

COMPETING FORCE OF PUSH AND PULL FACTORS ON EMPLOYEES MOTIVATION

Dr. Annapurna Gupta
Assistant Professor (Psychology)
S.V.P College, Bhabua

Abstract

The main purpose of this study was to assess the role of different push and pull factors on employee motivation. This study has its main focus on this purpose used exploratory approach in which a qualitative survey was carried out among Class 1 and Class 4 employees in Eastern part of India. The survey was implemented to get their responses on what they feel is (are) the best factors that could motivate them in a list of 10 push and 10 pull factors. In this focus on the study sets to identify the most preferred ranked factors for motivation.

The outcome of the study have been explained that of Achievement and Position or Power were the most push ranked factors and Position and Recognition were the most pull ranked factors among class 1 employees. While, the need of Security and Fundamental needs were the most push ranked factors and Money and Security were the most pull ranked factors by class 4 employees.

Keywords: Pull, push, motivation, competing force, employee.

Introduction

Presently we are living in a cut throat competitive world. Today the organizations are facing the problem how to motivate employees to work more productively and to increase their feelings of satisfaction, involvement and commitment. At one time, employees were considered just another input into the production of goods and services. What perhaps changed this way of thinking about employees was research, referred to as the Hawthorne studies conducted by George Elton Mayo from 1924 – 1932 (Dickson, 1973). The study found employees are not motivated solely by money and employee behaviour is linked to their attitudes (Dickson, 1973). The Hawthorne studies began the human relations approach to management, whereby the needs and motivation of employees become the primary focus of managers (Bedeian, 1993).

Understanding what motivated employees and how they were motivated was the focus of many researchers following the publication of the Hawthorne Study results (Terpstra, 1979). Five major approaches that have led to our understanding of motivation are Maslow's need-hierarchy theory, Herzberg's two-factor theory, Vroom's expectancy theory, Adams' equity theory, and Skinner's reinforcement theory.

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

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

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

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

Motivation Defined

Motivation is defined as the inner state of individual that activates him or make him move. It is a combination of forces which is initially direct or sustains the behavior towards goal. The arousal of motivation to form some act is attributed to an interaction between motives of an individual and the factors in the situation that confront it. The study of motivation confronts with how behavior is started energies and sustained, is directed and what kind of subjective reaction is present in organism. Motivation include both the push and pull factor that drive the organism. The mechanism of motivation begins in need and ends in need satisfaction. Motivation can be both conscious and unconscious.

Motivation has been defined as: the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction (Kreitner, 1995); a predisposition to behave in a purposive manner to achieve specific, unmet needs (Buford, Bedeian, & Lindner, 1995); an internal drive to satisfy an unsatisfied need (Higgins, 1994); and the will to achieve (Bedeian, 1993). For this paper, motivation is operationally defined as the inner force that drives individuals to accomplish personal and organizational goals.

Why do we need motivated employees? The answer is survival (Smith, 1994). Motivated employees are needed in our rapidly changing workplaces. Motivated employees help organizations survive. Motivated employees are more productive. To be effective, managers need to understand what motivates employees within the context of the roles they perform. Of all the functions a manager performs, motivating employees is arguably the most complex. This is due, in part, to the fact that what motivates employees changes constantly (Bowen & Radhakrishna, 1991). For example, research suggests that as employees' income increases, money becomes less of a motivator (Kovach, 1987). Also, as employees get older, interesting work becomes more of a motivator.

Numerous studies have been conducted on employees motivation. Review of literature has highlighted the role of some significant factors for motivation such as Hersey & Blanchard (1969), study of industrial employees, ranked: (1) full appreciation of work done, (2) feeling of being (3) sympathetic help with personal problems, (4) job security (5) Good wages/salaries as the five top motivational factors out of ten factors.

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

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

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

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

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

(1998). Further more, the results reported in Wiley (1997) indicated that this factor was ranked 1st in 1946 and consistently ranked 2nd between 1980 and 1992.

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

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

Kovach (1997) considering four ages (30 and under, 31-40, 41-50 and 50 and above) concluded that the 30 and under group choose good wages, job security, promotion/expectation as their first three choices. *need*The main purpose of selecting class 1 and class 4 employees is to find out the reason behind that How and Why a person choose or decide his job level? The second purpose of the study was to understand the factors which are helpful to motivate employ for employers at workplace.

The push and pull factors of motivation

Different needs are the intrinsic push factors to get moving and stay moving to the employee at workplace.

