

# Impact of Competing Force of Motivational Factors on Employees at Work Place

Dr. Annapurna Gupta<sup>1\*</sup> Tarun Tayal<sup>2</sup>

1. Department of Humanities, Anand Engineering College Agra, Uttar Pradesh (India)
2. Research Scholar Singhanian University - Jhunjhunu

\* E-mail of the corresponding author: [dragupta77@gmail.com](mailto:dragupta77@gmail.com)

## Abstract

The present research was conducted to ascertain the competing force of push and pull factors on employee motivation. This study is an assessment of this purpose used deductive approach in which a qualitative survey was carried out among engineers of North India. The survey was intended to get their responses on what they feel is (are) the best factors that could motivate them in a list of 10 push and 13 pull factors. In this light the study sets to identify the most ranked factors for motivation. The analysis from the empirical findings show that need of position and power and need of security were the most push ranked factors and interest and position or power were the most pull ranked factors for male engineers. While, the need of security and achievement were the most push ranked factors and working conditions and appreciation by management were the most pull ranked factors by female engineers.

**Keywords:** Pull, Push, Motivation, Competing Force, Employee.

## Introduction

Among the problems facing organizations today is how to motivate employees to work more productively and to increase their feelings of satisfaction, involvement and commitment. At one time, employees were considered just another input into the production of goods and services. What perhaps changed this way of thinking about employees was research, referred to as the Hawthorne studies conducted by George Elton Mayo from 1924 – 1932 (Dickson, 1973). The study found employees are not motivated solely by money and employee behaviour is linked to their attitudes (Dickson, 1973). The Hawthorne studies began the human relations approach to management, whereby the needs and motivation of employees become the primary focus of managers (Bedeian, 1993). Understanding what motivated employees and how they were motivated was the focus of many researchers following the publication of the Hawthorne Study results (Terpstra, 1979). Five major approaches that have led to our understanding of motivation are Maslow's need-hierarchy theory, Herzberg's two-factor theory, Vroom's expectancy theory, Adams' equity theory, and Skinner's reinforcement theory.

According to Maslow, employees have five levels of needs (Maslow, 1943): physiological, safety, social, ego, and self-actualizing. Maslow argued that lower level needs had to be satisfied before the next higher level need would motivate employees. Herzberg's work categorized motivation into two factors: motivators and hygiene (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959). Motivator or intrinsic factors, such as achievement and recognition, produce job satisfaction. Hygiene or extrinsic factors, such as pay and job security, produce job dissatisfaction.

Vroom's theory is based on the belief that employee effort will lead to performance and performance will lead to rewards (Vroom, 1964). Rewards may be either positive or negative. The more positive the reward the more likely the employee will be highly motivated. Conversely, the more negative the reward the less likely the employee will be motivated.

Adams' theory states that employees strive for equity between themselves and other workers. Equity is achieved when the ratio of employee outcomes over inputs is equal to other employee outcomes over inputs (Adams, 1965).

Skinner's theory simply states those employees' behaviors that lead to positive outcomes will be repeated and behaviors that lead to negative outcomes will not be repeated (Skinner, 1953). Managers should positively reinforce employee behaviors that lead to positive outcomes. Managers should negatively reinforce employee behavior that leads to negative outcomes.

## Motivation Defined:

Many contemporary authors have also defined the concept of motivation. Motivation has been defined as: the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction (Kreitner, 1995); a predisposition to behave in a purposive manner to achieve specific, unmet needs (Buford, Bedeian, & Lindner, 1995); an internal drive to satisfy

an unsatisfied need (Higgins, 1994); and the will to achieve (Bedeian, 1993). For this paper, motivation is operationally defined as the inner force that drives individuals to accomplish personal and organizational goals.

