A STUDY OF DIFFERENCE IN PREFERENCE FOR MOTIVATION FACTORS AMONG EMPLOYEES WORKING IN THAI EPOXY AND ALLIED PRODUCTS COMPANY LTD.

By

PRIYA. OBEROI

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Business Administration

Graduate School of Business
Assumption University
Bangkok, Thailand

April 2005
A STUDY OF DIFFERENCE IN PREFERENCE FOR MOTIVATION FACTORS AMONG EMPLOYEES WORKING IN THAI EPOXY AND ALLIED PRODUCTS COMPANY LTD.

By

PRIYA OBEROI

A Thesis submitted in partial fulfillment of the requirement for the degree of

Master of Business Administration

Examination Committee:

1. Dr. Navin Mathur (Advisor)
2. Dr. Patricia Arttachariya (Member)
3. Dr. Ismail Ali Said (Member)
4. Dr. Sirion Chaipoopirutana (Member)
5. Assoc.Prof. Poonsak Sangsunt (MOE Representative)

Examined on: 21 April 2005
Approved for Graduation on:

Graduate School of Business
Assumption University
Bangkok, Thailand
April
2005
ABSTRACT

Motivation is one of the most complex functions a manager faces due to the dynamic nature of human needs. This study examined the differences in the ranked preferences of motivational factors among the employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. sub-grouped as managers and operational level workers.

A census survey was conducted and a self-administered questionnaire was used as the research instrument. The respondents were 160 employees of the Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. who provided the data regarding the ranked preference of the motivation factors. Descriptive statistics were used to analyze the demographic factors and for finding the mean ranks of the motivational factors for the sub-group of employees, managers and operational workers which were the independent variables under the research conducted. Ten hypotheses statements were proved and statistical technique used for this purpose was Mann-Whitney test.

The analysis of the hypothesis test showed that there was no difference in the preference for each of the motivation factors among employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. classified as managers and operational level workers, except the sympathetic help with personal problems factor. Descriptive statistics revealed job security and good wages as the most important motivation factors for the employees of the company while sympathetic help with personal problems is the least motivating factor. The most important motivation factor for the managerial group was job security followed by good wages, appreciation for work done, interesting work, good working conditions, promotion and growth in the organization, feeling of being in on things, tactful discipline, personal loyalty to employees and sympathetic help with personal...
problems while the most important motivation factor for operational level employees was job security followed by good wages, interesting work, appreciation for work done, good working conditions, promotion and growth in the organization, feeling of being in on things, personal loyalty to employees, tactful discipline and sympathetic help with personal problems.

The ranking of the motivation factors by the two groups of employees was identical for job security, good wages, good working conditions, promotion and growth in the organization, feeling of being in on things and sympathetic help with personal problems factors. Managers placed more importance on appreciation for work done and tactful discipline compare to the operational level workers while the operational level workers placed more value on interesting work and personal loyalty to employees.
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CHAPTER 1
GENERALITIES OF THE STUDY

1.1 Introduction of the Study

An important function of management is to make work productive and to help the workers to achieve goals. Motivation has been a popular research topic over the past 50 years. It first emerged around World War II and ever since there have been many books, journals and studies on motivation, industrial psychology, interpersonal relations at work and worker satisfaction related to encouraging people to increase performance and productivity. Performance and productivity of workers should continue to be important topics for management research in future since employees are valuable assets of the organization (Ruthankoon & Ogunlana, 2003).

Success in any business requires more than just ability of employees and resources of the organization. It requires motivation of the work force. The resources of a firm cannot be fully utilized if the employees are not motivated to work. Changing needs of the staff requires individualized attention, specialized incentive programs and compensation plans which are more closely tied to individual achievement and performance. To produce top performance, compensation plans and incentive programs must be tailored to meet the specific needs of each employee. Employees of different ages, experience and responsibility levels also have varying needs over time. This requires managers to not only formulate incentives to specific needs but also re-evaluate each incentive program to accommodate their employees' needs (Jeffords, Scheidlt &Thibadoux, 1997).
Today's employees want to be happy and fulfilled, and desire to progress in their work to the point they are happy with themselves (Sonnenberb, 1991). Employees get motivated to function in environments that provide a challenge, offer new learning opportunities and offer opportunities for advancement and personal growth driven towards accomplishment of organizational goals.

Low unemployment level is a factor that forces many organizations to use motivation to retain their employees so as to maintain and increase their competitiveness within the global economy in which organizations are competing today. There is significant economic impact on an organization losing any of its critical employees, especially given the knowledge that is lost with the employee's termination of employment. This is the knowledge that is used to meet the needs and expectations of the customers and achieve competitive advantage for the firm. It has economic value for the organization and increases productivity. Organizational commitment can come about through motivating employees (Ramlall, 2004).

Demographic changes in the workplace, technological advances, de-layering and flattening of hierarchies, intense business competition and globalization leading to a turbulent and chaotic environment makes it necessary to determine what motivates people to perform well. A motivated workforce leads to profitable firms and it is necessary to use the employees' full talent (Wiley, 1997). Motivation is a continuous challenge among managers today. In spite of the various motivation theories and practices, managers often view motivation as a mystery. The reason for managers finding motivation as a real complex management function is that individuals are motivated by different things and in different ways (www.humanresources.about.com., last accessed on
25/09/2004). The problems and solutions to motivation problems can be complex. This is the reason for using employee surveys so as to enhance the understanding of the preference for the different motivation factors. Through exploring the attitudes that employees hold concerning motivation factors, management can create an environment that fosters employee motivation. Usually the strongest motivating factor is the thing which the employee lacks and values the most. The employees and their companies could benefit greatly through continuously conducting such surveys (Wiley, 1997).

Employees in the recent times lay more emphasis on interesting work due to changes in workforce and also on wages and job security because of downsizing and increased standard of living (Wiley, 1997). A recent study conducted by Watson Wyatt Co. (2004) on Thai employees showed the dissatisfaction of employees related to their wages and increased preference for interesting work (Bangkok Post, 2004).

1.1.1 Importance of motivation

In an increasingly competitive business environment, a highly motivated workforce is vital for the organization which seeks good results. To inspire the employees to work so as to get the best results, as individuals or as groups, the managers need to tap into the employees’ motivational forces. Hence, motivating employees is an essential skill which should be possessed by managers (Heller & Hindle, 1998).

Motivation is one of the most important factors affecting employee performance and productivity. Even if the employees’ are provided with clear work objectives, right skills and supportive work environment, the manager would not be able to get the work done through the employees if they are not effectively motivated. Change in the
workforce and change in business environment makes motivating employees more challenging (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000).

Supervisors think they know what motivates employees but forty years of survey results prove that they don’t really understand what employees need. A company that understands why its employees arrive to office on time, avoid job quitting, and are more productive, can ensure that all employees behave in the same manner which would give the company a competitive advantage through overcoming problems, such as employee absenteeism, cost of retraining and slack production (Kovach, 1987).

Treating the employees in a right way will result in higher quality, productivity, and profitability. Higher retention rates are possible when businesses offer people what they want from their jobs. Employees need work that keeps them interested. Too much change might create stress but so can too much routine. Employees are motivated by the best mix of change and routine (McKinley, 1998). Knowing what motivates employees and incorporating this knowledge into the motivational program would help to identify, employ, train and retain a productive workforce (Lindner, 1998).

The organizations that pay heed to motivating factors make more efficient use of their workforce. An organization that caters to the employees needs, will have fewer dissatisfied employees to deal with. People with job satisfaction have a good mood and deal with customers with a positive feeling and friendliness. Satisfied employees provide good service to the customers with better and more experienced skills. By implementing the motivational techniques, an organization will become a better place to work, and through this, they will be offering better service and better products to their customers (www.people.cornell.edu last accessed on 23/08/2004).
1.1.2 Company’s profile

Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. (TEC) is a joint venture company consisting of Aditya Birla Group, Thailand, Tohto Kasei Company Limited, Japan and Nissho Iwai Corporation, Japan. Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. became South East Asia’s pioneer manufacturer of epoxy resins when it started commercial production in 1992 at Rayong province in Thailand.

TEC offers a wide range of epoxies and modifiers that vary in features, such as molecular design, functionality etc. The products are marketed under the trade name of EPOTEC. They include liquid, solid, solutions, blends and multifunctional epoxy resins. The epoxy is exported to USA, Canada, South America, Europe, Middle East and South East Asian continent. Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. is a state-of-art complex and highly trained personnel, who use sophisticated production and control system to manufacture products of consistent quality and highest standards. The company holds ISO-9001 and ISO-14001 accreditation, in recognition of its sound management system (www.thaieoxy.com, last accessed on 10/08/2004).

The company’s personnel work closely with their customers to understand their needs and offer customized products and services. A well-equipped R&D Centre tests new products and develops process technology through highly qualified technical teams. Assistance is provided to customers in selecting the right combination of epoxy systems to achieve the best results. The Company uses Six Sigma and Total Productive Maintenance to improve on process capabilities and reliabilities. The state-of-art manufacturing & testing facilities and trained and committed people ensure that the
customers get products of high quality. The Logistic Services are geared to meet the on-time deliveries around the world with safety and reliability (Company Document, 2005).

Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., provides employment to 160 workers. The organizational chart of the company is given on the following page.
Figure 1.1: Organizational chart of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.

Note: SH is Section Head.


This organizational chart shows the top (level I), middle (level II) and low organizational levels (level III). All the employees at these levels belong to the managerial group. The operational level workers belong to level IV. Operational level
workers group consists of both the workers who directly operate on machines or products and the staff who are responsible for supervising workers.

1.2 Statement of problem

Motivation is a very important factor for employees’ performance, job satisfaction and organizational commitment. If the employees of the company are satisfied, they will keep the customers happy, which will eventually lead to customer satisfaction and customer loyalty and ultimately competitive advantage for the firm. Motivation has been a very popular topic in research especially now-a-days when employees are not merely considered as inputs in the business activities but emphasis is laid on understanding their needs and factors driving them towards better performance. By studying the difference in the ranked importance of the motivation factors among employees classified according to the organizational level, the company can find the ways to have a motivated and successful workforce exhibiting more efficiency in production and hence better quality products.

The researcher had an opportunity to discuss with the President of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. to seek his permission to conduct a research on some important dimension of the company. He suggested that the management of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. is preparing for developing a new approach towards management of its human resources. It is preparing to enhance work efficiency of its workforce in view of observation made by its President in recently held meeting with senior managers of the company. Therefore, he suggested that any research that will be
directed towards motivating employee in order to improve work efficiency will be appreciated.

Following is a brief conclusion of the observations made by the President in the meeting of company’s senior managers, as explained by the human resource manager to the researcher.

With the growth of intense global competition, effective and efficient management of human resources is the key for gaining competitive advantages over the competitors and for the long survival as well as for growing faster in highly volatile global market. Many fortune companies in the world market demonstrated this trend. Now, most of the business entrepreneurs and managing operators consider that people in the organization are the main drivers of all the organizational resources (money, material, machines, technology and knowledge) therefore acquiring, developing and maintaining workforce gains a prominent position on the agenda of management of every organization. Every business organization, “including our company” must not leave any stone unturned in this regard.

This research was conducted to know whether there is a difference in the ranked importance of motivation factors among the employees, grouped according to organizational level, so as to be able to have a better understanding of employee needs and employees expectations from the company. The statement of the problem for research conducted is “What are the differences in preference of the motivating factors among the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?”. Through this research, the difference in the ranked preferences of the various motivation factors under this study is revealed and emphasis is laid on the relative importance of these motivation
factors for formulating the motivational program for the managers and operational level workers of the company. This research study can help to get the solution for the problems faced regarding motivation of employees by the Human Resource Department of the Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.

The research questions for the study are:

- Is there a difference in the motivational preference for good wages among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?
- Is there a difference in the motivational preference for interesting work among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?
- Is there a difference in the motivational preference for appreciation for the work done among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?
- Is there a difference in the motivational preference for job security among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?
- Is there a difference in the motivational preference for good working conditions among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?
• Is there a difference in the motivational preference for tactful discipline among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?

• Is there a difference in the motivational preference for sympathetic help with personal problems among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?

• Is there a difference in the motivational preference for promotion and growth in the organization among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?

• Is there a difference in the motivational preference for feeling of being in on things among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?

• Is there a difference in the motivational preference for personal loyalty to employee among managers and operational level workers at Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd.?

• What is the ranked preference of motivation factors for the managers and operational level workers?

1.3 Research Objective

The objectives of this research are:

1.3.1 To find the difference in the ranked preference of each motivating factor among the managers and operational workers of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company, Ltd.
1.3.2 To find which motivation factors are most important for the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified on the basis of organizational level so as to design the motivational programs that would best fit the employees.

This research would enhance the understanding of the Management concerning the psychological needs of the employees of the company which would lead the managers to create a motivating environment.

1.4 Scope of Research

The research was conducted on the employees of the Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. who were the respondents of the study. Focus is laid on all the employees of the Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. Total number of employees working in Thai Epoxy are 160. A census survey was conducted to study the difference in ranked importance of the selected motivation factors. That is, all the employees of the company comprise the population of the research and a self administered questionnaire was distributed to the employees. The study was conducted in the factory of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. which is based in Rayong and also on the employees working in the Head Office in Bangkok, Thailand.

The dependent variables referred to in the research were job security, interesting work, good wages, good working conditions, personal loyalty to employees, feeling of being in on things, tactful discipline, appreciation for the work done, sympathetic help with personal problems and promotions and growth in the organization. The independent
variable was employees who are further classified on basis of organizational level as managers and operational level workers.

1.5 Limitations of the Research

1.5.1 The present study focused attention on difference in the ranked preferences of the motivation factors among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., therefore its findings may not be generalized for employees working in any other companies.

1.5.2 The present study focused attention on finding out the differences in ranked importance of factors in motivating the employees working in the Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. by selecting some specific variables. Therefore its findings may not be generalized for variables not included in the framework of the proposed research.

1.5.3 The present study will be conducted in a specific time frame, therefore its findings may not be generalized for all times.