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

Pusher (needs) creates intrinsic force and puller produces extrinsic force for to motivate any employee. Thus motivation is the result of competing force of push and pull factors. when the forces from push and the pull factors are in same direction the competing force accelerated on peak. At this state an employ can be succed to meet to the state of self actualization easily.so this is very important to understand for any organization about the psychology of the growth of the organization

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

Purpose of the Study

The main purpose of selecting class 1 and class 4 employees is to find out the reason behind that How and Why a person choose or decide his job level? The second purpose of the study was to understand the factors which are helpful to motivate employ for employers at workplace.The purpose of this study was to describe the importance of certain competing force of push and pull factors on employee motivation at the work place in East India. Specifically, the study sought to describe the ranked importance of the following 10 pushing factors in which ten different needs are included : (1) Need of achievement, (2) Need of position and power, (3) Need of self actualization, (4) Need of security, (5) Need of social status, (6) Need of self Esteem, (7) Need of creativity, (8) Need of competition, (9) Fundamental needs, (10) Luxurious needs and 10 pulling factors are included (1) Money, (2) Appreciation and reward by management, (3) Security, (4) Position and Power, (5) Advancement, (6) Interest, (7) Recognition, (8) Work simplification, (9) Working conditions, (10) Behaviour of co-workers and management among the employee of class 1 and class 4 job levels .

The main purpose of selecting class 1 and class 4 employees is to find out the causes behing that How and Why a person choose or decide his job level? And what are the precipitating and predisposing motivational push factors in selecting different job categories? According to literature it depicted that every person select his job according to his own needs level and put his potential to maintain that level accordingly.

The secondary purpose of the study was to understand or to help the employers that How can be employee motivate at workplace. so that employ can do their job in conducive environment or put their full potential

to get quality and quality output. Now it is very clear that until or unless employ feel satisfaction he will not put his full efficiency toward the job.

Research Methodology

Descriptive survey research method design is used for investigation . A convenience sample of 100 employee of (50 class 1 and 50 class 4, Age Range-25-45years) job levels.

For class 1 job level chief engineers, professors administrative officers, bank officers, Doctors were selected for study and For class 4 level Peon and attendants from different government offices were selected. The centre of the research is in eastern part of India. In the present study there are two independent variables class 1 and class 4 job levels and age group which is demographic and organismic variables respectively. The independent variables have been manipulated through selection.

On the basis of literature on the motivation it has been **hypothesized** that there will be a difference in motivational force of push and pull factors of employees of class 1 and class 4 job levels.

Footnote-Jobs are divided into four main job categories in India class 1, class 2, class 3, and class4 according to Pay- Scale, Designation and post.

Data Collection

A survey Inventory was developed to collect data from the respondent, for the study. The Inventory asked participants to rank the importance of these factors that motivated them at workplace. The most important factor was to be ranked 10 and the least important factor was to be ranked 1. All factors to be ranked and no rank could be used more than once. The participants assured of confidentially and secrecy of the information.

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

To analyze the data Paired Sample Mean statistic method ,ANOVA, and Linear Regression have been computed.

Table 1 Pushers Class 1-Class 4 **paired Samples Statistics**

Pushers	Class 1-Class 4	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	need of achievement	8.54	50	1.388	.196
	need of achievement	5.52	50	2.991	.423
Pair 2	need of position and power	6.58	50	2.556	.362
	need of position and power	4.62	50	2.372	.336
Pair 3	need of self actualization	5.00	50	2.373	.336
	need of self actualization	5.58	50	1.896	.268
Pair 4	need of security	4.86	50	2.879	.407
	need of security	7.82	50	2.593	.367
Pair 5	need of social prestige	3.88	50	2.396	.339
	need of social prestige	5.92	50	2.671	.378
Pair 6	need of self prestige	6.56	50	2.434	.344
	need of self prestige	6.96	50	.832	.118
Pair 7	need of creativity	6.72	50	2.524	.357
	need of creativity	4.90	50	2.476	.350
Pair 8	need of competition	4.06	50	2.676	.378
	need of competition	3.14	50	1.678	.237

Pair 9	need of fundamental need	3.50	50	2.178	.308
	need of fundamental need	6.92	50	3.504	.496
Pair 10	luxurious needs	5.36	50	2.884	.408
	luxurious needs	2.84	50	2.333	.330

Table -2 Pushers class /1class4 Paired Samples Correlations

Pushers Class 1/class 4		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	need of achievement & need of achievement	50	.128	.377
Pair 2	need of position and power & need of position and power	50	.471	.001
Pair 3	need of self actualization & need of self actualization	50	.363	.010
Pair 4	need of security & need of security	50	.355	.011
Pair 5	need of social prestige & need of social prestige	50	.190	.187
Pair 6	need of self prestige & need of self prestige	50	.293	.039
Pair 7	need of creativity & need of creativity	50	.035	.811
Pair 8	need of competition & need of competition	50	.243	.088
Pair 9	need of fundamental need & need of fundamental need	50	.155	.282
Pair 10	luxurious needs & luxurious needs	50	.248	.082