Why do we need motivated employees? The answer is survival (Smith, 1994). Motivated employees are needed in our rapidly changing workplaces. Motivated employees help organizations survive. Motivated employees are more productive. To be effective, managers need to understand what motivates employees within the context of the roles they perform. Of all the functions a manager performs, motivating employees is arguably the most complex. This is due, in part, to the fact that what motivates employees changes constantly (Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1991). For example, research suggests that as employees' income increases, money becomes less of a motivator (Kovach, 1987). Also, as employees get older, interesting work becomes more of a motivator. Numerous studies have been conducted on employees motivation. Review of literature has highlighted the role of some significant factors for motivation such as Hersey & Blanchard (1969), study of industrial employees, ranked: (1) full appreciation of work done, (2) feeling of being (3) sympathetic help with personal problems, (4) job security (5) Good wages/salaries as the five top motivational factors out of ten factors.

Kovach further reported that by 1986 the ranking had changed further and the top five ranked motivational factors were (1) interesting work (2) full appreciation of work done (3) feeling of being (recognition) (4) job security (5) good wages/salary.

In a survey by Wiley (1997) in which approximately 550 questionnaires were administered to persons employed in different industries and divided into 5 subgroups namely (employment status, gender, age, income levels and occupation). The survey concluded the following collective rank by respondent's (1) Good wages (2) full appreciation of work (3) job security (4) promotions/expectations and (5) Interesting work.

The ranked order of motivational factors according to a survey of extension workers by Lindner (1998) found the following ranking of five out of the ten motivational factors. (1) Interesting work (2) good wages/salary (3) recognition (4) job security (5) good working conditions.

It can be observed that Hampaz (1990) ranked Job satisfaction as the most important motivational factor at that time among industrial workers

Interesting work was also ranked 5th by one of the earliest employee surveys (Hersey & Blanchard 1969) as well as the 1946, 1997 results in Wiley. Wiley (1997) and Analoni (2000) all ranked good wages as the most important motivational factor, while it was ranked second by Lindner (1998) and Hampaz (1990). Hersey and Blanchard (1969) ranked promotions/expectations in 7th place. While Kovach (1987), Wiley (1997), Lindner (1998), all ranked this same factor in the 6th, 4th and 5th places respectively. On average, this factor was ranked 6th between 1946 and 1992 as reported in Wiley (1997). Recognition or full appreciation of work done in the study by Herzberg (1987) and Wiley (1990) was ranked 2nd, by Hersey & Blanchard (1969) as one of the most important motivational factor with a rank of 1st and 3rd by Lindner (1998). Further more, the results reported in Wiley (1997) indicated that this factor was ranked 1st in 1946 and consistently ranked 2nd between 1980 and 1992.

Wiley (1997) concluded that, women placed greater importance on appreciation of work done, interesting work and more importance on good working conditions, whereas, males on the other hand placed more emphasis on interesting work.

Harpaz (1990) comparison of the different age groups (30 years and under, 31-50, and over 50) showed that Job satisfaction was the most salient goal across all age groups, followed by good pay. However, good pay was generally less important for manager but more important for employees of all ages.

Kovach (1997) considering four ages (30 and under, 31-40, 41-50 and 50 and above) concluded that the 30 and under group choose good wages, job security, promotion/expectation as their first three choices.

### **The push and pull of motivation:**

In Hugh Loftings delightful book the story of Dr. Doolittle, a shy affectionate animal called pushme and pullu turns up. The pushme and pullu has heads at both ends so it can eat with one and talk with the other and always know where it is going and why. When it comes to motivation, human beings are a bit like the pushme and pullu some social and biological based need motivates such as hunger and thirst push us. If, you go long without food and water your body will motivate you to seek them. Other motives Pull us; they involved money, fame, powers that draw us toward a goal. Like the pushme and pullu, human beings are often pushed and pulled by competing force. Different needs are the intrinsic push factors to get moving and stay moving to the employee at workplace.

Pullers are the extrinsic attracters that pull a employee for hard work, to take high risk, challenges, to set new target, to develop innovative ideas and creativity, take responsibilities and accountabilities and able to cross all obstacles at work place.

Pusher (needs) creates intrinsic force and puller creates extrinsic force for motivation of employee. Thus motivation is the result of competing force of push and pull factors.

