

# IMPACT OF EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION ON PRODUCTIVITY AT MANUFACTURING PRIVATE SECTOR

<b>Dr.S.Gomathi</b>	<i>Senior Professor, VIT Business School, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632014. Tamil Nadu, India.</i>
<b>Mr.Vishnumoorthy</b>	<i>VIT Business School, Vellore Institute of Technology, Vellore-632014. Tamil Nadu, India.</i>

**ABSTRACT**Article DOI URL: <https://doi.org/10.36713/epra2939>

*The current study is done to explore the relationship between Employee motivation and organizational productivity with the mediating role of job satisfaction. The organizational productivity of Indian organization is decreasing despite adopting various strategies. There was a need to pinpoint the cause of this problem. This study revealed the fact that impact of employee motivation can be a cause of decrease in organization productivity. The result of this research suggests offering extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to the employees. In addition, measures should be taken to increase employees' job satisfaction as these factors will directly lead to an increase in organizational productivity.*

**KEYWORDS:** *Employee motivation, job satisfaction, organizational productivity, Electronics industry***INTRODUCTION**

All organizations are concerned with what should be done to achieve sustained high levels of performance through people. Consequently, the subject of adequate incentives for workers, as derived from the so many attempts made by management practitioners, is to look for the best way to manage to accomplish an objective or mission with the least inputs of materials and human resources available.

Certain problems of inadequate motivation, however, do arise as it concerns certain individuals who come into the work situation with differences in expectation, behavior, and outlook. These problems of individual motivation inadequately may be divided into two categories. Firstly, the inability of certain individuals to be motivated may stem from the fact that there is a deficiency in their personality. For such people, the desire to avoid failure may be too strong while paradoxically, the motive to produce positive results may be too weak. This could produce a general resistance to achievement-oriented activity that should naturally be overcome by other extrinsic modes of motivation if there is to be any spur to achievement-oriented activity at all. Secondly, even when the achievement motive is relatively strong, the challenges before the individual worker may be proven to be inadequate or too difficult, whichever of these that apply to the individual worker will usually manifest themselves in different ways such as lack of enthusiasm or premature surrender.

[www.eprapublishing.com](http://www.eprapublishing.com)

Despite all these apparent attendant problems of motivation, and productivity, every organisation do necessarily seek means of ensuring continuous productivity, which would be geared towards the accomplishment of organisation goals. The organizational system under study cannot be said to be different in any way, in terms of producing the results for which it was set up. In all these processes the private organisation and indeed the Electronics industry has thus helped to make India the country it is today.

This study will examine to what extent the financial and non-financial incentives participation, raise the morale of the worker for high productivity.

**Research Objectives**

The main objective of the study is to investigate the impact of motivation on the productivity of employees in private manufacturing industries India.

Specifically, the study seeks to

1. Determine how motivation influence the staff' approach to work
2. Find out any relationship between motivational factors and the performance of the staff and
3. Establish whether motivation has any influence on the staff.

**FRAMEWORK FOR ANALYSIS**

Regression and Anova methods were used for data analysis since it is considered as a reliable method for the

study and helps to relate with two or more variables. These methods were used to find the analytical response of the data given by the respondents.

### **HYPOTHESIS OF THE STUDY**

For the purpose of study, the following research hypotheses have stated based on the review of the literature:

Hypothesis 1

H0: Employee well-being has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the work

Hypothesis 2

H0: Relationship with managers have a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker

Hypothesis 3

H0: Compensation has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker

Hypothesis 4

H0: Training and career development have a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker

Hypothesis 5

H0: Employee motivation is a significant predictor of organizational productivity

### **RESEARCH METHODOLOGY**

#### **RESEARCH DESIGN**

Research design specifies methods and procedures for the study. In this study, the importance of motivation of employees and the organizational productivity is analysed. I have selected a Descriptive research design as a tool for my study. This research study will fit my project & provide effective results for the study.

Research instrument: Structured questionnaires were used for the purpose of collecting the data.