1.6 Significance of the Study

This survey will signify the differences in the ranked importance of motivation factors among the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd grouped as managers and operational level workers. The employees ranking of the motivational factors will reveal which factors are most important in motivating the employees of the company.
This research would show a true picture of what are the needs of the employees according to the organizational level. The managers can evaluate which motivation techniques can be effective in motivating the managers and the operational level workers. The managers of the Thai Epoxy and Allied products Company Ltd. can benefit from this research through the understanding about which factors of motivation hold more importance for different employee groups. This would guide them in the setting of the Human Resource policies in the near future, for the company's employees, which would be more effective in making employees satisfied with their job, thereby improving performance of the employees, higher productivity, better quality products and eventually help company gain competitive advantage.

1.7 Definition of Terms

Appreciation of the work done
Appreciation for the work done is the feedback and recognition an employee receives for his performance in the organization. Feedback is the direct and clear information received by an employee about the effectiveness their work activities (Robbins, 2003).

Attitudes
Evalutive statements or judgments concerning objects, people or events (Robbins, 2003).
Employees

People employed under a contract to work in a company in exchange of cash or compensation (George & Jones, 2002).

Feeling of being in on things

The degree to which a job provides freedom and discretion to an individual in scheduling or determining work procedures, job, recruitment, etc in the organization (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000).

Good wages

Good wages is the money received by an employee in exchange of their work arising from employment (Byars & Rue, 2000) which should benefit the employees and should be above minimum wage rate laid down by the government.

Good working conditions

It refers to safe and healthy workplace where employees do not suffer physical or psychological problems (Byars & Rue, 2000).

Job Security

It is the employees’ confidence regarding continued employment in the organization (Heller & Hindle, 1998).
Interesting work
Work comprising of a meaningful and challenging task (Rowley, 1996).

Motivation
Motivation is the process that accounts for a person’s direction, intensity and persistence of effort towards attaining a goal (Robbins, 2003).

Organizational level
The division of labor and pattern of coordination, work flow and formal power that direct organizational activities according to the hierarchies (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000).

Promotion and growth in the organization
It is a movement of an employee to higher level position in an organization. Promotion can be viewed as achievement and advancement at the job (Heller & Hindle, 1998). Growth is a person’s self esteem achieved through personal achievement as well as self actualization (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000).

Personal loyalty to employees
Employees seek respect and trust from their managers so as to motivated them to perform better (Wong, Siu & Tsang, 1999).
Sympathetic help towards personal problems

Employees may have a need to organize themselves close to personal life and therefore need to maintain a balance between job and personal problems (http://hbswk.hbs.edu last accessed on 19/09/2004).

Tactful Discipline

This is the use of some form of sanction or punishment when an employee deviates from rules (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999).

Rank

Rank is the relative order of the alternatives (Cooper & Schindler, 2003).
CHAPTER II

REVIEW OF RELATED LITERATURE AND STUDIES

This chapter comprises works done by various authors and researchers. This text provides us with the various findings about the ranked importance of the motivation factors by the employees and also exhibits the theories of motivation stated by famous authors and some criticism of their theories. This section of the research shows the value placed on selected motivation factors in motivating the employees to perform their best.

Motivation is derived from a Latin word movere which means 'to move'. Hence motivation can be defined as those psychological processes that arouse, direct and lead to persistence of voluntary behavior that are directed towards a goal (Krietner & Kinicki, 2004). Motivating employees is one of the most complex functions a manager performs. Managers need to understand what motivates employees within the context of the roles they perform (Lindner, 1998). Motivation involves getting people to do something because they want to do it, and this therefore requires an understanding as to the need of employees (www.edis.ifas.ufl.edu accessed on 20/09/2004).

The art of motivation starts with learning how to influence individuals' behavior (Heller & Hindle, 1998). Developing people within the company would improve their motivation, loyalty and self-fulfillment. It would also be more economical than reintroducing new labor into the present work environment. Motivation can have an effect on the output of the business regarding both quantity and quality of the product. The business relies to a great extent on the efficiency of the production staff to make sure that the products are manufactured in the quantity that meet demand for the scheduled...
time period. The employees that lack the motivation to produce completed products to meet the demand will lead the company to face disastrous consequences (www.bizhelp24.com last accessed in 09/10/2004).

Managers need to recognize that different motivators are appropriate for different staff and that different staff will demonstrate different levels of motivation in setting their own targets and efforts for striving towards those goals. An effective manager would recognize and work with these individual differences (Rowley, 1996). If motivation is the problem regarding an employee, the solution is complex and challenging. The best source of information is the employee. Employees should be asked on a regular basis what influences their desire to work. The employer should make use of the appropriate motivational techniques to fulfill the employees' needs and make employees perform better towards achieving the organizational goals. In order to attain high levels of performance, employers depend on their employees to perform at levels that positively affect the profitability of the company (Wiley, 1997).

Management is all about getting things done through others, and hence to improve on the effectiveness of managers it is necessary to know how to motivate employees. An inability to motivate others can leave a manager ineffective and powerless (Buhler, 2003).

2.1 Definition of Employee

An employee is a person who is employed to exchange his efforts for achievement of organizational goals for salary as contracted by the organization (www.isical.ac.in, last accessed on 26/08/2004). An employee is employed under a contract to work in a
company in exchange for cash compensation (George & Jones, 2002). Employees possess skills, experience and knowledge, and therefore have economic value to organizations (Ramlall, 2004).

Employees should not be regarded as just another input in the production of goods and services. In fact the needs and desires of the employees are to be recognized so as to have a satisfied and productive workforce. Employees are not motivated by only money but by other intrinsic and extrinsic factors too and employee behavior is the reflection of their attitudes (Lindner quoted Dickson, 1998).

Motivated employees are a must in rapidly changing workplaces and are an essential requirement for organizational survival because of their productivity and efficiency (Lindner, 1998). But employee needs are dynamic and their attitudes change constantly (Lindner quoted Bowen & Radhakrishnan, 1998) Employees needs and attitudes behavior are different because employees are individuals and what works with one employees may not work with another (www.edis.ifas.ufl.edu accessed on 20/09/2004).

2.2 Theories and studies related to the Employees

Several famous motivation theories suggest how best to address today's employees. These theories include Maslow's hierarchy of needs, McClelland's Socially Acquired Needs, Herzberg's two-factor theory and Adam's equity theory. Maslow's hierarchy of needs, McClelland's Socially Acquired Needs and Herzberg's two-factor theory are content theories of motivation while equity theory is a process theory of motivation.
2.2.1 Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory

Maslow’s (1943) need hierarchy theory is one of the earliest and best known content theories which explains why people have different needs at different times (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000). Need Hierarchy theory was initially based on clinical observation of few neurotic individuals and subsequently was used for explaining the human behavior (Krietner & Kinicki, 2004). Employees’ needs can be well understood by the Maslow’s need hierarchy theory since this theory lays emphasis on the internal factors that energize behavior. According to Maslow, human needs can be organized into five general levels according to their hierarchy of importance. The five categories of human needs are:

**Physiological needs** – these needs include food, air, water and shelter and these needs must be met in order for an individual to survive. This need is the most basic or compelling need and is placed at the bottom of the hierarchy (George & Jones, 2002).

**Safety needs** – these are needs for safe, secure and stable environment, absence of pain, illness and protection against danger and threat.

**Belongingness** – these needs comprise of need for love, affection, friendship and social interaction with other people (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000).

**Esteem** – Esteem is the need for self esteem which is a good feeling about oneself and one’s capabilities and is acquired from personal achievement, and social esteem (reputation) which is acquired through recognition and respect from others (George & Jones, 2002).

**Self-actualization** – this need is at the top of the hierarchy. Self actualization is the need for self fulfillment, self development or desire to grow. It shows in a sense that person’s potential has been realized (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000).
According to Maslow (1943) the behavior of an employee is primarily motivated by lowest unsatisfied need at a time. Physiological needs are the initial need and they are the most important and these needs are satisfied first. As these needs get satisfied, safety needs emerge as strongest motivator and this level becomes the focus of motivation. When safety need get satisfied, belongingness needs become most important and this process continues. This process of need satisfaction is known as satisfaction–progression process Self actualization need is an exception to satisfaction–progression process cause as people experience self actualization, they develop a desire of more than less of this need (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000). Using this theory, managers can use the hierarchy to motivate people by satisfying the most important needs. Maslow's theory can be instrumental for managers in determining what type of rewards can be effective in
motivating individual employees since they can determine where in the hierarchy their employees are and then tailor their rewards to best meet those individual needs (Buhler, 2003).

**Criticism**

Maslow’s need hierarchy is one of the best known motivation theories but the model is too rigid because employee behavior is dynamic and unstable. An employee’s behavior is motivated simultaneously by several needs. The needs of individuals need not concentrate around the above five categories and satisfaction of one need does not necessarily motivate employees to satisfy the next higher need level (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000)

### 2.2.2 David McClelland’s Socially Acquired Needs

David McClelland’s Socially Acquired Needs Theory proposes that people are influenced by a need for achievement, power, or affiliation and that the strength of that particular need will vary according to the situation. Studies have found that employees with a high need for achievement tend to set higher goals than will those with lower achievement need (Wiley, 1997)

This theory describes the secondary needs that can motivate people at the same time as the primary needs. These secondary needs can prove as important source of motivators and can be divided into three categories:

**Need for achievement:** People who possess high need for achievement desire to accomplish reasonable challenging goals through their own efforts. They have strong need to undertake personal responsibility for tasks and therefore they prefer to work
alone than in teams. The people with high need for achievement are most satisfied when they emerge successful in competitive situations and when their jobs offer challenge, feedback and recognition.

**Need for affiliation:** Need for affiliation can be explained as the need for seeking approval of others, conforming to their wishes and expectations and avoiding confrontations and conflicts.

**Need for power:** need of power can be described as the desire to control the environment the employee works in such as the people and material resources.

The need for achievement, affiliation and power are learned by people. These needs are not instinctive like the Maslow’s and Alderfer’s needs. McClelland developed training programs to strengthen these needs (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000).

### 2.2.3 Herzberg’s Motivator-Hygiene Theory

The two-factor theory as developed by Frederick Herzberg (1959) is also referred to as the motivator-hygiene theory. Herzberg’s theory suggests that employees are primarily motivated by growth and self esteem, such as responsibility, recognition, achievement, advancement and personal growth. (Myers & Tietjen, 1998).

Interesting work, promotion and growth, appreciation of the work done, and feeling of being in on things are motivators as explained in the Herzberg’s Motivator Hygiene theory. These factors make employees experience job satisfaction. Therefore the employees are motivated to achieve them. Positive motivation would only come from accomplishing a meaningful and challenging task. Motivators cause positive attitude towards job because it leads to satisfaction of self actualization need (Tietjen & Myers,
Good wages, good working conditions and job security are the hygiene factors which work as demotivators and their absence affects extend to which an employee is dissatisfied with their job (Wong, Siu & Tsang, 1999). Herzberg described motivators as factors that describe workers relationship to what he does or job content. Hygiene are factors that describe the workers relationship with the environment or job context (Couger, 1988).

Herzberg's theory proposes that the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction. Instead, the opposite of dissatisfaction is no dissatisfaction and the opposite of satisfaction is no satisfaction. Hence, moving people from dissatisfaction to satisfaction requires two sets of factors. The managers should avoid using hygiene for moving individuals toward higher levels of satisfaction while improving motivators will increase job satisfaction and not reduce dissatisfaction regarding job (Buhler, 2003).
Figure 2.2: Herzberg’s Motivator-Hygiene Theory

**Motivators**
- Recognition
- Personal growth
- Advancement
- Achievement
- Responsibility

**Hygenes**
- Compensation
- Supervisor’s relations
- Job Security
- Company policy
- Working condition
- Personal life

Source: Modified from Robbins, 2003

**Criticism of the Motivator – Hygiene Theory**

The relation between motivators and hygiene is hazy and overlapping in several cases. A new company policy which is a hygiene factor may have a significant effect on a worker's interest in the work itself. The two-factor theory is not consistent in categorizing factors of satisfaction. Individuals may have the same needs but may place different value to the different motivating factors (Tietjen & Myers, 1998).
Another limitation is that the results for professional workers may not be applicable to all groups. Herzberg uses satisfaction and motivation as interchangeable, and there is an embedded assumption that increased satisfaction leads to increased motivation but this is not always the case (Rowley, 1996).

2.2.4 Equity Theory

Adam’s (1965) study suggests that individuals compare fairness and justice of social exchanges. Feeling of equity revolves around a person’s evaluation of the rewards received to compensate for his or her contribution to the company. Feeling of inequity motivates an employee towards removing the inequity existing by modifying the inputs (efforts) or output (rewards) or changing the behavior (Krietner & Kinicki, 2004). Managers can take appropriate measures to motivate their employees using equity theory (Buhler, 2003).

2.3 Discussion of sub-variables of Employees

It is important to analyze the responses by subgroups on basis of employee demographics to determine if there are variations in the larger respondent group (Kovach, 1987). Different demographic groups of people may place different ranked importance on the ten motivating factors. Employees earning different incomes, or in different organizational level can possibly have different motivating values (Wiley, 1997). Hence what motivates individuals at one level of the organization may not motivate those at another level. This necessitates differentiating employees according to demographic factors when analyzing their attitudes for motivational purposes (Kovach, 1987).
purpose of this research, employees are classified on the basis of organizational level into two groups, managers and operational level workers.

2.3.1 Definition of a Manager

A manager is defined as someone who works with and through other people by coordinating their work tasks or activities so as to achieve the organizational goals. Managers can coordinate work of a department group or can even supervise one person.

A traditional structured organization often divides managers into three groups, first line, middle and top managers. First line managers are placed at the lowest level of organization and they manage work of the non managerial workers. The first line managers can be called supervisors, shift managers, foremen, etc. Middle managers are between the first line managers and top managers such as the project leaders, plant managers, etc. Top managers are involved in making of organization wide decisions. They have the responsibility of establishing company’s objectives, plans and goals which have an impact on the whole organization. These managers are the Presidents. Vice Presidents, etc. (Robbins & Coutler, 2005).

