PROBLEMS OF MOTIVATION AS A FUNCTION OF MANAGEMENT IN ORGANIZATIONS FROM THE SOCIAL SECTOR

Assist. prof. Velikova, P., PhD
Faculty of Management and Business Development – Angel Kanchev “University of Ruse”, Ruse, Bulgaria
pvelikova@uni-ruse.bg

Abstract: Organizational management in the social sector includes several main functions and the motivation is one of them. It can influence the success of the company negatively or positively, therefore it takes an important role. Motivation is based on various types of needs arranged in those models, approaches and theories. The multiple attempts to explain it have not come up to a single scientific explanation that is equally suitable for all organizations. Furthermore, the needs of motivation change due to factors like the dynamic environment in which companies today function. The globalization also produces new opportunities and risks for the motivation. The current material will attempt to collect and compare various motivational theories, and present some existing issues. Although there are similarities between the works of scientists in this direction, so far there is no universally applied guide for managers. Considering the changing needs of the management in terms of motivating their personnel, it is necessary to explore what problems are present in the motivation and search for possible solutions for them.
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1. Introduction

According to Murray and Holmes, the environment changes dynamically and faster than ever which is the situation in which organizations today have to work, exist and develop. As a consequence, all the functions of the management are subject to being reviewed and reconsidered. Motivation, as a management function, is also influenced by them. Since all people are different and have unique thoughts, feelings and act differently, motivating workers takes place in various ways. It is important, because managers have to perform it every day [Gordon, J., 2002] and the company achievements are related to it. Nbu suggests that that employees’ performance can be explained mostly with motivation and ability. He defines motivation as the enthusiasm and persistence which a person shows while performing a certain task while the ability relates to the competence of the performer. According to various authors, motivation can be defined as a goal directed behavior driven by internal and external forces that determine the direction, level and persistence of one’s efforts at the workplace [Nbu quotes Nelson and Quick, 2003, Luthans, 1998, and Pinder, 1998; Robbins, 2001]. Motivation is claimed to be "an internal psychological process”. The same source provides also a definition for it, similar to the one present here above in this material, and it reviews the three levels of motivational determinants (individual, organizational, and cultural and client) as well [Partnerships for Health Reforms: Primer for policy makers: Health worker motivation and health sector reform, 2016]. Most discussions in the literature relate motivation mostly to:

- Needs, drives, stimuli and triggers;
- Goals, desired outcomes;
- Approach versus avoidance (pleasure versus pain);
- Performance (actual), response, effort;
- Valence (attractive value), incentive;
- Expectations (of reward, satisfaction);
- Reinforcement;
- Abilities, intelligence, awareness (of options);
- Perception of reality;
- Personality differences;
- Management attitudes/ assumptions about people [Cole, 1995].

2. Motivation theories

Needs-based theories include Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Alderfer’s theory, Herzberg’s theory and McClelland’s needs theory [Lambrou, Kontodimopoulos and Niakas, 2010] (A very good comparison is presented in fig. 3). Maslow’s needs include (fig. 1 and fig. 3):

- Physiological: they refer to the needs for food, water, shelter, etc. that are most basic for the individual;
- Safety and security: they describe the desire that a person has for security and protection;
- Belongings and love: the focus here is on the social aspects of work and nonwork situations;
- Esteem – this level of the hierarchy refers to the concerns a person may have for mastery, competence and status. According to Gordon [2002], some people who show needs for esteem, may also desire recognition for their accomplishments and they may want the material symbols of success like a big office, an executive job title, recognition from the public, other privileges and rewards associated with success like club memberships or a luxury automobile;
- Self-actualization: the needs for it reflect the desire of the individual to grow and develop to his or her fullest potential; here the opportunity to be creative on the job is included as well along with desires for autonomy, responsibility and challenge.

Fig. 1 Maslow’s hierarchy of needs
Alderfer’s needs include existence, which encompasses the physiological needs and the needs for safety and security from Maslow’s pyramid; the next level is relatedness which corresponds
to belongingness and love; the last level is growth which encompasses esteem and self-actualization.