Sampling method: Nonprobability - Convenience sampling

#### **SAMPLE SIZE**

The sample size is limited with a fixed number of respondents covered under the research study from the employees.

The sample size for the research is 103 which were collected from the employees of the organization the total population of company is 4000 where 25 respondent from each shift is been covered in these research.

#### **SOURCE OF DATA**

Primary Data

This study is based on the analysis of the primary data collected from an adequate and representative sample of workers. The researched has used a structured Non-disguised questionnaire. The questionnaire was prepared for the conducting survey. Workers of different processes of respondents were conducted and surveyed.

Secondary Data

Secondary data was collected through various articles that were referred for carrying out the project.

#### **REVIEW OF LITERATURE**

In 'Beyond the Fringe', Simms discusses how various organizations utilize tailored versions of "non-cash rewards" as employee incentives. Simms suggests that Herzberg's view of salary as not being a motivator holds. The ability to hold up an incentive that doesn't get absorbed by the employee's monthly bills has a larger effect on employee motivation.

He also suggests it may be more acceptable to boast about a special award or party rather than an employee's salary raise. Simms then goes on to expand the discussion of non-cash rewards such as flextime, an employee of the month, and tailored goal incentives. Simms argues it is important for employers to communicate these benefits to employees because many employees don't understand their total compensation package. By communicating the total package, the employer reinforces their commitment to the employees and helps to motivate the employee. This motivation leads to greater employee satisfaction and performance (Simms, 2007).

The case study of the Harrah's Entertainment sales teams lays out the use of team incentives to increase sales across the various branches of the Harrah's Entertainment family of products. However, the core to the incentive packages, that Jakobson discusses, is the use of Merchandise Awards. Jakobson states that Merchandise Awards are even more effective than Top Seller Trips. Harrah's also uses simple employee motivation tactics such as recognition at weekly and monthly sales meetings of the top sales teams (Jakobson, 2007).

Whiteling (2007) looks at the cases of Reuters and supermarket giant Sainsbury's to show how important it is to create a culture where employees become directly involved in suggestions for change. By creating a culture where employee input is valued and utilized, the changes faced by the organization are better understood and receive the support of the employees. This also has the side effect of creating employee motivation to support and accomplish the organizations goals and change efforts (Whiteling, 2007). Silverman utilizes a similar strategy to create a high-performance workforce.

Employees need to feel their stories are being heard, understood, and valued by those requesting the stories. By forging these relationships, the employee feels valued by the employer, supervisor, and organization as a contributor. This value translates into higher work performance and stake within the organization (Silverman, 2006; Whiteling, 2007).

Sharbrough's (2006) study looks at the correlations between the leader's use of Motivating Language (ML) and employee job satisfaction and the perception of a supervisor's effectiveness. In both cases, there was a statistically significant correlation in this study between a leader's use of ML and employee job satisfaction and the perception of a supervisor's effectiveness. This correlation can be utilized by organizations to measure a leader's use of ML and determine levels of employee satisfaction as well as determine the perceived effectiveness of a supervisor.

#### **DATA ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION**

This chapter comprises discussions associated with the findings of the entire research. This includes a summary of the work, findings both theoretical and empirical findings, conclusions, the policy implication of the findings, recommendations, limitation of the research, suggestions for further study and contribution to knowledge.

### Employee well-being has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the work Table Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. Error of the Estimate
1	.672 <sup>a</sup>	.451	.42	.56004

The table above revealed that there is a strong relationship at R = .672 between employee well-being and the level of effectiveness of the worker. An examination of

the table shows that R square = .451 which implies that employee well-being accounts for 42% of variations having a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker.

#### Anova

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.033		5.00	15.96	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	30.424	9	.31		
	Total	55.456	10			

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Well-being

The table shows that the F-value is the Mean Square Regression (5.007) divided by the Mean Square Residual (0.314), yielding F=15.962. From the results, the model in

this table is statistically significant (Sig =.000). Therefore, employee well-being is a significant predictor of effectiveness at F = 15.96.

