer Turnover: Of Maslow's Needs Hierarchy and Herzberg's Motivation Theory'. *Public Personnel Management*, 38(2): pp. 69-82.

Vallerand, R., Pelletier, L. and Koestner, R. (2008) 'Reflections on Self-Determination Theory'. *Canadian Psychology/Psychologie Canadienne*, 49(3): pp. 257-262.

Wallace, L. and Trinkka, J. (2009) 'Leadership and Employee Engagement'. *Public Management*, 91(5) pp. 10-13.

Warner, W.B. (2011) 'On the Legacy of Theory Y'. *Journal of Management History*, 17(2): pp.193-201.

Wiley, J. (2010) 'Employee engagement'. *Human Resources*, 1(1): pp. 29-32.

Williams, A. and Manias, E. (2014) 'Exploring Motivation and Confidence in Taking Prescribed Medicines in Coexisting Diseases: a Qualitative Study'. *Journal Of Clinical Nursing*, 23(3/4): pp. 471-481.

Wilson, P.M., Mack, D.E. and Grattan, K.P. (2008) 'Understanding Motivation for Exercise: A Self-Determination Theory Perspective'. *Canadian Psychology*, 49(3): pp. 250-256.

Xu, M., Ong, V., Duan, Y. and Mathews, B. (2011) 'Intelligent Agent Systems for Executive Information Scanning, Filtering and Interpretation: Perceptions and Challenges'. *Information Processing and Management*, 47(2): pp. 186-201.

Yang, C., Hwang, M. and Chen, Y. (2011) 'An Empirical Study of the Existence, Relatedness and Growth (ERG) Theory in Consumer's Selection of Mobile Value-Added Services'. *African Journal of Business Management*, 5(19): pp. 7885-7898.

Yu-Chi, W. (2011) 'Job Stress and Job Performance Among Employees in the Taiwanese Finance Sector: the Role of Emotional Intelligence'. *Social Behaviour & Personality: An International Journal*, 39(1): pp. 21-31.

Appendices

Appendix A

Motivation

What is your age?

Employment Status

Which Industry did/do you work in?

Next

Powered by
SurveyMonkey

(SurveyMonkey, 2015)

Appendix B

Why are you motivated to do your work? (If not currently employed, please answer based on your previous employment)	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Agree	Strongly Agree
Because the work is fun	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I would feel ashamed if I did poorly.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because someone requested me to do it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because my work is a big part of who I am.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I believe my work is valuable.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I find the work interesting.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I would feel guilty if I did not do well.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I get paid to do it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because my work goals and personal goals are integrated.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I value the work.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I find the work engaging.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because I would feel bad about myself if I did not do a good job.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because the situation demands it.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because my work helps to define me.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>
Because my work is important.	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>	<input type="radio"/>

(SurveyMonkey, 2015)