2.3.2 Definition of operational level workers

Non managerial workers are those who work directly on a job or task. They are directly involved in the production or creation of organizational products. The non
managerial or the operational level employees have no one reporting to them (Robbins & Coutler, 2005).

2.4 Empirical studies related to Organizational level – managers and operational level workers

In the study conducted by Kovach (1987) on 1000 U.S. industrial employees, the organizational level was divided into lower, middle and higher non-supervisory category and statistical differences were found in the comparison of the lower level with both higher and middle level employees. The lower level employees ranked “good wages” first and “job security” second most important motivation factor. The lower level, non-supervisory employee’s preference for these motivation factors suggest the importance of fulfillment of the basic needs before the higher level needs. Middle and higher level workers ranked “interesting work” and “full appreciation for work done” as the first and second most important factors, respectively.

According to the research conducted by Wong et al. (1999) on Hong Kong hotel employees concerning their motivational choices, the managerial level employees showed more preference towards job security, feeling of being involved and opportunities for advancement and development compared to the supervisory and general levels. This research reflected the perceived importance of job security to the hotel managers since they have more to lose if their job was terminated because of better benefits and compensation compared to other organizational level employees. The managerial level
employees have a strong desire for involvement in decision making and operations of the hotel which leads them towards being satisfied with their jobs.

Financial incentive serves as important solution to the problem of keeping attractive and good quality blue-collar workers. Paying a fair wage is crucial. Blue-collar workers traditionally feel that they have no goals to attain to above struggling through the day (Anonymous, 2001).

Low wage workers thrive for respect and recognition since they have low self esteem and want to know about their performance. These motivators would lead to lower turnover, improved productivity and customer service provided. When employees are not motivated by their jobs, their attitudes could lead to high turnover rates, theft, poor customer service, and low productivity. Respect is considered by human-resources professionals to be necessary for a happy and productive work force. Arthur Andersen's Enterprise Group (1996) conducted a survey of 966 small and midsize businesses and 63 percent of the respondents confirmed that conveying respect and value was an effective way to motivate and retain employees. Low-wage workers are affected by workplace environment. Managing low-wage workers successfully requires sensitivity, common sense, and understanding of their psychology since the employees are the people who make or break the organization (Maynard, 1997).

2.5 Definition and features of the motivation factors

2.5.1 Wages and Salaries

Wages is the actual money received by an employee in exchange of their work arising from employment (Byars & Rue, 2000). Good wages can be explained as wages
above the average mean wages prevalent in the job market (Wall Street Journal, 2004). Good wages could be inclusive of year-end bonuses based on sales growth as opposed to net profits (Brant, 2004). Good wages should offer health insurance as an employee benefit so as to attract more qualified workers. People of all ages expect good wages and benefits from their employers (Miodonski, 2004)

Good wage is an extrinsic reward with an intrinsic potency (Wiley, 1997). A company need not have big profits to give good wages but by giving good wages the company could make good profits. The employees need to be rewarded well for their good performance (www.bpoindia.org last accessed on 25/11/2004). Good wages is an important motivating factor but what motivates an employee more is the self esteem gained from public recognition associated with the wages instead of the material gain (Wiley quoted Dowson and Dowson, 1997). Good pay, not great pay, will retain valued employees when appreciation, tactful discipline, and interesting work are intact (McKinley, 1998).

2.5.2 Interesting work

An employee can have a desire to excel in a chosen line of work. The most important drive for such employees is to continuously improve, progress and master such skills. Employees are motivated by challenges (www.hbswk.hbs.edu last accessed on 19/09/2004). Employee will be motivated by accomplishing a meaningful and challenging task (Rowley, 1996). Challenging jobs improve employee motivation while monotonous and boring jobs lowers the motivation to perform well (Krietner & Kinicki, 2004).
2.5.3 Appreciation for work done

Full appreciation for the work well done is one of the most powerful and least costly motivation tool (Wiley, 1997). Most employees possess a strong need that their work efforts should be appreciated and acknowledged. They require reassurance that their existing skills are still valued in the rapidly changing environment (Rowley, 1996). Appreciation for the work done help employees meets their needs for esteem, self-actualization, growth, achievement and self concept (Wiley quoted Lussier, 1997).

Generally recognition is given to small number of super-achievers and average worker is overlooked on whose efforts the daily operations of the entire business depends. Hence, it is important to consider that fact that appreciation for the work done can have positive motivational effect for all the employees (Wiley quoted Levesque, 1997). Verbal recognition includes praise, thanks and compliments (Tietjen & Myers, 1998). Public recognition can be in the form of associate meetings, department newsletter, trophy presentations, etc. Private recognition can be in the form of gift certificates, acknowledging achievement in performance appraisal, etc. (www.edis.ifas.ufl.edu last accessed on 24/09/2004).

2.5.4 Job security

Job security is assurance a company gives to its employees. Job security relates to employee’s physical, emotional and familial wellbeing (Wiley quoted Leibman and Weinstein, 1997). Job security can be associated with job retention. As per observation the population of insecure employees is larger than that of those who lose their jobs.
Security is encompassed by changes in a person's assumptions about self, the organization and the environment. Job insecurity is concerned with loss of a job (unemployment) or changes in job content (Wiley quoted Hartley et al., 1997). Organizational downsizing has had a negative effect on job security and productivity. Job security should be incorporated into company's compensation program since it affects employee morale and productivity because job security and productivity are closely related (Wiley, 1997).

2.5.5 Good working conditions

Good working conditions comprise of a pleasant interpersonal atmosphere where people get along well and pleasant physical working conditions such as good machinery, manageable and pleasant working hours, etc (Tietjen & Myers, 1998). Definition of working conditions has broadened in the past decade. Besides providing a safe and healthy work place, additional factors like work place flexibility could lead to an attractive work environment. Flexible work place has flextime and telecommuting enhancing non financial compensation and acts as an important factor in attracting and retaining employees (Mondy et al., 2002).

2.5.6 Tactful discipline

Discipline is a state of employees' self control and orderly conduct (Mondy et al., 2002). Discipline has the ability to produce fast results in short run. Managers are reinforced for using discipline because it produces an immediate change in employee's behavior. But disciplining employees through punishment may also undermine manager-
employee relation (Robbin, 2003). Tactful discipline can be explained as selecting the right time and place for reprimands so as to avoid a disrespectful situation for the employee. Embarrassed in front of colleagues at work would not be appreciated by any employee (McKinley, 1998)

2.5.7 Sympathetic help with personal problems

Personal life is concerned with personal situation affecting an employees’ job in the organization (Ruthankool & Ogunlana, 2003). Some employees organize themselves close to their private lives. Such employees can be motivated if their jobs give them freedom to maintain a balance between their job and personal problem (www.hbswk.hbs.edu, last accessed on 19/09/2004). Help with personal problems is concerned with assistance with health, emotional, financial, and family problems. (McKinley, 1998)

2.5.8 Promotion and growth in the organization

Some employees use interpersonal skills and would like to supervise larger groups of employees and hence promotions would motivate them (www.hbswk.hbs.edu last accessed on 19/09/2004). Promotion and growth will consist of achievement and advancement. Achievement is the act of accomplishing or finishing a specific task. It is accomplishing something successfully, especially by means of exertion, skill, practice, or perseverance. Advancement is promotion, progress and rising rewards for achievement (Heller & Hindle, 1998).
2.5.9 Feeling of being in on things

Employees could like to be alone, functioning according to their own rules and procedures instead of being made to just follow instructions by the superiors (www.hbswk.hbs.edu last accessed on 19/09/2004). Nowadays, employees are encouraged to take work related decisions and be in charge of what they do. Managers need to give up control and employees need to learn how take responsibility of their work and make appropriate decisions. Lately, a number of organizations are having self managed teams, in which workers operate largely without bosses (Robbins, 2003).

2.5.10 Personal loyalty to employees

Personal loyalty to employees can be defined as respect and trust given by employer to the employees (Wong et al., 1999). Employees expect loyalty, personal help, rewards, fair performance evaluation from the employers. Employees have feelings, they need not only fairness but to be treated with kindness, courtesy and decency (Sonnenberg, 1991). Personal loyalty to workers has gained importance with the increase in mergers and acquisitions of companies since this creates insecurity in the minds of employees. People want assurances that the company will do everything possible to utilize their skills (McKinley, 1998).

2.6 Empirical studies related to the motivation factors

2.6.1 Wages and Salaries

A major study was conducted in 2004 by Watson Wyatt Company involving 6700 respondents from 30 leading companies in Thailand. This study suggested that Thai
employees are satisfied with their jobs but dissatisfied with their compensation. A total of 63% of respondents were satisfied with their jobs while 45% were disappointed with the compensation. Employees expect an increase in salary as well as larger bonuses when their companies perform better. Since many businesses are recovering from 1997 turnaround, expectations of employees are higher. Only 32% of employees felt equity regarding salary compared with employees holding similar positions in other companies. But this is restricted to the amount of truth in the rumors among staff regarding the salaries earned in other companies (Bangkok Post, 2004).

Good wages has been ranked the second most important motivating factor in the research conducted by Lindner (1998) on the employees of the Piketon Research and Extension Center. In the research conducted by Wiley (1997), the respondents were more concerned about the extrinsic rewards. Good wages was chosen as the top motivational factor for employees surveyed during that year. Pay or good wages is generally valued by all employees, regardless of gender, occupation, age, income or employment status. (Wiley, 1997) According to the research conducted by Wong et al. (1999), there was no significant difference for good wages as a motivation factor among employees classified by education.

2.6.2 Interesting work

In spite of having confidence in their companies' long term success, half the respondents under the study conducted by Watson Wyatt Company could possibly change the company if more competitive jobs were offered somewhere else (Bangkok Post, 2004)
In 1980 and 1986, the research conducted by Kovach, the most important motivating factor was interesting work. According to the research conducted by Kovach (1987), no significant statistical difference was found in the preference for interesting work among employees classified by gender, age, income and job type but difference in preference existed among employees classified by organizational level. Findings of the research conducted by Wong et al. (1999) revealed that female employees had higher preference for interesting work compared to the male employees. The research conducted by Lindner (1998) at the Piketon Research and Extension Center revealed interesting work as the most important motivating factor.

2.6.3 Appreciation of work done

The second most important item for employees in the research conducted by Kovach (1980, 1987) was full appreciation for work done. Employees are motivated by feedback and recognition for their work performance.

Appreciation for the work done was ranked second in the research conducted by Wiley. Women placed more importance for appreciation for work done compared to men (Wiley, 1997). According to the research conducted by Wong et al. (1999), women employees placed higher preference for appreciation or praise for the work done indicating that gender played a role in influencing employees’ perception towards the motivation factors.

2.6.4 Job security

Workforce reduction due to de-layering, downsizing, global competition and recession leads to increased importance of job security for employees. Employees’
reaction to job security may be in the form of severe psychological reactions such as low self-esteem, low self-confidence etc. which could lead to deterioration in organization effectiveness (Wiley, 1997).

Job security has been ranked the fourth most important motivating factor in the research conducted by Lindner (1992) on the employees of Piketon Research and Extention Center. Job security was significantly more important for blue collar skilled workers when compared to white collar skilled workers in the research conducted by Kovach (1987).

2.6.5 Good working conditions

The research conducted by Couger (1988) on the U.S. Programmers and Analysts revealed that working conditions was one of the least valued motivation factor and similar ranking was given by Fitz-enz (1977) in the research conducted in the similar environment (Couger, 1988). The research conducted by Kovach (1987) revealed average overall ranking to good working conditions except for employees over 50 years of age, white-collar unskilled employees and higher non supervisory staff who placed higher ranking on good working conditions. Wiley’s (1997) study on the preferences of motivation factors among employees classified by income revealed that the lower income group and the middle income group differed significantly on good physical working conditions. The middle-incomers placed lesser importance on working conditions.
2.6.6 Tactful discipline

Tactful discipline was the lowest ranked motivating factor in the research conducted by Labour Relations Institute of New York in 1946 on the U.S. industrial employees (Wiley, 1997) and by Kovach (1980). Tactful discipline is an extrinsic factor as revealed under the research conducted by Wong et al. (1999). Tactful discipline is among the lowest ranked motivation factor as revealed by the research conducted by Kovach (1987) on 1,000 U.S. employees.

2.6.7 Sympathetic help with personal problems

The research conducted by Kovach (1987) on the industrial employees in U.S. revealed that sympathetic help with personal problems is the least important motivation factor as judged by the overall employee ranking. When analyzed according to employee demographics, this factor was important for employees over the age of 50. Wiley (1997) conducted a research on employees attitudes towards motivation factors and sympathetic help with the personal problems was the lowest ranked motivation factor. Also, the employees sub grouped by income were significantly different in the motivational value placed by them on sympathetic help with personal problems. Lower income employees placed more value (mean) on this factor compared to middle income group.

2.6.8 Promotion and growth in the organization

This factor is the most important motivator identified by the Hong Kong hotel employees in the research conducted by Wong, Siu and Tsang (1999). Promotion and growth was ranked the sixth most important factor in the research conducted by Lindner
(1998). In the study conducted by Watson Wyatt Company (2004) on Thai employees, findings revealed that 40% of the respondents felt that they did not have proper information needed to do their jobs effectively. 33% of the respondents felt they were unfairly judged for promotion or career opportunities (Bangkok Post, 2004).

Kovach (1987) stated that workers under 30 years group were significantly different in motivational preference for promotion and growth in the organization compared to workers of other age groups. There was statistically significant difference in preference of promotion and growth among employees classified by income. Low Income group placed promotion and growth in the organization in primary position.

2.6.9 Feeling of being in on things

Workers who are more involved in job-related decisions and communications respond by being more motivated and more involved in their work (Wiley quoted Sekaran, 1997). Employees must believe that their work is being performed well and also that their work is having a positive impact on the company, so as to accept empowerment. It is important for employees to feel that they control their own actions (Wiley quoted Thomas and Velthouse, 1997).