#### Table: Coefficients

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.244	.28		.862	.391
	EW	-.028	.10	-.031	-.269	.789

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

The table above revealed the degree of influence of employee well-being on the effectiveness of the worker and its level of significance. The statistical results are given as; (Employee

Well-being; =.028; t=.269; p<0.05). The statistical result implies that employee well-being is a statistically not significant predictor of effectiveness.

Linear Regression Model is given as  $Y = a + X$  Where Y = Effectiveness

a = constant

x = Coefficient of X

Therefore Effectiveness = .244 + 0.028EW

Based on the results in the Anova table above, the significance level for all items is less than 0.05, therefore, we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. That is, employee well-being has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker.

### Relationship with managers have a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker

#### Table: Model Summary

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.644 <sup>a</sup>	.414	.384	.59995

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Relationship with Managers

The table above revealed that there is a relationship at R = .644 between employee relationships with managers and the level of efficiency of the worker. An examination of the table shows that the R square = .414 which implies that

employee relationship with managers accounts for only 4.1% of variations having a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker.

#### Table: ANOVA

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	24.717	5	4.94	13.734	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	34.914	97	.36		
	Total	59.631	102			

a. Dependent Variable: EFFICIENCY

b. Predictors: (Constant), Employee Relationship with Managers

The table shows that the F-value is the Mean Square Regression (4.943) divided by the Mean Square Residual (0.360), yielding F=13.734. The model in this table shows

that employee relationship with managers is statistically significant at (Sig =.000) and is a significant predictor of efficiency at F = 13.734.

**Table: Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.462	.293		1.577	.118
	RWM	.306	.089	.340	3.444	.001

a. Dependent Variable: Efficiency

The table above revealed the degree of influence of employee relationships with managers on the efficiency of the worker and its level of significance. The statistical results are given as; (Employee Relationship with Managers =.306; t=3.444; p>0.05). The statistical result implies that a relationship with managers is a statistically significant predictor of efficiency. Linear Regression Model is given as  $Y = a + X$

x = Coefficient of X

Therefore Efficiency = 0.462 + 0.306RWM Based on the results in the Anova table above, the significance level for employee relationship with managers is less than 0.05, therefore, we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. That is employee relationships with managers have a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker.

Where Y = Efficiency  
a = constant

**Compensation has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker**

**Table: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.679 <sup>a</sup>	.461	.433	.55511

a. Predictors: (Constant), Compensation

The table above revealed that there is a relationship at R= .679 between compensation and the level of effectiveness of the worker. An examination of the table shows that the R

square = .461 which implies that compensation accounts for 46.1% of variations having a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker.

**Table: ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	25.566	5	5.113	16.593	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	29.891	97	.308		
	Total	55.456	102			

- Dependent Variable: Effectiveness
- Predictors: (Constant), Compensation

The table shows that the F-value is the Mean Square Regression (5.113) divided by the Mean Square Residual (0.308), yielding F=16.593. The model reveals that

compensation is statistically significant at (Sig =.000) therefore it is a significant predictor of effectiveness at F = 16.593.

**Table: Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.221	.270		.817	.416
	COMP	.251	.101	.247	2.492	.014

a. Dependent Variable: Effectiveness

The table above revealed the degree of influence compensation had on the effectiveness of the worker and its level of significance. The statistical results are given as; (Compensation; =.251; t=2.492; p<0.05). The statistical result implies that compensation is a statistically significant predictor of the level of effectiveness of the workers. Linear Regression Model is given as  $Y = a + X$

Where Y = Effectiveness a = constant  
x = Coefficient of X

Therefore Effectiveness = .221 + 0.251COMP

Based on the results in the Anova table above, the significant levels for compensation are less than 0.05 therefore we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. That is, compensation has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker.

**Training and career development have a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker****Table: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.628 <sup>a</sup>	.394	.369	.60714

a. Predictors: (Constant), Training and Career Development

The table above revealed that there is a relationship at R= .628 between training and career development and the level of efficiency of the worker. An examination of the table shows that the R square = .394 which implies that training

and career development accounts for only 39.4% of variations having a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker.