A visualization is shown on the following figure:

Fig. 2 Maslow’s hierarchy of needs and Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory

Herzberg’s theory found out that job satisfaction is a major factor for motivation. The work is divided into hygiene factors and motivators as table 1 shows:

Table 1: Hygiene factors and motivators

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Hygiene factors</th>
<th>Motivators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Pay</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Fringe benefits</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Policies and administrative</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>No job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>Meaningful work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition for accomplishments</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Feeling of achievement</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Increased responsibility</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunities for growth and</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>advancements</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job dissatisfaction</td>
<td>The job itself</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Hygiene factors relate to the context of the job like company practices, wages, benefits and working conditions. They do not motivate but it is believed that they should be at a certain level so that motivators will have a positive effect. Motivators relate to the content of the job like responsibility and growth; they satisfy higher order needs and their results are job satisfaction.

According to McClelland’s needs theory, three types of needs exist: for achievement, affiliation and for power (fig. 3 presents a visualization of Alderfer’s, Herzberg’s, Maslow’s and McClelland’s theories):

- Need for achievement: it reflects the desire of the individual to accomplish goals and to show mastery or competence, also performing a certain job fast;
- Need for affiliation: it is similar to Alderfer’s need of relatedness and Maslow’s belongingness need (interaction, love, affection);
- Need for power: this is the need to control the work that a person or others perform.

Fig. 3 A comparison between Alderfer’s, Herzberg’s, Maslow’s and McClelland’s theories [Baxter, 2015]

There are more theories as well (F. W. Taylor and Scientific Management, Hawthorne Studies, Socio-technical Systems, D. McGregor, etc. – content theories, and Expectancy theory – especially the work of Vroom, Equity theory, Goal theory – especially the contribution of Locke, Attribution theory – especially the work of Kelley, Reinforcement theory – process theories) (Cole, 1995, p. 129) but since there is a large variety, only a few of them are mentioned in this short material.

Theories based on intrinsic factors focus on internal thought processes and perceptions about motivation (e.g. Adam’s equity theory, Vroom’s expectancy theory (fig. 4), Locke’s goal setting theory) while the effect of external factors and their role in understanding employee motivation include other theories like Skinner’s reinforcement theory [Buchbinder, Shanks, 2007]. An instrument developed for measuring motivation based on Maslow’s and Herzberg’s theories consisting of 19 items is presented by Paleologou et al. These items are grouped under four distinct motivational factors. The job attributes factor encompasses 7 items: authority, goals, creativity opportunities, clear duties, job control, skill exploitation and decision-making. The remuneration factor encompasses 4 items: salary, environment, retirement/pension and absenteeism. The co-workers factor encompasses 5 items: teamwork, job pride, appreciation, supervisor and fairness. The achievements factor encompasses 3 items: job meaningfulness, earned respect and interpersonal relationships. Motivational theories can be divided into two categories, content and process theories. The suggestions of the first group are that all individuals possess the same set of needs, while the latter stress on the difference in people’s needs and focus on the cognitive processes that create these differences [Paleologou, V., N. Kontodimopoulos, A. Stamouli, V. Aletras and D. Niakas,].

Fig. 4 Vroom’s expectancy theory [Nimri, 2016]

Vroom’s expectancy theory has been proven worthy. Lawler and Porter present a modified expectancy theory (fig. 5):

Fig. 5 Lawler and Porter’s modified expectancy theory

Chiang and Jang used an adjusted expectancy theory model based on Porter and Lawler’s modified model (fig. 6) [Nimri, 2016]:

Fig. 6 Adjusted expectancy theory model [Nimri, 2016]
In recent years more and more employees are able to get an individual financial stimulus because of their individual achievements at work. This is logical for companies because they expect the staff to be knowledgeable in order to be able to perform well. On the other hand, a main factor for the success of companies is considered to be the corporate culture (the values and standards followed in the company). Both factors are considered to be main motivators by other researchers as well [Dielemann, M., P. V. Cuong, L. V. Anh and T. Martineau, 2003]. Some authors consider them as a part of the four work-related motivators (job attributes, remuneration, co-workers and achievements) [Lambrou, Kontodimopoulos and Niakas, 2010]. This poses the question whether the financial motivation is more important or adhering to company values and standards. According to psychology and sociology people are motivated mainly by feelings like love and hate, and values like honesty, honor and dignity [Murray and Holmes, 2009].