According to the research conducted by Couger (1988) on the IS employees in U.S., findings revealed no statistical difference in ranking of responsibility among the managers and programmers and analysts but there was difference in the ranks placed on responsibility between the employees above the age of 40 and below the age of 30.
2.6.10 Personal loyalty to employees

Personal loyalty to employees is the second most important motivator in the research conducted on the Hong Kong hotel employees by Wong, Siu and Tsang (1999). They rate loyalty and respect over wages. The importance of respect and trust is emphasized because of the Chinese ‘face’ or ‘Guanxi’ concepts. Kovach (1987) research proved ranking for personal loyalty towards employees to be moderately higher for employees of over 50 years age, compared to younger employees.

2.7 Past Researches

Different employees have different needs at different times as stated by Maslow’s theory and this is proved by the studies conducted on the employees from different origins and over different time period by the various researchers on the ten motivating factors so as to find out the change in the preferences of employees regarding the various motivating factors. Kovach (1980, 1987), Wiley (1997) and Wong et al. (1999) are among some of the researchers who conducted research on the motivational preferences of the employees.

Kovach (1980) conducted research on 200 industrial employees in U.S. where the employees were asked to rank ten motivational factors in terms of personal preference. Kovach (1987) conducted a similar survey on 1000 industrial employees in U.S. who ranked the 10 motivational factors and the results were analyzed according to the different sub groups of employees divided on the basis of their demographic profile because Kovach argued that there could be difference in the attitude of employees towards these 10 factors according to the different demographics just as there were
differences in wants over time. Findings revealed significant difference in the motivational preference for some factors among employees sub grouped according to gender, age, income level, job type and organizational level. This survey reflected the importance of Interesting work as a motivation factor.

Wiley (1997) researched 460 persons employed in different industries in U.S. concerning their preference of 10 motivation factors studied in the previous researches mentioned above. Wiley analyzed the preference of motivational factors and compared the findings with the motivational surveys conducted over the past forty years. The employees were sub divided according to their demographics. Respondents were asked to rank these factors from 1-10, most important to least important. Descriptive statistics were used on the data collected to determine the relative factor rankings. Responses of the employees were analyzed using non-parametric test of significance for sub group gender and employment status to show that respondents were significantly different in their motivational preference for the different motivation factors. Other demographic factors of employees were analyzed using one-way Anova since there were more than three classes for these demographics. Difference in preference was revealed by the findings proving the changing values of employees. Study conducted by Wiley based on the researches conducted in 1946, 1980 and 1987 shows the changing importance of the various motivation factors. Factors which motivate U.S. employees in 1997 were more extrinsic compared to previous researches. Findings revealed the changing preference of the motivational factors reflecting the change in values over time and also the effect of the social economic environment.
Wong et al. (1999), conducted a research on the hotel employees in Hong Kong regarding their choices of job-related motivators, based on the 10 motivation factors developed in Kovach. Employees were to rank the motivation factors from 1-5, most important to least important. Manova analysis revealed no interaction effect between 3 independent variable, gender, marital status and position level, which were the employees demographic. Anova analysis was used to determine the significant difference existing between employee demographic variables concerning their motivation choices.

This research supported the factor used under the Herzberg’s two factor theory. Promotion and growth, interesting work, recognition for the work done, feeling of being in on things, loyalty to employees and sympathetic help towards personal problem are intrinsic factors causing job satisfaction while good wages, job security, good working conditions and tactful discipline are extrinsic factors reducing job dissatisfaction. The top three motivating factors in this research were promotion and growth, personal loyalty to employees and good wages (Wong et al., 1999).

Table 2.1 Summary of Previous Studies

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Researcher</th>
<th>Year</th>
<th>Method</th>
<th>Statistical technique</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Kovach</td>
<td>1987</td>
<td>1000 industrial sector employees in U.S. were the respondents of this research who were divided into categories according to sex, age, income level, job type and organization level and these employees provided the ranking from 1-10 to the</td>
<td>Descriptive Statistics were used to find the mean ranks.</td>
<td>There were statistically significant differences in the ranked preference for motivation factors among all the subgroups except gender.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wiley</td>
<td>1997</td>
<td>550 employees in different industrial sectors were surveyed. 460 employees responded. Respondents were asked to rank the survey 10 factors from 1-10 according to how important each was in motivation them.</td>
<td>Descriptive statistics was used for relative ranks, Non-parametric was used for analyzing significant difference in ranked preference among groups – gender and employment status. One-way Anova was used for analyzing responses of groups of people according to age, income and occupation category.</td>
<td>Factors that motivated workers are more extrinsic than they used to be. Employees differed in their ranking for the motivation factors but they overwhelmingly selected good wages as the most important motivator.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
<td>---</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wong, Siu &amp; Tsang</td>
<td>1999</td>
<td>Self administered questionnaire were mailed to 3240 employees (in different departments) at 72 Hong Kong Hotels who were asked to choose the factors on likert scale and provide demographic details. 1245 useful responses were returned from 64 Hotels.</td>
<td>One-way Anova and Manova analysis were used to determine significant difference and interaction effect between the sub groups of employees respectively.</td>
<td>Significant differences were found between subgroup of employees. Most important factors among most demographic variables were interesting work, promotion and growth and feeling of being involved.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER III

RESEARCH FRAMEWORK

In this chapter, theoretical framework, conceptual framework, and hypotheses are included. Theoretical framework refers to the theories and concepts being used as a basis or reference drawn from the literature review. A conceptual framework is developed by researcher. Finally, after developing theoretical and conceptual framework, the researcher generated the research hypotheses related to this study.

3.1 Theoretical Framework

The theoretical framework is a model which is used to clarify the relationship between the variables as referred from the studies conducted by previous researchers or from the ideas of the famous authors. It focuses on the overall concept being investigated in the research conducted. Under this framework, the various theories and studies which are explained in literature review are integrated and the main variables included.

This research focused on the difference in preference of the motivation factors among employees sub grouped according to the organizational level. Motivation is the force within an employee that affects his or her direction (towards a particular goal), intensity (particular level of effort), and persistence (for a certain amount of time) of voluntary behavior (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000). The various theories laid down by the famous authors Maslow and Herzberg support the variables contained in the conceptual model.
Figure 3.1: Theoretical Framework

Source: Adapted from T. R. Mitchell (1997)

A well known Organizational Behavior researcher, Mitchell (1997) proposed that employee's inputs and job context are the two key factors that influence motivation. Employees give to their company their ability and job knowledge and bring with themselves their disposition, traits, emotions moods, beliefs and values to their work setting.

Job context factors comprise of physical environment, the tasks, rewards and recognition, supervisors support, etc. Employee’s inputs and the company’s job context factor influence each other and also motivation processes. Motivated behavior is affected by employee’s ability, job knowledge, job context factors and motivation, which in turn, influences performance.

Motivation is concerned with a whole lot of psychological processes that culminate in an employee’s desire and intention to behave in a particular manner. The
outcome of motivation is the behavior of the employee, efforts exerted and choice of strategies employed by the employee to complete a specific task. Behavior is affected by employee inputs, job context factors and motivation. Accumulation of behavior over a period of time and across contexts and people, leads to performance which is assessed by the employee’s manager (Krietner & Kinicki, 2004).

The above model takes into consideration the entire concept being investigated in this research. The employee input is the attitude (beliefs and values) which they bring with themselves to the workplace and these attitudes lead to differences in preference for the motivation factors or the job context factors. The ten motivation factors referred in the study are Good Wages, Interesting work, Appreciation for work done, Job security, Good working conditions, Tactful discipline, Sympathetic help with personal problems, Promotion and growth in the organization, Feeling of being in on things and Personal loyalty to employees which could either limit or enable motivation. The employees classified as managers and operational level workers may have different ranked preferences for each of these motivation factors which would influence their motivation.

3.2 Conceptual framework

The conceptual framework consists of the independent and dependent variables and their respective sub-variables. This framework is based on the previous empirical studies and serves as a map of ideas of the research conducted herein.
Figure 3.1: The Conceptual Model emphasizing Independent and Dependent Variables

- **Managerial level** (Top, middle and lower level)
  - Good Wages
  - Interesting work
  - Appreciation for work done
  - Job security
  - Good working conditions
  - Tactful discipline
  - Sympathetic help with personal problems
  - Promotion and growth in the organization
  - Feeling of being in on things
  - Personal loyalty to employees

- **Operational level**
  - Good Wages
  - Interesting work
  - Appreciation for work done
  - Job security
  - Good working conditions
  - Tactful discipline
  - Sympathetic help with personal problems
  - Promotion and growth in the organization
  - Feeling of being in on things
  - Personal loyalty to employees
3.2.1 Explanation of independent variable

Employees form a very important part of an organization and are one of the prime reasons for the success or failure of businesses. A well motivated employee is an asset to the organization and can lead an organization to be a profitable concern through their higher productivity and quality performance. The variable employee can be subdivided into various groups on the basis of their demographics. For this research, the sub variable of employees is organizational level. Organizational level has two groups, managers and operational level workers. The researches conducted by Kovach (1987) and Wong et al. (1999) support this sub variable.

Organizational level

A structure through which individuals cooperate systematically to conduct business (www.answers.com last accessed on 30/01/2005). The division of labor and pattern of coordination, work flow and formal power that direct organizational activities according to the hierarchies (McShane and Von Glinow, 2000). Organizational structure is classified as managerial level and operational level workers for this research.

Managers

Managers are those who are responsible for all the coordination and management functions in an organization. The managers coordinate all the work of the other people and direct the activities towards accomplishing organizational goals. The managers formulate the policies, objectives and goals of the organization (Robbins & Coutler, 2005). For the purpose of this study, managers comprised of employees at high (or Level I), middle (or level II) and low (level III) organizational level.
Operational level workers

Operational level workers or the non managerial workers are those who work directly on a job or a task. They are the placed lowest in an organization structure (Robbins & Coutler, 2005). For the purpose of this study, operational level workers included the workers who are directly working on the job and the staff controlling them. They are the employees that belong to level IV of organizational structure.

3.2.2 Explanation of the dependent variables

The ten motivating factors which are compared in the research are:

1) Good wages

Wage is a direct financial compensation received by an employee in return for his service (Mondy, Noe & Premeaux, 2002). Good wages should benefit the employees and need to be above the minimum wage level set by the government. Good wages are supportive of the rise in inflation. Rewards are intended to motivate certain behaviors. Rewards need to be timely and tied to performance. Wage is an extrinsic reward. Employees’ satisfaction from the reward depends on what is expected and how much is received (Beer & Walton, 1990).

2) Interesting work,

Employees are expecting more from their work. They are looking for their workplace to provide them with a sense of meaning and identity. They want work that
engages their interest, makes best use of their abilities, and develops their potential 

3) Appreciation of work done

Appreciation is in the form of recognition and feedback. Recognition is 
acknowledgement of achievements by senior staff members. Full appreciation for the 
work enhances self esteem and it is a form of a reward (Heller & Hindle, 1998). 
Feedback is the amount of information received by an employee for his job performance 
in the organization. People possess a strong need to know how they are performing their 
jobs (Mondy et al., 2002).

4) Job security

Job security is the degree of confidence that an employee has regarding continued 
employment in an organization (Heller & Hindle, 1998).

5) Good working conditions

Working conditions include working hours, workplace layout, facilities, and 
equipment provided for job (Heller & Hindle, 1998). Physical working environment 
includes factors such as humidity, temperature, ventilation, noise, light. Adverse physical 
conditions can have negative impact on performance. Normal lighting, ventilation, 
temperature, sound absorbers to reduce unpleasant noises are required to keep a good 
working environment. Employees should not suffer any permanent physical and 
psychological damage. Telecommuting and flextime make attractive working conditions 
(Byars & Rue, 2000).
6) Tactful discipline

Disciplinary actions help the company to accomplish the organizational goals when company rules are violated. Discipline is a state of employee self control and orderly conduct. Tactful discipline involves penalty against an employee who fails to meet standards as laid down in the company policies or set by the administration (Ivancevich & Matteson, 1999). Managers avoid any social embarrassment for the employee while using tactful discipline as a motivating factor.

7) Sympathetic help with personal problems.

When the line between work life (work time) and personal life (non work time) becomes blurred, it creates personal conflict and stress. Creation of global organizations, professional jobs, dual career couples working and some demanding organizations lead to less time for an employees’ personal life. Employees are left with very limited time for their personal lives and hence employees want flexibility in their work schedules so as to better manage life and work conflicts. Organizations which fail to maintain such a balance are unable to retain motivated employees (Robbins, 2003).

8) Promotions and growth in the organization

Promotion is a person’s movement to a higher level position in the organization. An individual who is promoted to a higher level normally receives additional financial gains and ego boost associated with achievement and accomplishment. Most people feel good about being promoted but others who are not promoted may slack off or express resentment. Promotions are reduced if number of levels in the hierarchy is reduced and
hence employees are rewarded in other ways (Mondy et al., 2002). Growth is concerned with personal development of the employee (Robbins, 2003).

9) Feeling of being in on things

It is important to place the responsibility for decision making directly on the employees themselves. Employees are more motivated when they use their own judgment instead of simply carrying out policies that allow for little or no discretion (www.kenblanchard.com last accessed on 25/11/2004). The employees require substantial freedom, independence and discretion in scheduling the work and in determining the procedure to be used for the work activities (Robbins, 2003). Jobs that provide autonomy lead employees to feel responsible for their work.