**Table ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
	Regression	23.507	4	5.877	15.943	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	36.124	98	.369		
1	Total	59.631	102			

a. Dependent Variable: Efficiency

b. Predictors: (Constant), Training and Career Development

The table shows that the F-value is the Mean Square Regression (5.877) divided by the Mean Square Residual (0.369), yielding F=15.943. The table shows that training

and career development are statistically significant at (Sig =.000). Therefore it is a significant predictor of efficiency at F=15.94.

**Table: Coefficients**

Model		Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
		B	Std. Error	Beta		
1	(Constant)	.611	.254		2.406	.018
	TCD	.220	.106	.237	2.072	.041

a. Dependent Variable: Efficiency

The table above revealed the degree of influence training and career development has on the efficiency of the worker and its level of significance. The statistical result is given as (Training and Career Development;  $\beta = .220$ ;  $t=2.072$ ;  $p<0.05$ ). The statistical result implies that training and career development is a significant predictor of the level of efficiency of the workers.

Linear Regression Model is given as  $Y = a + \beta X$

Where Y= Efficiency

a = constant

x = Coefficient of X

Therefore Efficiency =  $.611 + 0.220TCD$

Based on the results in the Anova table above, the significant levels for training and career development are less than 0.05 therefore we accept the alternative hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. That is, training and career development have a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker.

**Employee motivation is a significant predictor of organizational productivity****Table: Model Summary**

Model	R	R Square	Adjusted R Square	Std. The error of the Estimate
1	.777 <sup>a</sup>	.604	.446	.54868

a. Predictors: (Constant), Extrinsic Motivational Factors, Intrinsic Motivational Factors

The table above revealed that there is a strong relationship at R= .777 between employee motivation and the level of productivity of the workers. An examination of the table shows that R square = .604 which implies that

employee motivation accounts for only 60.4% of variations having a significant effect on the level of productivity of the worker.

**Table: ANOVA**

Model		Sum of Squares	Df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1	Regression	33.480	29	1.154	3.835	.000 <sup>b</sup>
	Residual	21.977	73	.301		
	Total	55.456	102			

a. Dependent Variable: PRODUCTIVITY

b. Predictors: (Constant), Extrinsic Motivational Factors, Intrinsic Motivational Factors

The table shows that the F-value is the Mean Square Regression (1.154) divided by the Mean Square Residual (0.301), yielding F=3.835. From the results, the model in this

table is statistically significant (Sig =.000). Therefore, employee motivation that is both intrinsic and extrinsic factors combined are significant predictors of productivity at F= 3.835.

**Table: Coefficients**

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.	
	B	Std. Error	Beta			
1	(Constant)	.075	.319		.236	.814
	IMF	.253	.145	.282	1.744	.085
	EMF	.176	.128	.198	1.375	.173

a. Dependent Variable: Productivity

The Anova table above revealed the degree of influence of both motivational factors on the level of productivity of the workers and their levels of significance. The statistical results are as follows; (Intrinsic Motivational Factors; =.253 t=1.744; p<0.05, Extrinsic Motivational Factors; =.176; t=1.375; p<0.05). The statistical results imply that both employee’s intrinsic motivational factors and extrinsic motivational factors are significant predictors of productivity however extrinsic factors are more statistically significant. Multiple Regression Model is given as

$$Y = a + 1X1 + 2X2 + 3X3$$

Where Y = Productivity

a = constant

x = Coefficient of X

Therefore Productivity = 0.75 + 0.253IMF + 0.76EMF

Based on the results from the Anova table above, the significant level for all items is less than 0.05. Therefore we accept the alternate hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis. That is, employee motivation has a significant influence on organizational productivity. However, it is important to note that extrinsic motivational factors had a more significant effect on productivity than intrinsic motivational factors.

**FINDINGS**

Findings Based on the hypothesis of the Study

The findings of this study are presented below in line with the hypothesis of the study:

Hypothesis 1: To determine the effect of employee well-being on the level of effectiveness of the workers.