### **Purpose of the Study:**

The purpose of this study was to describe the importance of certain competing force of push and pull factors on employee motivation at the work place in North India. Specifically, the study sought to describe the ranked importance of the following 10 pushing factors in which ten different needs are included : (1) Need of achievement, (2) Need of position and power, (3) Need of self actualization, (4) Need of security, (5) Need of social status, (6) Need of self Esteem, (7) Need of creativity, (8) Need of competition, (9) Fundamental needs, (10) Luxurious needs and 13 pulling factors are included (1) Money, (2) Appreciation and reward by management, (3) Security, (4) Prestige or fame of the organization, (5) Position, (6) Power, (7) Advancement, (8) Interest, (9) Recognition, (10) Good infrastructure, (11) Work simplification, (12) Working conditions, (13) Behaviour of co-workers and management among male and female engineers of 25 – 45 yrs age groups. The secondary purpose of the study was to understand or to help the employees that how employee can be motivated at workplace.

### **Research Methodology:**

The research design for this study employed descriptive survey method. The target population of this study included 400 male and female engineers 25 – 45 yrs age group. The sample size comprises all 200 male and 200 female engineers of the target population. The centre of the research is in North India.

### **Data Collection:**

The study based on primary data. With the review of literature, a survey questionnaire was developed to collect primary data from the respondent, for the study. The questionnaire asked participants to rank the importance of these factors that motivated them at workplace. The most important factor was to be ranked 5 and the least important factor was to be ranked 1. All factors to be ranked and no rank could be used more than once. The participants assured of confidentiality, anonymity and secrecy of the information given by them.

### **Result Analysis:**

The figure below present the collective rank order of the 10 push factors (need) and 13 pull factors according to how important each is in influencing the respondents.

**Notes:** Column A – Shows the sum of the ranking given to each factor by the total respondents, the smaller the sum of the total rank, the lower the factor was ranked as a motivational factor. Column B – Shows the number of times respondents ranked the factors most important, Column C – shows the percentage of respondents who ranked a particular factor as most important (5)

Hence it could be seen from the table 1, that column C is a derivation from column B this explain why if we count from the excel sheet how many times the number 5 appears on each questionnaire from the total participants and get the corresponding result for each factor. Then make a summation of this total and divide the corresponding result above that summation multiplied by 100 gives the percentage in column C.

From the analysis of data in male engineers' category, 18.88% or total of 170 of the 200 participants, as shown in table-1 ranked - need of position and power as the most important push motivational factor. In fact, it was the most popular number one motivational factor. The remaining 81.12% was shared among the 9 other factors. While 4.44% ranked possibilities in need of self actualization occupying the 10th position as the least important motivational factor. The second highest push ranked factor was security representing 14.44% of the total respondents, followed by need of achievement 11.66% and need of self prestige 10.00% respectively.

While in female engineers' category, most important push ranked factor need of security 15.20% or total of 858 of 200 participants. Remaining 84.80 was shared among the 9 other factors. While 5.26% ranked possibilities in luxurious needs and self achievement need in occupying the 9th position as the least important motivational factors. The second highest push ranked factor was need of achievement representing 14.61% of the total respondents, followed by 12.28% need of self prestige and need of competition 11.11% respectively.

As shown in table 2 the most important pull ranked factors in male category interest occupying 14.97% total of 856 of 200 respondents. Remaining 86.3% was carried among the 9 other factors. While 3.74 ranked recognition and working conditions placing 9th position as the least important motivational factors. The second highest pull ranked factor was position representing 13.36% of the total respondents, followed by power 10.69% and 10.16% security respectively.

Under female category, the most important pull ranked factor working conditions 13.08% or total score of 872 of 200 respondents. Remaining 86.92% was shared among the 9 other factors. While 4.18% ranked recognition occupying 10th position as the least important motivational factor. The second highest pull ranked factor was appreciation and reward by management representing 10.99% of the total respondents followed by interest 9.94%

and advancement and work simplification 8.37% respectively.

### **Interpretation and Discussion:**

Different needs are the intrinsic push factors to get moving and stay moving to the employee at work place. Pushers' need creates intrinsic force in employee to achieve the goal.

The ranked order of pushing factors (needs) in male engineers were founded : (1) Need of position and power, (2) Need of security, (3) Need of achievement, (4) Need of self Esteem, (5) Need of competition, (6) Need to live luxurious life, (7) Need of social Status, (8) Fundamental need, (9) Need of creativity, (10) Need of self actualization.