10) Personal loyalty to employees

Employees expect the employers’ respect and trust towards them which encourages the feeling of loyalty of the employees towards the company (Wong et al., 1999). The highest level of trust is achieved when there is emotional connection between the parties. Trust exists when parties understand each other’s wants and desires. The need to monitor the employee would reduce if employer trusts the employee. This type of trust the managers seek ideally in teams. Trust can build over period of time and the employer can predict the employees’ behavior (Robbins, 2003)

3.3 Research Hypothesis

Research hypothesis comprises of all those statements which are to be proved in this research.
Hypothesis 1

H01: There is no difference in the ranked preference for good wages among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

H1: There is a difference in the ranked preference for good wages among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 2

H02: There is no difference in the ranked preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

H2: There is a difference in the ranked preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 3

H03: There is no difference in the ranked preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

H3: There is a difference in the ranked preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 4

H04: There is no difference in the ranked preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.
Ha4: There is a difference in the ranked preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 5

Ho5: There is no difference in the ranked preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha5: There is a difference in the ranked preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 6

Ho6: There is no difference in the ranked preference for tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha6: There is a difference in the ranked preference for tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 7

Ho7: There is no difference in the ranked preference for sympathetic help with personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha7: There is a difference in the ranked preference for sympathetic help with personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.
Hypothesis 8

Ho8: There is no difference in the ranked preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha8: There is a difference in the ranked preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 9

Ho9: There is no difference in the ranked preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha9: There is a difference in the ranked preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 10

Ho10: There is no difference in the ranked preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha10: There is a difference in the ranked preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

3.4 The Operational Definition of the Variables

The independent and the dependent variables can be clearly portrayed through the Operationalization table which define the variables related to employees and motivation factors and show the operational components and the type of scale to be used for that
particular variable. The operationalization table is used to show examples of the questions which were used in the research.

Table 3.1: **Operationalization Table for Independent Variable – Employees**

The sub-variables of the independent variable, employees are shown as follows:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Independent Variable</th>
<th>Variable Definition</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Level of Measurement</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Manager</td>
<td>Manager is one who works with and through other people by coordinating their work activities to achieve organizational goal</td>
<td>Manager (top, middle and low level)</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level worker</td>
<td>These workers are directly involved in the production or creation of company's products and have no one reporting to them.</td>
<td>Operational level workers (including staff at level IV)</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 3.2: **Operationalization Table for Dependent Variables**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dependent Variable</th>
<th>Variable Definition</th>
<th>Operational Definition</th>
<th>Level of Measurement</th>
<th>Question Number</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good wages</td>
<td>Beneficial financial compensation received by the employee for services rendered in the organization which is above the minimum wage level set by government.</td>
<td>Good wages is the money received by an employee in exchange of his/her work arising from employment which should benefit the employee</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interest</td>
<td>Definition</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----------</td>
<td>------------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td>---------</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>Work comprising of a meaningful and challenging task (Rowley, 1996)</td>
<td>Challenging, creative and meaningful work</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for work done</td>
<td>It is the feedback and recognition an employee receives for the work done.</td>
<td>Acknowledgement of achievements by senior staff members.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Employees' confidence regarding continued employment in the organization (Heller &amp; Hindle, 1998).</td>
<td>Confidence in retention of job.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
<td>It is concerned with a safe and healthy workplace where employees do not suffer physical or psychological problems.</td>
<td>Good machines, ventilation, office layout, pleasant working hours, etc.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful discipline</td>
<td>It is about use of some form of sanction or punishment when employee deviates from rules (Ivancevich &amp; Matteson, 1999).</td>
<td>Some form of punishment given to employee when he/she deviates from rules.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic help with personal problems</td>
<td>Employees want to maintain a balance between the job and personal problems.</td>
<td>Balance between work and personal life.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and growth in the organization</td>
<td>Promotion is a movement of an employee to higher level position in an organization. Growth is a person's self esteem achieved through personal achievement as well as self actualization.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of being in on things</td>
<td>It is the freedom and discretion allowed to an individual in scheduling or determining work procedures and decision making in the organization.</td>
<td>Autonomy in decision making regarding work activities.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal loyalty to employees</td>
<td>It is concerning respect and trust received from the employer or seniors in the organization.</td>
<td>Respect and trust from managers.</td>
<td>Ordinal</td>
<td>Part II</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
CHAPTER IV

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter discusses the research methodologies used, respondents or the target group and the sampling procedures employed, research instrument or questionnaire used to get information from the respondents, data gathering procedures and the statistical techniques involved for the interpretations used in the research.

4.1 Research Method Used: Descriptive Study

The research conducted is a descriptive study since the purpose is to describe the ranked importance of the motivation factors for the employees. A census survey was employed for this research. A census survey is an investigation of all the elements making up the population under study (Zikmund, 2002). Since the population is small, it would be feasible to survey all the employees of the company. Also, the employees can have different needs and they could hold different preference for the various motivation factors under study, so it would be appropriate to study the attitudes of the whole population. Descriptive statistics were used for analyzing the employee demographics and also for finding the mean ranks of the motivation factors for the two groups of respondents. The inferential statistics is required for analyzes of the difference in ranked preference for the motivation factors among the employee grouped as managers and operational level workers. Inferential statistics will make use of non parametric test since the dependent variables are measured on ordinal scale and assumption for normal
distribution cannot be made. SPSS software package was used to make interpretation from the data collected.

4.2 Respondents and sampling procedures

The respondents for this research were all the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Co., Ltd. The total number of employees on whom the survey was conducted is 160. The employees of the company are divided into two groups on the basis of organization level, managers and operational level workers since the motivational preferences could differ across these groups. The research was conducted at Head Office in Bangkok and at the Factory in Rayong, Thailand. The time horizon of the research was March, 2005.

4.3 Research Instrument : Structured Questionnaire

Questionnaires were used for an orderly and structured approach for data gathering. The questionnaire helped in studying the importance of the motivation factors as perceived by the employees who are grouped according to their demographic, organizational level. The researcher divided the questionnaire into two parts:

The first part of the questionnaire contained questions asking about the demographic profile of the employees. The second part of the questionnaire required the respondents to rank the selected organizational factors in order of most important to least important, that is, 1(most important) to 10(least important). One rank cannot be used for more than one variable and all variables needed to be ranked (Wiley, 1997). This provided the researcher the data required to analyze the difference in the ranked
preference for the motivation factors among managers and operational level workers. The questionnaire was developed in Thai language for Thai employees working in the company and in English language for the foreigners employed in the company. The questionnaire was self administered. The questionnaire was given to all the employees of the company since the focus of the study is towards everyone working in the organization.

Outline of the questionnaire.

Part I: Demographic profile of employees  
Question no.1-5

Part II: Ranking of the motivation factors

Demographic profile questions (1-5) provided multiple choices to the employees to choose their appropriate profile. Part II of the questionnaire required the employees to rank the given motivation factors according to their relative importance. Features or definition of the motivation factors which are the dependent variables under the study conducted were written in an enclosed sheet to enhance the understanding of these motivation factors stated for ranking.

4.4 Data Collection

A self administered questionnaire was used for the research for collecting primary data. A list of questions with pre specified answer choices was provided. The questionnaire were distributed to all the employees of the company. The Top management and human resource team provided full support to the researcher while conducting the research on the employees of the company. The employees were assured about the non disclosure of their personal identity regarding their questionnaire so as to
encourage the employees to provide reliable information and to reflect their true attitudes regarding the ranked importance of the motivation factors. The data took about a week for collection.

The secondary data was gathered from books written by various Organizational Behavior authors, research journals searched through the ABAC library web page, ABI/INFORM (business information consisting of bibliographic entries), journal articles available in the university library, the internet and Company documents. This information has been used to develop the concepts and framework for the research.

4.5 Data analysis techniques

After the data was collected from the employees, the data was interpreted by Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). SPSS presents data in easily interpretable formats and ensures accuracy of information.

Independent variables under the research conducted were measured on ordinal scale. All the dependent variables were measured on ordinal scale. Ordinal scale was used for the dependent variables since the forced choice ranking was applied for answering the question in part II of the questionnaire. Significance level of 0.05 was used for hypothesis testing and two tailed test was performed.

Descriptive statistics were used for Question 1 to 5. Frequency tables and Bar graphs were used for analyzing the employee demographics. Descriptive statistics were also required for finding the mean for each motivating factor (dependent variable) under each subgroup of employees. These mean values served as the base for assigning relative ranks
to the motivating factors for the two independent sub variables, managers and operational level workers.

Inferential Statistics were used for analyzing the data collected through Part II of the questionnaire. Test of significance was conducted for finding the difference in preference for each motivation factor among the subgroup of employees. Mann-Whitney test was applied for analyzing data (Cooper and Schindler, 2003). Mann-Whitney (or ranked-sum) test is used for testing group differences when population is not normally distributed or when variability is unequal. This test is alternative to independent t-test (Zikmund, 2003). Mann-Whitney test is most appropriate when data is measured on ordinal scale but it can be used for higher scales also. The test statistics for Mann-Whitney test is given by the formula:

$$Z = \frac{T - \mu_T}{\sigma_T}$$

where

Mean: $\mu_T = \frac{1}{2} \frac{n_1 + n_2 + 1}{n_1 \times n_2}$

Standard Deviation: $\sigma_T = \sqrt{\frac{n_1 \times n_2 (n_1 + n_2 + 1)}{12}}$

$n_1$ and $n_2$ are sample sizes of the two samples to be analyzed and $T$ is the sum of the ranks of sample1.

Using significance level of 0.05, we can reject null hypothesis of equal ranked (mean) preferences for a motivation factor among the two groups, managers and operational level workers, if $Z > 1.96$ or $Z < -1.96$ or if two-tailed significance value or $p$ value is less than 0.05 (Zikmund, 2003).
CHAPTER V
DATA ANALYSIS

This chapter presents the analysis of the data collected from 160 respondents through a self administered questionnaire and interpretations of the findings by the use of SPSS program. The data analysis can be divided into two parts. The first part is concerned with use of descriptive statistics for analysis of the demographic profile of the employees. Frequency tables and bar graphs display the demographic characteristics of the employees. Descriptive statistics is also used for finding the mean ranks provided for the motivation factors by employees grouped as managers and operational level workers. The second part presents the hypotheses test results. Hypothesis testing makes use of the Mann-Whitney, a non-parametric test to determine whether hypotheses are substantiated or not.

5.1 Descriptive Analysis

Self administered questionnaires were distributed to all the 160 employees of the company to collect data to analyze the demographics and motivational preferences of the employees. The response rate for the survey was 100%, that is, all the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. participated in this survey.

5.1.1 Demographic Characteristics of the respondents

According to the study, emphasis is placed on only one of the employee demographics, organizational level but we analyze all the demographic characteristics of
the employees so as to find the demographic profile of the all the employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. The frequencies for all the respondents of the study are as follows:

Table 5.1 Frequency table for Respondent’s Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.1 shows that out of 160 respondents who are the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., 96 (or 60%) are in the age group of 21-30 years, 51 (or 31.9%) respondents of the company are in the age group of 31-40 years, 11 (or 6.9%) of respondents are in age group of 41-50 years and 2 (or 1.3%) employees belong to the age group of 51 years or above. Therefore, as observed, the majority of the employees belong to the younger age group, 21-30 years.
The bar graph shows that the majority age group is 21-30 years.

Table 5.2 Frequency table for Respondent’s Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.2 shows that out of the 160 respondents, 126 (or 78.8%) respondents are male and 34 (or 21.3%) respondents are female. Therefore it can be concluded that the majority of the employees working in the company are male.
Bar graph shows that majority gender group is male.

Table 5.3 Frequency table for Respondent’s Income Level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income level (Baht)</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or below</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
<td>73.8%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 40,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>11.3%</td>
<td>85.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 - 60,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>8.1%</td>
<td>93.1%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001 or Above</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5%</td>
<td>6.9%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.3 shows most of the respondents have a monthly income of 20,000 Baht or below. A total of 118 (or 73.8%) respondents earn income less than or equal to 20,000 Baht per month. Rest of the income groups are 20,001 to 40,000 Baht per month, 40,001
to 60,000 Baht per month and 60,001 Baht or above and each comprises of 18 (or 11.3%), 12 (or 7.5%) and 12 (or 7.5%) respondents, respectively.

**Figure 5.3 Bar Graph representing Income**

Bar graph shows that majority respondents earn income of 20,000 Baht or below.

**Table 5.4 Frequency table for Respondent's Organizational Level**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational Level</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top level</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5.4 shows that 12 (or 7.5%) respondents function at the top level of the organization. 10 (or 6.3%) respondents belong to middle level of the organization. 19 (or 11.9%) belong to the lower level of the organization. The high, middle and low level employees together are referred to as managerial level employees as the purpose of the study indicated and comprise of 41 (or 25.6%) respondents. There are 119 (or 74.4%) respondents comprising of workers and staff at the operational level of the organization.

The majority respondents belong to the operational level.

**Figure 5.4 Bar Graph representing Organization level**

Bar graph shows majority respondents work at operational level.
Table 5.5 Frequency table for Respondent’s Work Experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work Experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid Less than 2 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 4 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 - 7 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>80.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8 years or above</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.5 shows 41 (or 25.6%) of the employees have work experience of less than 2 years. 68 (or 42.5%) employees have work experience of 2 to 4 years, 19 (11.9%) respondents have work experience of 5-7 years and 32 (or 20%) employees have worked for 8 years or more. Therefore, it can be concluded that the largest number of respondents have had work experience of 2-4 years.

Figure 5.5 Bar Graph representing Work Experience
5.1.2 Descriptive statistics for the dependent variables – motivation factors

Table 5.6 Descriptive statistics for the Motivation Factors - Mean Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>Good wages</th>
<th>Interesting work</th>
<th>Appreciation for work done</th>
<th>Job Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>Good working conditions</th>
<th>Tactful Discipline</th>
<th>Sympathetic help towards personal problem</th>
<th>Promotion and Growth in the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>8.46</td>
<td>5.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.61</td>
<td>5.40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.82</td>
<td>5.44</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>Feeling of being in on things</th>
<th>Personal loyalty to employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.6 shows the mean ranks of the ten motivation factors (dependent variables). The motivation factors were ranked from 1 (most important) to 10 (least important) by the all the 160 employees of the company classified as managers and operational level workers for the purpose of the research conducted. Based on the means of each factor, the relative factor rankings are determined (Wiley, 1997). The array of means range from 2.76 to 8.46 for managers and 2.81 to 7.61 for the operational level workers. A mean of 2.76 is
assigned rank of 1, and 8.46 is assigned a rank of 10 for the managers group while 2.81 is assigned the rank of 1 and 7.61 is assigned the rank of 10 for the operational level workers group.