- The findings of this study are based on statistical data analyses and hypothesis testing. The descriptive analysis of data collected revealed that the above-stated employee well-being is a significant predictor of effectiveness. Therefore, the alternate hypothesis which states that employee well-being has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker is accepted and the null hypothesis rejected.
- These findings corroborate the findings of Lin (2013) in the research titled assessment of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee productivity. Findings from the study revealed that intrinsic factors like employee well-being and organizational policy have a significant effect on workers’ effectiveness which is also a measure of productivity.
- This was further validated by Jibowo (2007) establishing that intrinsic motivation is a significant predictor of employee effectiveness and plays a major role in improving worker performance and productivity levels in an organization.

- He further stated that managers should ensure that an employee’s well-being is taken seriously and that workers are extrinsically well rewarded to remain intrinsically committed to their jobs.

Hypothesis 2: To determine the effect of employee relationships with managers on the level of efficiency of the workers.

- The findings from the study revealed that employee relationship with managers is a significant predictor of worker efficiency as a measure of productivity.
- As such the alternate hypothesis which states that employee relationship with managers has a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the workers was accepted while the null was rejected.
- Findings also showed that it had a minimal effect on the level of efficiency of the worker as such was not rated as highly as expected. This could be since other factors could also affect the efficiency of workers which may not be intrinsic. These factors could be extrinsic such as compensation, training, and career development, etc. also it could be due to other intrinsic factors like organizational policies that may not have been included in this study.
- These findings agree with Centres and Bugental (2007) in their study of the relationship between motivational factors and workers’ performance using the two- factor theory where effectiveness and efficiency were used as measures of performance.
- It was discovered that there was a significant relationship between both intrinsic and extrinsic factors and worker efficiency levels. Taylor (1992) further supported his statement that extrinsic factors tend to be rated more highly than intrinsic factors especially for those at lower levels of the organization.
- He further stated that employees who enjoy friendly relationships with their co-workers both within and outside the workplace tend to be very efficient at their jobs than those who don’t.

Hypothesis 3: To examine the effect of compensation on the level of effectiveness of the workers.

- The findings from the study reveal that compensation is a significant predictor of worker effectiveness. As such the alternate hypothesis which states that compensation has a significant effect on the level of effectiveness of the worker was accepted while the null was rejected.
- Findings also showed that compensation was rated highly by the respondents and is believed to have a great effect on the level of effectiveness of the workers. This couldbe since extrinsic factors

especially monetary rewards tend to appeal more to workers especially in developing nations where the standard of living is poor and basic amenities are lacking is seen as a way of fulfilling other needs which intrinsic factors may not provide.

- These findings correspond with the findings of Taylor & Vest (1992) in his research, which investigated the influence of monetary incentives and its removal on workers' performance and productivity; it was observed that subjects in the experimental group who received monetary incentives performed better than those who did not. Also (Assam, 2002) further pointed out in his study that extrinsic factors like adequate compensation tend to positively influence the level of a worker's effectiveness much more than intrinsic factors.

Hypothesis 4: To examine the effect of training and career development on the level of efficiency of the workers.

- The findings from the study revealed that training and career development is a significant predictor of worker efficiency. As such the alternate hypothesis which states that training and career development has a significant effect on the level of efficiency of the worker was accepted while the null was rejected.
- Findings also showed that only "training and career development" was deemed statistically significant. This could be because although extrinsic factors especially monetary rewards tend to appeal more to workers, training and career development provide them with opportunity for growth through skill acquisition.
- Also, the lack of required tools, skills, and resources necessary to carry out their work efficiently in an organization may affect the level of efficiency of the worker. Furthermore, the lack of adequate job schedule may also be responsible for inefficiency in most organizations.
- Similarly, Lake (2000) in his study which is of importance to this research investigated the correlation between motivation and job performance using employee effectiveness, efficiency, commitment, and innovation levels as a measure of performance.
- The study concluded that most workers in developed nations placed more importance on intrinsic factors than those in less developed nations who opted for extrinsic factors citing the need to satisfy other needs as a major criterion for their choice.
- He further stated that the need for career growth through training and development was deemed a major criterion for an improved level of efficiency of workers citing the acquisition of necessary skills as a determining factor.