Therefore, the hierarchy of needs in female engineers were founded as : (1) Need of achievement, (2) Need of security, (3) Need of competition (4) Need of self prestige, (5) Need of social prestige, and Need of creativity, (6) Fundamental needs, (7) Needs of position, (8) Luxurious life, (9) Need of self actualization.

The ranked order of pulling factors which attracts male engineers to set new target, to take high risk and challenges or to cross all hurdles at workplace 5 most ranked factors out of 13 factors were: (1) interest, (2) position, (3) security, (4) power and (5) advancement. Hence, among the female engineers the most ranked pullers were (1) working conditions, (2) security, (3) interest, (4) advancement and (5) position.

A comparison of these results to Maslow's need-hierarchy theory provides some interesting insight in to employee motivation. The number one ranked pushers' need of position and power is a self actualizing factor. The number two ranked pushing motivators of security is a safety factor. The number three ranked need of achievement is also a self actualization factor the number four ranked motivation self prestige is an esteem factor. Therefore, the number one ranked pulling factor by male engineers' interest and position and power is also self actualization factor. Thus it is obvious that the male engineer are pushing by the position and power and also pulling by the same interest and position and power at workplace. In future they can be motivation with the position and power. The number three ranked puller is security the number two pushers in security needs. Thus it is obvious that male engineers can be motivated by to fulfill security needs. Number four pusher is self esteem, it is also fulfill by position and power.

Hence, the number one rank puller by the female engineers is working conditions second puller is appreciation by management and job security.

### **Conclusion:**

Thus it is obvious that motivation is a result of the competing forces of pulls and push factors. So if the organization wishes to motivate their employees they must be focus on the push factor first, then they can pull them by creating environment accordingly.

Therefore, according to Maslow (1993) if organization wish to address the most important motivational factors; physiological, safety, social and self esteem needs must first be fulfill. If organization wishes to address second most important motivational factors employees' interest, security, good working conditions. Position power, advancement, appreciation, good behaviour would suffice.

Contrary to what Maslow theory suggests the range of motivational factors are mixed in this study. Maslow conclusion that lower level motivational factors must be meeting before ascending to the next level were not confirm by this study.

### **References:**

- Allan Byman and Robert G. Bmguess (1999) "Qualitative research" Pretence Hall pp 89-94.
- Carole Wade and Carole Tavis Third Edition(1993) "psychology" Harper Collins College,publishers.
- Duane P Shultz, Sydeny Ellen Shultz Eight Edition, Psychology and Work today Dorling Kindersley publishing Inc.
- Greenberg J &Baron A.R (2003) "Behaviour in Organisations", Prentice Hall, Vol. 8, pp.188-215
- Herberg, F. Mausner, B & Snyderman, B. (1969) " The motivation to work", John Wiley and Sons, New York.
- Kanungo, R.N. (1990) "Work alienation in developing Countries: Western Models and Eastern realities", In A.M. Jaeger & R.N. Kunungo (Eds.), Management in developing Countries. Routledge, London, pp.195-209.
- Sekaran Uma (2002) "Research Methods for Business", Vol.4, pp. 197-199.
- Nelson, B. (2001), "Motivate employees with intangible benefits", Available at: <http://www.findarticles.com>.
- Young, B.C. (2000), "Methods of Motivating: Yesterday and Today" Available at:Harpaz,
- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press
- Antomioni, D. (1999), "What motivates middle managers"? Industrial Management, Nov,- Dec, Vol. 41, No 6, pp.

27-30.

Bedeian, A. G. (1993). *Management* (3rd ed.). New York: Dryden Press.

Bowen, B. E., & Radhakrishna, R. B. (1991). Job satisfaction of agricultural education faculty: A constant phenomena. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 32 (2). 16-22.

Buford, J. A., Jr., Bedeian, A. G., & Lindner, J. R. (1995). *Management in Extension* (3rd ed.). Columbus, Ohio: Ohio State University Extension.

Buford, J. A., Jr. (1990). Extension management in the information age. *Journal of Extension*, 28 (1).