Table 5.7 Ranking of motivation factor by Employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. classified as managers and operational level workers

The ranks are mean values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Factor</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Operational level workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Wages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for work done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful discipline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic help with personal problems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and growth in the organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of being in on things</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal loyalty to employees</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 5.7 represents ranking of each of the 10 motivation factor for the managers and operational level workers. The results show that job security, good wages and
appreciation for work done are the three most important motivation factors for managers while job security, good wages and interesting work are the most important motivation factors for operational level workers. Tactful discipline, personal loyalty to employees and sympathetic help with personal problems are the three least important motivation factors. The managers and operational level employees give nearly similar relative mean ranks to motivation factor. These findings reveal that similar ranking is placed on the motivation factors by the two groups of employees, managers and operational level workers reflecting the similarity in values of the two group of employees thereby contradicting the studies and ideas of the previous researchers who emphasized the difference in preferences of the above motivation factors according the employee demographic, organization level. Ranking placed on good wages and job security reflects the desire of the employees of the company regarding improvement in their wages structure and concern about their emotional and familial well being.

5.2 Analysis of Hypothesis Testing

The hypotheses were formulated to prove whether there was any difference in the ranked preference for each of the selected motivation factor among employees grouped as managers and operational level workers. Ten hypotheses were generated for this study. All the hypotheses make use of non parametric test, Mann-Whitney (Wiley, 1997). Two-tailed significance test is conducted. The results and interpretations reveal whether there is significant difference in the factor means for managers and operational level workers. The analysis is as follows:
Hypothesis 1

Ho1: There is no difference in the ranking preference for good wages among employees classified as managers and operational workers.

Ha1: There is a difference in the ranking preference for good wages among employees classified as managers and operational workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho1 if p<0.05

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for good wages among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho1 will be rejected if p value presented in the table 5.8 is less than 0.05 significance level.

Table 5.8: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for good wages among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good wages</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>3376.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.87</td>
<td>9504.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good wages</th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>2364.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>9504.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.307</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level
Table 5.8 indicates the result of hypothesis testing to show the difference in the ranked preference for good wages among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. classified by organizational level. Since the p-value (two-tailed significance) is 0.759 which is greater than significance level of 0.05, the null hypothesis failed to reject. Hence, there is no difference in the ranked preference for good wages among employee classified as managers and operational level workers.

**Hypothesis 2**

Ho2: There is no difference in the ranking preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational workers.

Ha2: There is a difference in the ranking preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho2 when p<0.05

Null Hypothesis is evaluated by using the Mann Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference of interesting work among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho will be rejected if p value presented in the Table 5.9 is less than 0.05 significance level.
Table 5.9: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76.87</td>
<td>3151.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>81.75</td>
<td>9728.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Interesting work</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>2290.50</td>
<td>3151.50</td>
<td>-.588</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Grouping Variable: Organizational level

The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.9 indicates the p value as 0.556 which is greater than significance level. Hence, null hypothesis failed to reject. This means that there is no statistically significant difference in ranked preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational level workers at the 0.05 significance level.

Hypothesis 3

Ho3: There is no difference in the ranking preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.
Ha3: There is a difference in the ranking preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho3 if $p<0.05$

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for appreciation for good work among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho will be rejected if $p$ value presented in the table 5.10 is less than 0.05 significance level.

Table 5.10: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for work done</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>72.49</td>
<td>2972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>9908.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Appreciation for work done</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2111.000</td>
<td>2972.000</td>
<td>-1.301</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.10 indicates the $p$ value as 0.193 which is greater than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, the null hypothesis failed to reject. This
means that there is no significant difference in ranked preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

**Hypothesis 4**

Ho4 : There is no difference in the ranking preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha4 : There is a difference in the ranking preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho4 if $p<0.05$

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for job security among employees working in Thai Company and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho4 will be rejected if $p$ value presented in the table 5.11 is less than 0.05 significance level.

**Table 5.11 The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77.40</td>
<td>3173.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>81.57</td>
<td>9706.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.11 indicates the p value as 0.611 which is greater than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, null hypothesis failed to reject. This means that there is no significant difference in ranked preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

**Hypothesis 5**

H₀₅ : There is no difference in the ranking preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hₐ₅ : There is a difference in the ranking preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject H₀₅ if p<0.05

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for good working conditions among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. H₀₅ will be rejected if p value presented in the table 5.12 is less than 0.05 significance level.
Table 5.12 The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>79.33</td>
<td>3252.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>80.90</td>
<td>9627.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good working conditions</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2391.500</td>
<td>3252.500</td>
<td>-.190</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.12 indicates the two-tail significance as 0.849 which is greater than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, null hypothesis failed to reject. This means that there is no significant difference in ranked preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Hypothesis 6

Ho6: There is no difference in the ranking preference for tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational workers.

Ha6: There is a difference in the ranking preference for tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational workers.
Decision Rule: Reject Ho6 if \( p < 0.05 \)

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for tactful discipline among employees working in Thai Company and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho6 will be rejected if \( p \) value presented in the table 5.13 is less than 0.05 significance level.

**Table 5.13: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for Tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactful Discipline</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>3101.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>9779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Test Statistics(a)**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Tactful Discipline</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2240.000</td>
<td>3101.000</td>
<td>-0.788</td>
<td>0.431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*a Grouping Variable: Organizational level*

The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.13 indicates the \( p \) value as 0.431 which is greater than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, null hypothesis failed to reject. This means that there is no significant difference in ranked preference for tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational workers.
Hypothesis 7

Ho7: There is no difference in the ranking preference for sympathetic help towards personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha7: There is a difference in the ranking preference for sympathetic help towards personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho7 if $p<0.05$

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for sympathetic help towards personal problems among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho7 will be rejected if p value presented in the table 5.14 is less than 0.05 significance level.

Table 5.14: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for Sympathetic help with personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic help towards</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98.07</td>
<td>4021.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>personal problem</td>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>8859.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.14 indicates the p value as 0.004 which is less than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, null hypothesis is rejected. This means that there is a significant difference in ranked preference for sympathetic help with personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational workers. According to the mean ranks, the operational level employees place more value on the sympathetic help towards personal problems.

Hypothesis 8

Ho8 : There is no difference in the ranking preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha8 : There is a difference in the ranking preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho8 if p<0.05

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by
organizational level. Ho8 will be rejected if p value presented in the table 5.15 is less than 0.05 significance level.

Table 5.15: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organization level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and Growth in the organization</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.06</td>
<td>3364.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.96</td>
<td>9515.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion and Growth in the organization</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2375.500</td>
<td>9515.500</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.15 indicates the p value as 0.801 which is greater than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, null hypothesis failed to reject. This means that there is no significant difference in ranked preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational workers.
Hypothesis 9

Ho9: There is no difference in the ranking preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha9: There is a difference in the ranking preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho9 if \( p < 0.05 \)

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for feeling of being in on things among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho will be rejected if p value presented in the table 5.16 is less than 0.05 significance level.

Table 5.16: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of being in on things</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td>3051.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>82.60</td>
<td>9829.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Feeling of being in on things</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>2190.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>3051.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.990</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.16 indicates the p value as 0.322 which is greater than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, null hypothesis failed to reject. This means that there is no significant difference in ranked preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational workers.

Hypothesis 10

Ho10: There is no difference in the ranking preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Ha10: There is a difference in the ranking preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

Decision Rule: Reject Ho10 if p<0.05

Null Hypothesis is evaluated using the Mann-Whitney Test to find whether a difference exists in the ranked preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., classified by organizational level. Ho will be rejected if p value presented in the table 5.17 is less than 0.05 significance level.
Table 5.17: The analysis of the difference in the ranking preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal loyalty to employees</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>81.55</td>
<td>3343.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>9536.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Personal loyalty to employees</th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>2396.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>9536.500</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.864</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Grouping Variable: Organizational level

The Mann-Whitney test analysis in Table 5.17 indicates the p value as 0.864 which is greater than significance level of 0.05. Therefore, null hypothesis is failed to reject. This means that there is no significant difference in ranked preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.
## 5.3 Summary of Hypothesis Tests

### Table 5.18 Summary of the Mann-Whitney tests

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis Statement</th>
<th>Statistical test</th>
<th>Significant value (2 tailed)</th>
<th>Result</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho1: There is no difference in the ranking preference for good wages among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney Test</td>
<td>0.759</td>
<td>Failed to reject Ho1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha1: There is a difference in the ranking preference for good wages among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho2: There is no difference in the ranking preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney Test</td>
<td>0.556</td>
<td>Failed to reject Ho2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha2: There is a difference in the ranking preference for interesting work among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho3: There is no difference in the ranking preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann Whitney Test</td>
<td>0.193</td>
<td>Failed to reject Ho3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ha3: There is a difference in the ranking preference for appreciation for work done among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis</td>
<td>Null Hypothesis</td>
<td>Alternative Hypothesis</td>
<td>Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>----------------</td>
<td>------------------------</td>
<td>------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho4:</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranking preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>There is a difference in the ranking preference for job security among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann Whitney Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho5:</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranking preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>There is a difference in the ranking preference for good working conditions among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann Whitney Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho6:</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranking preference for tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>There is a difference in the ranking preference for tactful discipline among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann Whitney Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho7:</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranking preference for sympathetic help with personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>There is a difference in the ranking preference for sympathetic help with personal problem among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann Whitney Test</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ho8:</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranking preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>There is a difference in the ranking preference for promotion and growth in the organization among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.</td>
<td>Mann Whitney Test</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Hypothesis 9

\text{H}_{0:9}: \text{There is no difference in the ranking preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.}

\text{H}_{a:9}: \text{There is a difference in the ranking preference for feeling of being in on things among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.}

\text{Test:} \text{Mann Whitney Test} \quad 0.322 \quad \text{Failed to reject } \text{Ho}_{0:9}

Hypothesis 10

\text{H}_{0:10}: \text{There is no difference in the ranking preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.}

\text{H}_{a:10}: \text{There is a difference in the ranking preference for personal loyalty to employees among employees classified as managers and operational level workers.}

\text{Test:} \text{Mann Whitney Test} \quad 0.864 \quad \text{Failed to reject } \text{Ho}_{10}
CHAPTER VI
SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

This chapter summarizes and concludes the research results and findings along with the recommendations made in this study. It consists of four sections. The first section is the interpretation of results or the summary of findings. The second section will comprise the discussions about findings. The third section is the recommendations for the research. The last section is the suggestions for future research.

6.1 Summary of the findings

The main purpose of this study was to find the differences in the ranked preference for motivation factors among employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. sub-grouped by organizational level. There were ten hypotheses to be proved by using Mann-Whitney, a nonparametric test. Descriptive statistics was used to find the mean ranks of each of the motivation factor provided by the managers and operational level workers and from the results, relative ranks were assigned to the motivation factors. The demographic profile of the employees working in the company was analyzed using frequency tables.

From the analysis of the demographic profile of the employees, it was found that there are 41 employees at the managerial level and 119 employees working at the operational level. Managerial level employees are grouped as top, middle and low level employees. Top level has 12 employees, middle level has 10 employees and low level has 19 employees.
Majority of the employees belong to the following groups according to the demographics:

Gender – male

Age - 21-30 years

Income – 20,000 Baht or below / month

Organizational level – operational level workers

Work experience – 2 to 4 years

Table 6.1 Ranking of motivation factors by Employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. classified as managers and operational level workers

The ranks are mean values.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Factor</th>
<th>Managers</th>
<th>Operational level workers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good Wages</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for work done</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Tactful discipline</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sympathetic help with personal problems</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>10</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion and growth in the organization</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of being in on things</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Findings from the descriptive statistics reveal that for the managers the highest ranked motivation factor is job security followed by good wages, appreciation for work done, interesting work, good working conditions, promotion and growth in the organization, feeling of being in on things, tactful discipline, personal loyalty to employees and the least important motivation factor sympathetic help with personal problems. For the operational level workers the most important motivation factors is job security followed by good wages, interesting work, appreciation for work done, good working conditions, promotion and growth in the organization, feeling of being in on things, personal loyalty to employees, tactful discipline and sympathetic help with personal problems.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hypothesis</th>
<th>Statistical test</th>
<th>Results</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 1</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for good wages among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 2</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for interesting work among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 3</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for appreciation for work done among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 4</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for job security among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 5</td>
<td>Mann-Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for good working conditions among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 6</td>
<td>Mann- Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for tactful discipline among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>------------</td>
<td>--------------</td>
<td>-----------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------------</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 7</td>
<td>Mann- Whitney</td>
<td>There is a difference in the ranked preference sympathetic help with personal problems among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 8</td>
<td>Mann- Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for promotion and growth in the organization among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 9</td>
<td>Mann- Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for feeling of being in on things among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hypothesis 10</td>
<td>Mann- Whitney</td>
<td>There is no difference in the ranked preference for personal loyalty to employees among managers and operational level workers.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6.2 shows the results of the ten hypotheses used to test the difference in the ranked preference for each motivation factor among the two groups. The results suggest that all the hypotheses are failed to reject except hypothesis 7 which is rejected. This proves that there is no difference in the ranked preference of each of the motivation factor among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. classified by organizational level, except Hypothesis 7 which states that there is significant difference in the ranked preference for sympathetic help with personal problem among managers and operational level workers.

6.2 Discussion and Conclusion

According to the results of hypothesis testing, it was found that all the tests failed to reject the null hypothesis except for hypothesis 7, thereby proving that there is no difference in ranked preference of each motivation factor among the managers and
operational level workers employed in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., except the factor sympathetic help for personal problems where a difference in ranked preference exists. The mean ranks for sympathetic help with personal problems for operational level workers is lower than that of the managers suggesting that the operational level workers place more importance towards this factor compared to managers. Hypothesis testing proves that there is significant difference between the two groups for sympathetic help with personal problems. However, the relative ranks assigned to the motivation factors for the two groups, manager and operational level workers differ for some of the factors. This is because the ranked means of each motivation factor is compared with other factors' means in order to assign relative ranks to the motivation factors within the group.