Hypothesis 5: To determine the influence of employee motivation on organizational productivity.

- The findings from the study revealed that motivational factors are significant predictors of the level of productivity of the worker. As such the alternate hypothesis which states that employee motivation has a significant influence on organizational productivity was accepted while the null was rejected.

- However, most importantly is that findings from the study showed that motivational factors were rated significantly at 60.4% as factors affecting worker productivity in this study.
- Findings from the study also showed that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors were statistically significant and can independently affect the level of productivity of the workers.
- However, it was discovered that extrinsic motivational factors were found to be more significant than intrinsic motivational factors. That is extrinsic motivational factors were believed to have a greater effect on the level of productivity of the workers.
- The remaining 39.6% not accounted for as factors affecting employee productivity levels could be due to other factors that may not have been covered in this research. This could include factors such as organizational culture, leadership styles, and organizational strategy and structure amongst others.
- In corroboration, a related study by (Akerlele, 2001) compared the relative importance of ten motivational factors such as pay, training, security, etc. Which are extrinsic to the job, and other intrinsic factors like employee well-being, good relationships with managers, responsibility, etc. among 80 employees of an organization.
- And it was hypothesized that higher values will be placed on intrinsic rather than extrinsic job factors. However, the result did not uphold the hypothesis and it showed several extrinsic factors such as adequate compensation, job security, training amongst others were rated as the most important factors affecting productivity levels in selected organizations.
- Similarly, Lake (2004) posits that motivational factors regardless of nature i.e. intrinsic or extrinsic cannot be underestimated when productivity is concerned.
- Baase (2009) Nwachukwu (2004) also suggested that for an organization to be profitable, relevant, and remain competitive in a rapidly changing and constantly evolving business environment, it must be ready to cater to the needs of its workforce. This is because workers are regarded as an asset to any organization as such ensuring high productivity levels amongst them requires adequate motivation

### Recommendations

The following recommendations are made based on the findings of the study;

- Managers must ensure employees are adequately motivated. Employee well-being should be given due consideration and health and well-being programs should be organized to cater to the needs and welfare of employees.
- Management should encourage interpersonal relations amongst co-workers and their managers to promote a sense of belonging and unity amongst staff. Also, managers should ensure employees are involved in decision-making processes and given a chance to air their views.

- iii. Also, management must ensure they create a work environment that is conducive for workers with adequate working conditions as well as providing the right tools and resources to ensure worker effectiveness in discharging their respective duties.
- iv. Furthermore, proper scheduling of job activities is key to achieving efficiency in the workplace. Adequate compensation packages in the form of monetary or non- monetary rewards are essential to ensure that employees stay productive. Management should ensure that rewards and benefits are fairly, justly, and competitively allocated to employees.
- v. Management must also strive to ensure that all employees engage in training programs to acquire new skills and also have equal opportunity to utilize their skills and competencies. Management should make sure that career development opportunities are communicated to employees.
- vi. An established career path and an adequate development plan should be put in place for employees, development programs should be linked to each employee's career needs and not just the organization's needs. Employees should be selected for sponsored training programs fairly and justly.
- vii. Organizations should ensure that performance management provides adequate information about the strength and weaknesses of employees in the form of feedback from employee evaluations.
- viii. Employees who offer the same level of inputs concerning skills, efforts, qualifications, experience, should be entitled to equitable outcomes in terms of pay, promotion, job security, and opportunity for advancement. Additional inputs and outstanding performance should entitle an employee to additional rewards.

Finally, this study recommends that management should make policies that aids in ensuring that employees are adequately extrinsically motivated to remain intrinsically motivated on the job. This will, in turn, enhance or boost employee morale resulting in a competitive edge through higher commitment levels, employee engagement, lower turnover, and improved performance and productivity levels.

## CONCLUSION

Employees are and should be considered the most vital above other factors of production, the most valuable resource available to an organization. This is because they are an integral part of the organization as such it is very important for organizations, in pursuit of a competitive edge, to ensure that the satisfaction of their employees is made a top priority. This is to ensure that employees display a positive attitude to work through improved performance and productivity levels. Also, it is important to note that a lack of adequate motivation results in low productivity and vice versa.