Buford, J. A., Jr. (1993). Be your own boss. *Journal of Extension*, 31 (1).

Dickson, W. J. (1973). Hawthorne experiments. In C. Heyel (ed.), *The encyclopedia of management*, 2nd ed. (pp. 298-302). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.

Harpaz, I. (1990). The importance of work goals: an international perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21. 75-93

-Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, N.J, pp.34-35

Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1996) "Management of Organisational behaviour", Prentice

Higgins, J. M. (1994). *The management challenge* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.

Kovach, K. A. (1987). What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Business Horizons*, 30. 58-65.

Kreitner, R. (1995). *Management* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.

Linder, J.R, (1998), "Understanding employ motivation", *Journal of extention*, June, Vol.No3, PP.58-65.

Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, July 1943. 370-396.

Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Free Press.

Smith, G. P. (1994). Motivation. In W. Tracey (ed.), *Human resources management and development handbook* (2nd ed.).

Smith, K. L. (1990). The future of leaders in Extension. *Journal of Extension*, 28 (1).

Terpstra, D. E. (1979). Theories of motivation: borrowing the best. *Personnel Journal*, 58. 376.

Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.

Wiley, C. (1997) "What motivates employees according to over 40 years of Motivation surveys. *International Journal of Mnapower*, Vol. 18, No3, pp. 264-280

**Dr. Annapurna Gupta** is an Asst. professor in Department of Humanities at Anand Engineering college, Agra, India. She presented her research at several National and International conferences, seminars and workshop on Psychological issues. She has spent his 10 years in teaching Psychology at graduation and post graduation level. Now she is teaching B. tech courses with expertise of industrial Psychology.

**Tarun K. Tayal** is an Asst. Professor in Department of Management Studies at Anand Engg. College, Agra, India. He presented his research at several Nationals and International Conferences, Seminar and Workshops on management issues. He has spent 10 yrs. with corporate sector at regional level with India's leading business houses as Raymond Ltd. Digjam Woolen Mills and Glaxo India Ltd etc. Now He is teaching MBA and B. Tech. Courses with expertise of International Business and Economics. He worked on various University assignment in India.- As Uttarakhand Tech. University Dehradun, G. B. Tech. University Lucknow, HNB Garwal University Srinagar and Mahamaya Tech. University Greater Noida, India.

Table 1: Collective rank order of pushing factors according to respondents.

No.	Factor	Male			Female		
		A	B	C	A	B	C
1	Need of achievement	1044	105	11.66%	1036	125	14.61%
2	Need of position and power	1080	170	18.88%	802	65	7.60%
3	Need of self actualization	624	40	4.44%	622	45	5.26%
4	Need of security	1060	130	14.44%	858	130	15.20%
5	Need of social status	648	70	7.77%	650	90	10.52%
6	Need of self esteem	914	90	10.00%	424	105	12.28%
7	Need of creativity	658	65	7.22%	612	90	10.52%
8	Need of competition	820	75	8.33%	436	95	11.11%
9	Fundamental needs	704	80	8.88%	318	65	7.60%
10	Luxurious needs	876	75	8.33%	458	45	5.26%

Table 2: Collective rank order of pulling factors according to respondents.

No.	Factor	Male			Female		
		A	B	C	A	B	C
1	Money	574	40	4.27%	540	65	6.80%
2	Appreciation or reward	458	55	5.88%	744	105	10.99%
3	Security	604	95	10.16%	436	40	4.18%
4	Prestige or fame of the organization	560	60	6.41%	404	45	4.71%
5	Position	784	125	13.36%	600	75	7.85%
6	Power	636	100	10.69%	440	65	6.80%
7	Advancement	602	90	9.62%	480	80	8.37%
8	Interest	856	140	14.97%	704	95	9.94%
9	Recognition	758	35	3.74%	842	40	4.18%
10	Good Infrastructure	642	75	8.02%	729	75	7.85%
11	Work simplification	229	45	4.81%	621	80	8.37%
12	Working conditions	408	35	3.74%	872	125	13.08%
13	Behaviour of co-workers and management	424	40	4.27%	180	65	6.80%