The Hypotheses testing that proves no difference in the ranked preference of each motivation factors among employees working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. contradicts the viewpoint of Kovach (1987) who argued that preferences of motivation factors can differ according to employee demographics. Kovach (1987), Couger (1988) and Wong et al. (1999) findings revealed difference in motivational preference among employees grouped according to organizational level. The research conducted by Kovach (1987) showed the difference in preference for interesting work, appreciation for work done, good wages and job security among the employees grouped according to the organizational level. According to the research conducted by Wong et al. (1999), the employees belonging to the managerial group differed statistically for the motivation factors job security, feeling of being in on things and promotion and growth in the organization when compared to the other organizational groups. This proves that the
factors that motivate employees differed according to the context in which an employee works.

The results of descriptive statistics suggest the importance of job security and good wages. Good wages and job security were also among the top three motivation factors in the research conducted by Wiley (1997) on the 550 industrial employees of U.S.A. The research conducted by Kovach (1980, 1987) on the U.S. industrial employees suggested the importance of interesting work. According to the research conducted by Wong et al. (1999) on the Hong Kong hotel employees, the most important motivators for opportunity for advancement and growth. The researches conducted by Wiley (1997) and Kovach (1980, 1987) places average importance to good working conditions similar to the ranking placed on this factor in the research conducted. The research also confirms the low ranked preference for sympathetic help with personal problems as revealed in the research conducted by Kovach (1987), Couger (1988), Wiley (1997) and Wong et al. (1999).

There is no difference in the ranking for good wages and job security among the managers and operational level workers signifying importance of the need of job security for both group of employees and also importance of higher wages and salaries. The operational level workers are the low wage employees who have limited financial resources. Hence valuing money over other factors is justified but the managerial level employees especially the top level employees concern for money as a motivator is questionable but since most of the manager are expatriates, it would be reasonable to justify the importance laid on good wages by them.
The ranking of the motivation factors for operational level employees is not in conformity with Maslow’s need hierarchy theory. Most important factor is job security which is a safety factor and the management should address this first. Next most important factor is good wages which is a physiological factor. The third most important factor is interesting work which is a self actualizing factor. The fourth ranked motivator is appreciation for work done and this is an esteem factor according to Maslow. The order of these factors is contrary to what Maslow’s theory suggests. The ranking of motivation factors under this study also contradicts the Herzberg’s two-factor theory which states that intrinsic factors such as job itself, responsibility, recognition etc. are the most important factors that motivate employees leading to job satisfaction. The two most important factors revealed under this research that motivate the respondents are extrinsic factors such as job security and good wages. These two factors hold the most value in motivating the employees of the company to perform their best.

6.3 Recommendations

The results of the study indicate that job security and good wages are the most important motivators for the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd., irrespective of any organizational level they belong to. Job security and good wages are the low level needs according to the Maslow’s need hierarchy theory. These needs are the basic needs of a person and have to be satisfied before the person moves on to the higher level needs. Employees are motivated by what they lack and value most. Hence the importance of these two factors indicate that the employees at managerial level or operational level would like to earn better wages or salaries and would also like to have
assurance of job security. Importance of job security and good wages also indicates the desire to improve, maintain or sustain a better standard of living for the employees working in the company. The results also show lack of interest towards sympathetic help with personal problems and personal loyalty to employees.

From the findings of this research the researcher would like to make the following recommendations which would benefit the management of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. The recommendations for effectively making use of the motivation factors according to the importance place by the employees are given as follows for the managers and operational level workers:

**Managers**

Job security is the most important motivation factor for the Managers working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. Job insecurity can result in weak work commitment and low organizational effectiveness (Wiley, 1997). One of the ways to remove job insecurity could be by raising managers’ personal and professional self esteem by recognizing their performance since appreciation for work done is one of the most important motivation factor for the managers. Motivation through Job security could be improved through career development schemes for employees such as training programs for the managers so as improve on the employees marketable skills. Lower and middle level managerial employees should be encouraged to undertake further education and the company should provide the employees with education allowance. Job redesign could build challenge and opportunity into work itself and could lead to lowering of job insecurity through employee engagement in the work. Job enrichment, which is,
assigning the employees responsibility for scheduling, coordination and planning work activities could lead to motivated managers (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000). High involvement in the work could result in the feeling of job security among managers. Managers’ work could also be made more interesting through job enlargement such as increasing the number of tasks to be performed. Motivating employee is the ability to match the job to an individual and hence management must take this factor into account while designing jobs for the employees. More involvement of the managers at all the levels of the organization in the company's decisions can also build confidence of managers and create organizational commitment.

Since good wages is the second most important motivation factor, an effective compensation package is critical. Pay fulfills physiological need and boosts self esteem of the employees. The management should provide reassurance of salary raises. Money is what most employees need most from their work and hence it motivates them to perform better. People would always like to earn more so as to improve on their standard of living especially with the rise in inflation.

The company should have a flexible compensation system. It could offer managers choice of commission, royalties, travel prizes or group rewards- gain sharing or profit sharing. The management should allow managerial employees to pick and choose their own remuneration package. This way the employee gets what he or she values most. They should be offered a choice of compensation system that motivates them to perform their best. Every package should suggest to an employee an equal reward for equal achievement so that the employee feels equity regarding compensation. Commission can be used to motivate the sales force team so as to increase the sales of the company.
Royalties can be offered to the R&D department employees. Bonus can be paid for performance. Pensions, insurance or healthcare schemes would show the concern of the management regarding the welfare of employees.

Even if compensation is closely tied to performance, motivational impact of additional compensation is short-lived. Some employees may respond with some extra effort at their job with increase in compensation but others could regard increased compensation as a reward for past performance. The effect of good wages on future performance cannot be confirmed (Jeffords, Scheidt & Thibadoux, 1997). The management can modify the timing of compensation increases. Rewards for good performance may be awarded on a quarterly basis rather than once a year. The Company could consider scheduling professional training programs during periods when compensation increases are not ordinarily available to help prolong the motivational impact of monetary incentives.

Appreciation for work done is the third most important motivation factor for the managers. More challenging work for well performing managers, more control over the work environment and promotion from within policy could be used as a motivational technique for motivating managers to show appreciation for their work done. Various motivational techniques could be used for the factor appreciation for work done to motivate the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. Management can make use of verbal communication as a means to motivate employees through the appreciation factor. Publicly recognizing outstanding workers, publishing examples of good performance through articles in company magazines, employee of the month incentives to motivate staff, thank you letter and small cash incentive, work place visits
by top executives to high performance employees, personal handwritten notes of thanks accompanying paychecks, telephone calls at home to employees by senior management, acknowledge accomplishment with written evaluation, gifts, gift certificate for popular stores, extra support during difficult times and flexible schedule options could all motivate the employees of the company. Even a pat at the back of an employee is simplest way of recognition.

Managers can get motivated by good working conditions such as well decorated office, good canteens, recreation activities and good working environment that fosters cordial relations with superiors and peers.

Operational level workers

Job security is the most important motivation factor for the operational level workers in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. This shows the concern of the workers about the emotional and familial wellbeing associated with their job security. Job security is directly related to productivity (Wiley, 1997) and therefore the management has to pay heed to this factor and create motivational program to remove the element of insecurity from the mind of the employees. Job insecurity can lead to low self esteem, low confidence, anxiety, powerless & social isolation of the employee. Employees need reassurance about job security, health and stability of the organization. Since Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. belongs to Petro-Chemical Industry which is a specialized industry, highly specialized jobs lead to boredom and job insecurity which could affect job dissatisfaction. Skilled labor employed at the factory desire more interesting jobs and higher wages as shown by the ranking provided by the employees.
Higher involvement in the job or interesting job thorough job rotation could probably lower the job insecurity factor and lead to a motivated workgroup.

The management of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company Ltd. should motivate the employees through job security by giving assurance for job employees. The management should review existing job and consider redesigning them where appropriate so as to add variety and challenge.

Good wages is the second most important motivation factor which could be prior need of the employees since the company employs skilled workers who demand higher salaries compared to unskilled workers. Also with inflation setting in, there is a tendency for workers to desire higher salaries above the wage level set by government. Salary is an important issue in for the employees and so the company should consider the importance of this factor and increase the salaries of the workers over a period of time. The management should provide reassurance of salary raises. Wages or salaries of the employees should experience growth over a period and surpass the growth in inflation (Wall Street Journal, 2004).

Management should keep the wages and salaries of the employees above the minimum wage level laid down by the Government. Salary, the rate of salary increase, and annual bonus should be based on industry conditions or according to the profit earnings of the company (Wall Street Journal, 1989). The well performing employees can get a higher raise for their contribution towards the achievement of organizational goals.

Interesting work is the third most important motivation factor for operational level workers. The management should therefore review existing job and consider redesigning them where appropriate so as to add variety and challenge. The research conducted by
Wyatt Watson Company (2004) suggested that 50% of the Thai employees could quit their job in a big organization for interesting work offered somewhere else (Bangkok Post, 2004). Job Rotation motivational techniques could be used by the management for making job more interesting for the operational level workers if appropriate. Job rotation can be practiced to move an operational level employee from one job to another for a short period of time to avoid boredom of routine job (McShane & Von Glinow, 2000). Tailoring each employee’s work with his/her specific needs will allow for higher intrinsic motivation which would help the organization attract and retain the most talented employees (Buhler, 2003).

Appreciation for work done is the fourth most important motivating factor for the operational level workers of the company. Employees value self awareness of how they perform at their jobs through confirmation of superiors in the organization. Workers want to be appreciated and should be given recognition for good performance when they deserve it. Workers can be motivated in the same way as the motivational techniques used for appreciation of work done as mentioned before for the managers. Appreciation for the work done is the cheapest and one of the most effective ways to motivate employees. This factor is an intrinsic motivation factor and will make employees expend more efforts (Wong et al., 1999). Employees need regular feedback in the form of praise or constructive criticism regarding their work performance.

Appreciation for the work done would enhance personal and professional esteem. The average worker is generally overlooked. Since all the workers are involved in daily operations of the company, it is necessary to appreciate their work (Wiley, 1997). A
company can have economic restraints towards paying more to their employees but there are none or nominal economic restraints associated with appreciation for work done.

Good working conditions were given mediocre ranking by the employees. The management can conduct an environmental analysis and make improvements in the environment so as to provide safe and healthy working conditions for the employees (Kovach, 1987). Good machinery, pollution free environment (such as exhaust and odors) through good ventilation, safety control measures and pleasant and manageable working hours will enhance motivation of operational level employees.

Employees compare their fairness in pay, promotion, status and recognition with those of the peers doing similar tasks. The employees will improve their performance if the feeling of equity exists in the motivators else they will be less willing to exert effort at work (Wong, 1999). Hence it is important for Management to look into this aspect along with the consideration of the motivation factors that the employees value. Fairness in treating employee is a must while making use of the motivational techniques so as to bring about improved performance and low employee turnover.

The management usually concentrates on improving the bottom line results. They deal with employees as inputs in the production process rather than concentrating on what makes the employees really need. Since goal of every management is to increase production and efficiency to reach maximum results, care should be taken to understand the needs, abilities and attitudes of the employees so as to have a motivated workforce. Conducting surveys regarding what motivates employees to work is important to create an environment that encourages employee motivation (Wiley, 1997).
Effective employee motivation is one the managers most difficult and important duties. Successfully motivating employees will lead to increased productivity, reduced costs and customer satisfaction. Understanding of the psychological processes is necessary to guide the employees towards accomplishing organizational goals (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2004).

Everyone needs some form of motivation. Whether organization size is large or small, the manager should get the best from his employees. Motivation is something that is approached differently by different businesses and responsibility of having a motivated workforce lies with all immediate supervisors and senior personnel. This survey should be regularly administered every 2-3 years so as to formulate the right motivational programs for the employees of the company since employee needs vary over time. The employees can prove to be the company’s greatest asset when they are well motivated.

6.4 Further Studies

This study examined the difference in the ranked preference for the motivation factors among employees classified as managers and operational level workers. There can be various studies which can be conducted in the near future regarding:

1. This research is concerned with the employee demographic, organizational level. Further researches may take into consideration the impact of employees demographics, such as gender, age, income level, work experience, etc. on the ranked preference of motivation factors.

2. This research was concerned with the ten motivation factors framed by Kovach (1980) but further studies may take consideration all the intrinsic and extrinsic
factors mentioned in Herzberg's two-factor theory. The influence of the motivation factors on job satisfaction and dissatisfaction should be studied. The validity of two-factor theory may be proved with respect to the current environment.

3. Aspects of organizational context should also be studied in the future as one of the motivation factors in making the workers perform their best towards accomplishing organizational goals.

4. This research was conducted on the employees of Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company, Ltd. Further studies can be extended to the employees working in other companies in Thailand. Research may be conducted to study the attitudes of the Thai employees concerning the job motivators.
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Questionnaire

This questionnaire has been made for the collection of primary data to be used as part of my Masters thesis entitled “A Study of Difference in Preference for Motivation Factors among Employees Working in Thai Epoxy and Allied Products Company, Ltd.”. The purpose of the questionnaire is to determine ranked importance of the motivating factors studied under the research. This questionnaire provides you with a chance to express your viewpoint towards what really motivates you to perform better and work harder. Please fill in the questionnaire according to what you truly feel about each motivating factor given below. The information provided by you will be kept as “Strictly Confidential” and will be used only for academic purposes.

Thank you.

Part I : Demographic profile of employees

Please put a tick (✓) mark in front of the right answer.