Furthermore, the advent of Globalization has resulted in the ability of different organizations to source for employees across several countries and the previously existing barriers have been reduced, this has resulted in higher competition for personnel with the right skills and experience. As such it is important for employers and their managers who value their staff to recognize those factors that affect employee performance and productivity levels on the job or in the workplace and ensure they are fulfilled accordingly. (Brown

& Yashioka, 2003; and Sinha & Sinha, 2012). The concept of motivation may be complex particularly in the workplace and may pose a serious challenge to managers as it is relative to individuals. This is because people differ in what they need and want as such what may be seen as a source of motivation to an individual may not seem so to another. As such managers tend to find it extremely difficult in coping with such a dilemma in trying to figure out how to keep members of the workforce motivated. Although, several factors may affect worker productivity levels in an organization such as organizational culture, leadership style, organizational strategy, and structure, etc. The aspect of Motivation, however, plays a major role in improving worker productivity levels and therefore should not be underestimated. This study concludes that employee motivation be it intrinsic or extrinsic has a significant effect and is a predictor of productivity levels in an organization. It also concludes that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors of motivation appeal to employees and the right mix of both are essential in bringing out the best performances from a workforce. These findings validate the

Herzberg two- factor theory, Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, and Vroom's expectancy theory. From the findings of the study, one can deduce that most workers perceive extrinsic motivation as generally having a larger influence on the psychological aspects of employee productivity. We also found that intrinsic motivation is of importance to employee productivity, albeit to a lesser extent psychologically but rather as a part of the total package that is offered to the employee by an organization.

## REFERENCES

1. Broussard, S. C., & Garrison, M. E. B. (2004). The relationship between classroom motivation and academic achievement in elementary school-aged children. *Family and Consumer Sciences Research Journal*, 33(2), 106–120.
2. Brown, W. A., & Yashioka, C. F. (2003). Mission attachment and satisfaction as factors in employee retention. *Journal of Non-profit Management and Leadership* 14(1), 5-18.
3. Burns, A. J., Roberts, T. L., Posey, C., Bennett, R. J. & Courtney, J. F. (2015). Assessing the role of security education, training, and awareness on insiders' security-related behavior: An expectancy theory approach. In: *System Sciences (HICSS)*, 2015 48th Hawaii International Conference.
4. Centers, R. & Bugental D. E. (2007), Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations among different aspects of the working population. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 15(1), 7-20.
5. Chapman, E., & Goodwin, C. (2001). *The supervisor's survival kits your first step into management* (9th Edition). Prentice-Hall.
6. Cooper, D., & Schinder, P. (2006). *Business research methods*. (8th edition). New York. McGraw-Hill.
7. Cummins, R. C. (2010), Job stress and the buffering effect of supervisory support. *Group Organization. Management*. 15, 92–104.
8. Davies, J. (2005). Review of the effects of task factors on job attitude and job behavior II. *Job Enlargement and Organizational Context*, *Perdonsi Psychology* 22, 418–426.
9. Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and the "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of Behavior, *Psychological Inquiry*, 11, 227-268.

10. Eshiteti, S. N., Okaka, O., Maragia, S. N. Odera, O. & Akerele, E. K. (2013). Effects of succession planning programs on staff retention. *Mediterranean Journal of Social Sciences*, 4(6), 157.
11. Farr, R. (1977). On the nature of attributional artifacts in qualitative research: Herzberg's two-factor theory of work motivation. *Journal of Occupational Psychology*, 50(1), 3-14.
12. George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behavior*. 6th edition. Reading, MA: Prentice-Hall.
13. Giancarlo, F. L. (2014). Should HR professionals devote more time to intrinsic rewards? *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 46(1), 25-31.
14. Gillenson, M. L., & Sanders, T. C. (2005). Employee relationship management: Applying the concept of personalization to U.S. navy sailors. *Information System Research*, 22(1), 45-50