There are studies that analyze employees’ motivation in different countries like the work of Usugami and Park who compare Japanese and Korean personnel motivation. Companies in both countries have an understanding of the importance of staff motivation for the performance of the company and satisfaction of both clients and employees, but Japanese organizations have a comparatively stronger awareness of it. In those two countries the financial stimulus is very important. A difference that has been established is that Korean organizations regard as a factor for motivation the “employment stability”. A major motivational factor for Japanese companies is “clarifying company policy and job attributes” [Usugami and Park, 2007].

Other authors like Christophel and Kay present that communication openness of the managers was positively and significantly related to motivation [Kay and Christophel, 2009].

It has been established that in Japan for example the motivation of the personnel is moving from a more traditional, collective/ company orientation towards more self-orientation [Brislin, MacNab, Worthley, Kabigting and Zukis, 2005].

There are authors that explore and present models which can increase internal motivation on the workplace like Oldham and Hackman. They have developed one which includes three main factors: (a) the psychological status of employees that must be present for internally motivated work behavior to develop; (b) the characteristics of jobs that can create these psychological states; and (c) the attributes of individuals that determine how positively a person will respond to a complex and challenging job [Oldham and Hackman, 1976].

Nelson and Quick also relate to the suggestion that when employees’ motivation is high, this leads also to a high job performance and fewer employee complaints. There are various models/ scales based on the positive correlation between those two factors that have been adopted in studies besides Herzberg’s [like

3. Motivation of the personnel: in assistance to the managers

Creating a system that can motivate the employees is not an easy task since each person is unique. Also, in each company a different set of motivations would work since the desires and needs of workers could vary greatly. Factors like power and status differences, security and uncertainty avoidance, praise, pay increases, job flexibility, job titles, etc. would be valued differently around the world. Various standards of living and cultures will result in unique motivation combinations which becomes a great challenge to managers.

Still, there are categories of incentives that have been defined in assistance to this task:

- Piecework systems: they represent a payment to the worker based on an item produced, i.e. according to the individual performance (like assembling electronic parts or sewing together pieces of a clothing);
- Commissions: they are given for a certain level of sales rather than for a certain number of produced items; this could be in the form of a percentage of total or new sales or a compensation for a quota that has been reached;
- Bonuses: they are given once or they could be a lump sum for one’s exceptional performance;
- Gainsharing programs allow workers to share bonuses for a group performance after productivity improvements.

Another type of motivation outside this classification is motivation through employee ownership. This means that the employee can own part of the organization or stocks. There are countries benefiting from these types on incentives like the USA, Germany and China.

4. Conclusion

Based on the various materials presented and reviewed in this report a few conclusions can be drawn in relation to the motivational role of the managers in the organizations from the social sector:

- The models and theories that have been created so far offer various opportunities and can be used in parallel;
- Each model, approach or theory should be used in accordance with the views of the management. As mentioned in the text, each organization is unique and therefore the methods that can be applied in order to obtain certain results will vary;
- The application of a specific model or theory cannot always guarantee the achievement of the desired results.

There has been plenty of scientific work and a long list of theories exist on employees’ motivation. This material presents only a few major theories without any claims that it is exhaustive. A large number of the data presented above originates from scientific articles, reports and books on research made in the public sector and more precisely – organizations in the social sphere. The latter falls...
within the strong interest of researchers which leads to plenty of data based on real life actual results available in the literature. Motivation for work has been extensively researched through the years. The results could also be used by employers [Yordanova, 2009; Pencheva, 2009; Andreva et al., 2010; Beloev et al., 2014; Dobreva et al., 2014; Yordanova, 2005; Yordanova, 2011; Yordanova, 2013, Yordanova, 2015; Kyuchukov and Kunev, 2007; Naydenov et al., 2015; Paskaleva, Ruskova and Kunev, 2005; Pencheva, 2008; Pencheva and Yordanova, 2009; Stoyanov, Iliiev and Doychinov, 2014].
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