1. Gender
   - Male
   - Female

2. Age
   - 21-30 years old
   - 31-40 years old
   - 41-50 years old
   - 51 years or above

3. Income level
   - Below or equal to 20,000 Baht per month
   - 20,001 - 40,000 Baht per month
   - 40,001 – 60,000 Baht per month
   - 60,001 Baht per month or above
4. Organizational level
   - Top level
   - Middle level
   - Lower level
   - Operational level

5. Number of years in Work
   - Less than 2 years
   - 2 - 4 years
   - 5 - 7 years
   - 8 years or above

Part II: Ranking of the motivation factors

This section provides you with the 10 motivation factors focused in the current research. Please rank these factors from 1 to 10, 1 for most important to 10 for least important. One rank cannot be used for more than one factor and all factors need to be ranked.

Motivation factors

- Good wages
- Interesting work
- Appreciation for work done
- Job security
- Good working conditions
- Tactful discipline
- Sympathetic help with personal problems
- Promotion and growth in the organization
- Feeling of being in on things
- Personal loyalty to employees
Note: enclosed herein are the meanings of all the motivation factors so as to enhance the understanding of the factors to be ranked.

Motivation: the will to achieve or an internal force to satisfy an unsatisfied need.

Motivation factors: factors which direct a person to work harder and improve performance.

Good wages: Good wages is the money received by an employee in exchange of his/her work arising from employment which should benefit the employee and should be above minimum wage rate laid down by the government.

Interesting work: A work providing sense of meaning and identity, making best use of abilities and developing potential.

Appreciation for work done: Feedback (direct and clear information about the work performed) and recognition (praise) for the work done.

Job security: employees’ confidence in retaining his/her job or status in the organization.

Good working conditions: Safe and healthy workplace with good working environment such as good machinery, pleasant working hours, workplace layout, etc.

Tactful discipline: use of some form of sanction or punishment when employee deviates from rules (company policies, administrative practices, etc.)

Sympathetic help with personal problems: managing a balance between personal life and work life.

Promotion and growth in the organization: A movement to higher level position in the organization. It is concerned with accomplishment, achievement, learning and development.

Feeling of being in on things: freedom for decision making, scheduling and determining work procedures, etc.

Personal loyalty to employees: respect and trust received by the employee from employer, manager or superiors in the organization.
แบบสอบถาม

แบบสอบถามนี้ จัดทำขึ้นสำหรับเก็บข้อมูลเบื้องต้น เพื่อใช้เป็นส่วนหนึ่งของการวิจัยในหัวข้อเรื่อง “การศึกษาเปรียบเทียบ ความสำคัญของปัจจัยทางสังคมที่เป็นแรงจูงใจของพนักงาน ที่ทำงานในบริษัทไทยอิปิตช์ แอคเคิล ไอดี โปรดัคชั่น จำกัด” วัตถุประสงค์ของแบบสอบถามนี้ คือ เพื่อกำหนดระดับความสำคัญของปัจจัยที่เป็นแรงจูงใจที่ทำให้การศึกษาการให้การวิจัยนี้แบบสอบถามนี้จึงจำเป็นที่จะให้ชัดเจนว่าที่พนักงานนั้นๆ จุดยึดใจในสิ่งที่ทำให้เป็น “ความต้องการ” อย่างแข็งค์รัด และจะใช้เพื่อวัตถุประสงค์ทางการศึกษาเท่านั้น

ขอคุณในความร่วมมือของคุณ

ส่วนที่ 1 ประวัติส่วนตัวของพนักงาน
การใส่เครื่องหมาย (✓) หน้าคำตอบที่กำหนดแล้ว

1. เพศ
   ( ) ชาย
   ( ) หญิง

2. อายุ
   ( ) 21-30 ปี
   ( ) 31-40 ปี
   ( ) 41-50 ปี
   ( ) 51 ปีขึ้นไป

3. ระดับรายได้
   ( ) ต่ำกว่า หรือเท่ากับ 20,000 บาทต่อเดือน
   ( ) 20,001 - 40,000 บาทต่อเดือน
   ( ) 40,001 - 60,000 บาทต่อเดือน
   ( ) มากกว่า หรือเท่ากับ 60,001 ต่อเดือน
4. ระดับของค่า
   ( ) ระดับสูง
   ( ) ระดับกลาง
   ( ) ระดับต่ำ
   ( ) ระดับปฏิบัติการ

5. จำนวนปีที่ทำงาน
   ( ) น้อยกว่า 2 ปี
   ( ) 2-4 ปี
   ( ) 5-7 ปี
   ( ) เท่ากับ หรือ มากกว่า 8 ปี

ส่วนที่ 2: ระดับของปัจจัยที่เป็นแรงจูงใจ
ส่วนนี้จะกำหนดปัจจัยที่เป็นแรงจูงใจให้ท่าน 10 ปัจจัยที่สำคัญในการจับ
กรุณาระจัดลำดับปัจจัยเหล่านี้
ตั้งแต่ลำดับที่ 1 ถึงลำดับที่ 10 โดยให้ลำดับที่ 1 เป็นแรงจูงใจที่สำคัญมากที่สุด และลำดับที่ 10
เป็นแรงจูงใจที่มีความสำคัญน้อยที่สุด

ปัจจัยที่เป็นแรงจูงใจ
  - ความคิด
  - งานน่าสนใจ
  - มีความพอใจในงานที่ทำ
  - ความมั่นคงของงาน
  - สถานที่ทำงานดี
  - ระเบียบวินัยดี
  - การให้ความช่วยเหลือปัญหาต่างๆ
  - การสื่อสารที่หนึ่งและความสัมพันธ์ในองค์กร
  - ความรู้สึกมีส่วนร่วม
  - ความชิโรงต่อหน้างาน
สิ่งที่ทำให้ความตั้งใจที่จะทำให้สำเร็จ หรือ
การผลิตความคิดในเพื่อทำให้ความต่อเนื่องในการไม่มีทางใดเป็นความพี่พอใจ
ปัจจุบัน ปัจจัยที่ส่งผลกระทบต่อมีให้ผลในทางหน้าฟ้าและบริบทผลการที่ทำให้เกิด

เนื่องจากอาจารย์ (ที่เหมาะสม) เป็นผลประโยชน์ที่สูงซึ่งได้รับการซ้ำทาง (การทำ)
ซึ่งความสุราภิบาลการจ้างส่งต่อที่สำคัญโดยวิจารณ์

งานนี้ งานที่ให้ความรู้สึกว่ามีความหมาย ทำหมายและมีชื่อเสียง การทำงานอย่างเต็มความสามารถ
และการได้พัฒนาความสามารถที่อยู่ภายใน

การย้ายศิษย์ เมื่อทำงานเสร็จ ผลตอบกลับ (ข้อมูลทางตรงและชัดเจนเกี่ยวกับงานที่ได้ทำสำเร็จ) การจำได้
(สาระสิริ) เมื่อทำงานเสร็จ

ความมั่นใจในงาน ความมั่นใจของพนักงานในการวางแผนของชาหรือเรือ หรือ สถานในองค์การ
เรียกใช้การทำงานดี เวลาทำงานที่ปลอดภัยและง่าย พร้อมด้วยสภาพแวดล้อมการทำงานที่ดี
เช่นเครื่องจักรปั้น, ช่างภายในทำนองที่พอใจ, มีของสถานที่ทำงาน, ฯลฯ

ระเบียบวินัยของพนักงานต่ำแบบ การใช้รูปแบบทางไกล เมื่อพนักงานไม่ทำตามกฎ (นโยบายรัฐก
วิธีการปกครอง ราย)

ความสามารถที่เข้าถึงเพื่อฝึกกับปัญหาที่พบตลอด
การบริหารความพยายามต่างๆชี้วัดสถานะและชีวิตการทำงาน
การเลือกสิ่งที่มีและผลผลิตในน้ำที่ทำงาน การทำให้ผู้ต้องการจะบังคับในองค์การ
ซึ่งเป็นเรื่องที่เกิดขึ้นกับความสามารถและการได้รับผลสำเร็จ
การเติบโตเป็นการทำงานที่มีการขั้นตอนในการขยับข้รและผลผลิต

ความรู้สึกของการเป็นสิ่งเล็ก ยิ่งในการตัดสินใจ การจัดการและการกำหนดขั้นตอนการทำงาน

ความรู้สึกการสนใจของพนักงาน ความผ่อนคลายและความรู้สึกใจที่พนักงานได้รับความข้าง ผู้จัดการ
หรือผู้มีตำแหน่งสูงกว้างในองค์การ

SISUTHEP UNIVERSITY
THAILAND
SINCE 1969

มหาวิทยาลัยธัญบัตร
APPENDIX B
(Frequencies and mean ranks)
## Frequencies

### Statistics

#### Gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>126</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
<td>78.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>21.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>21-30</td>
<td>96</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
<td>60.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-40</td>
<td>51</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>31.9</td>
<td>91.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>41-50</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>98.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>51 or above</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Income level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,000 or below</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
<td>73.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 40,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>11.3</td>
<td>85.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40,001 - 60,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>92.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>60,001 or above</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organization level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Top level</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Middle level</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Low level</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operation al level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>74.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Statistics

Work experience

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>N</th>
<th>Valid</th>
<th>Missing</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Work experience</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td>Less than 2 years</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>25.6</td>
<td>25.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 4 years</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>42.5</td>
<td>42.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 7 years</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>11.9</td>
<td>11.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8 years or above</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>20.0</td>
<td>20.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Means

Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Good wages * Organizational level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work * Organizational level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for work done * Organizational level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job Security * Organizational level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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### Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>Good wages</th>
<th>Interesting work</th>
<th>Appreciation for work done</th>
<th>Job Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>3.66</td>
<td>4.20</td>
<td>3.76</td>
<td>2.76</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>3.72</td>
<td>4.29</td>
<td>4.37</td>
<td>2.81</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>3.71</td>
<td>4.27</td>
<td>4.21</td>
<td>2.79</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good working conditions *</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational level Tactful Discipline *</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational level Sympathetic help towards personal problem *</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Organizational level Promotion and Growth in the organization *</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>160</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Organizational level

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good working conditions</th>
<th>Tactful Discipline</th>
<th>Sympathetic help towards personal problem</th>
<th>Promotion and Growth in the organization</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>5.24</td>
<td>7.02</td>
<td>8.46</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>5.29</td>
<td>7.29</td>
<td>7.61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.28</td>
<td>7.22</td>
<td>7.82</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Case Processing Summary

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Cases</th>
<th>Included</th>
<th>Excluded</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>N</td>
<td>Percent</td>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feeling of being in on things * Organizational level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal loyalty to employees * Organizational level</td>
<td>160</td>
<td>100.0%</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Mean

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>Feeling of being in on things</th>
<th>Personal loyalty to employees</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>6.73</td>
<td>7.34</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>6.97</td>
<td>7.18</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>workers</td>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>6.91</td>
<td>7.22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Gender

Age

Frequency

Gender

Age

Frequency
Income level

Organizational level

Organizational level
Mann-Whitney Test

### Good wages

#### Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good wages Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.34</td>
<td>3376.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.87</td>
<td>9504.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

#### Test Statistics (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Good wages</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2364.000</td>
<td>9504.000</td>
<td>-.307</td>
<td>.759</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Grouping Variable: Organizational level

### Interesting work

#### Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Interesting work</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>76.87</td>
<td>3151.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>81.75</td>
<td>9728.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Interesting work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>2290.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>3151.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.588</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.556</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

Appreciation for work done

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Appreciation for work done</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>72.49</td>
<td>2972.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>83.26</td>
<td>9908.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Appreciation for work done</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>2111.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>2972.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-1.301</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.193</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

Job Security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job Security</td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>77.40</td>
<td>3173.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td></td>
<td>81.57</td>
<td>9706.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Job Security</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>2312.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>3173.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.509</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.611</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

Good working conditions

Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Good working conditions</td>
<td>managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>79.33</td>
<td>3252.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>80.90</td>
<td>9627.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Good working conditions</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Mann-Whitney U</td>
<td>2391.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Wilcoxon W</td>
<td>3252.500</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Z</td>
<td>-.190</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</td>
<td>.849</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

Tactful Discipline

Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Tactful Discipline</td>
<td>managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>75.63</td>
<td>3101.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>82.18</td>
<td>9779.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics(a)</th>
<th>Tactful Discipline</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mann-Whitney U</strong></td>
<td>2240.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilcoxon W</strong></td>
<td>3101.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>-.788</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.431</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level

### Sympathetic help towards personal problem

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Ranks</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Sympathetic help</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>towards personal</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>problem</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>98.07</td>
<td>4021.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Operational level</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>74.45</td>
<td>8859.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>workers</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistics(a)</th>
<th>Sympathetic help towards personal problem</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Mann-Whitney U</strong></td>
<td>1719.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Wilcoxon W</strong></td>
<td>8859.000</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Z</strong></td>
<td>-2.870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</strong></td>
<td>.004</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

a Grouping Variable: Organizational level
## Promotion and Growth in the organization

### Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Promotion and Growth in the organization</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>82.06</td>
<td>3364.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>79.96</td>
<td>9515.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Statistics (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Promotion and Growth in the organization</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2375.500</td>
<td>9515.500</td>
<td>-.252</td>
<td>.801</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

(a) Grouping Variable: Organizational level

## Feeling of being in on things

### Ranks

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Feeling of being in on things</th>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td></td>
<td>41</td>
<td>74.41</td>
<td>3051.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td></td>
<td>119</td>
<td>82.60</td>
<td>9829.00</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td></td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Test Statistics (a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Test Statistic</th>
<th>Feeling of being in on things</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2190.000</td>
<td>3051.000</td>
<td>-.990</td>
<td>.322</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Personal loyalty to employees

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Organizational level</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean Rank</th>
<th>Sum of Ranks</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Personal loyalty to employees</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Managers</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>81.55</td>
<td>3343.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Operational level workers</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>80.14</td>
<td>9536.50</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>160</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Test Statistics(a)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Personal loyalty to employees</th>
<th>Mann-Whitney U</th>
<th>Wilcoxon W</th>
<th>Z</th>
<th>Asymp. Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>2396.500</td>
<td>9536.500</td>
<td>-.171</td>
<td>.864</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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