Table 3 Pullers Class 1/Class 4 Paired Samples Statistics

Pullers Class 1/Class 4		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	money and benefits	5.70	50	2.435	.344
	money and benefits	8.36	50	1.699	.240
Pair 2	appreciation by management	5.64	50	2.136	.302
	appreciation by management	4.62	50	2.702	.382
Pair 3	security	5.62	50	2.127	.301
	security	8.10	50	1.930	.273
Pair 4	position and power	7.70	50	2.297	.325
	position and power	3.86	50	2.990	.423
Pair 5	advancement	7.10	50	2.765	.391
	advancement	4.92	50	2.275	.322
Pair 6	interest	7.36	50	1.956	.277

	interest	6.04	50	2.441	.345
Pair 7	recognition	6.42	50	2.681	.379
	recognition	3.42	50	2.704	.382
Pair 8	work simplification	2.78	50	2.207	.312
	work simplification	5.32	50	2.606	.369
Pair 9	working conditions	3.12	50	2.135	.302
	working conditions	4.40	50	1.512	.214
Pair 10	behaviour of coworkers	3.52	50	2.493	.353
	behaviour of coworkers	6.08	50	2.739	.387

Table 4 PullersClass1/ Class 4 Paired Samples Correlations

PullersClass1/ Class 4		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	money and benefits & money and benefits appreciation by	50	-.013	.930
Pair 2	management & appreciation by management	50	-.042	.773
Pair 3	security & security	50	.248	.082
Pair 4	position and power & position and power	50	.300	.034
Pair 5	advancement & advancement	50	.478	.000
Pair 6	interest & interest	50	.270	.057
Pair 7	recognition & recognition	50	.383	.006
Pair 8	work simplification & work simplification	50	.232	.104
Pair 9	working conditions & working conditions	50	.478	.000
Pair 10	behaviour of coworkers & behaviour of coworkers	50	.299	.035

Table-5 Pullers Class1 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
money and benefits	Between Groups	23.195	5	4.639	.764	.581
	Within Groups	267.305	44	6.075		
	Total	290.500	49			
appreciation by management	Between Groups	16.229	5	3.246	.689	.634
	Within Groups	207.291	44	4.711		
	Total	223.520	49			
security	Between Groups	51.018	5	10.204	2.629	.036
	Within Groups	170.762	44	3.881		

	Total	221.780	49			
position and power	Between Groups	51.793	5	10.359	2.205	.071
	Within Groups	206.707	44	4.698		
interest	Total	258.500	49			
	Between Groups	38.596	5	7.719	2.281	.063
recognition	Within Groups	148.924	44	3.385		
	Total	187.520	49			
work simplification	Between Groups	18.373	5	3.675	.484	.786
	Within Groups	333.807	44	7.587		
working conditions	Total	352.180	49			
	Between Groups	12.371	5	2.474	.481	.788
behaviour of coworkers	Within Groups	226.209	44	5.141		
	Total	238.580	49			
advancement	Between Groups	28.105	5	5.621	1.267	.295
	Within Groups	195.175	44	4.436		
	Total	223.280	49			
	Between Groups	35.233	5	7.047	1.152	.348
	Within Groups	269.247	44	6.119		
	Total	304.480	49			
	Between Groups	8.865	5	1.773	.213	.955
	Within Groups	365.635	44	8.310		
	Total	374.500	49			

Table 6 Pullers Class 4 ANOVA

		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
money and benefits	Between Groups	20.473	6	3.412	1.212	.319
	Within Groups	121.047	43	2.815		
	Total	141.520	49			
appreciation by management	Between Groups	9.797	6	1.633	.202	.974
	Within Groups	347.983	43	8.093		
	Total	357.780	49			
security	Between Groups	31.068	6	5.178	1.470	.211
	Within Groups	151.432	43	3.522		
	Total	182.500	49			
position and power	Between Groups	118.315	6	19.719	2.652	.028
	Within Groups	319.705	43	7.435		
	Total	438.020	49			
advancement	Between Groups	25.748	6	4.291	.810	.568
	Within Groups	227.932	43	5.301		
	Total	253.680	49			
interest	Between Groups	26.090	6	4.348	.703	.648
	Within Groups	265.830	43	6.182		
	Total	291.920	49			
recognition	Between Groups	54.350	6	9.058	1.282	.286
	Within Groups	303.830	43	7.066		

work simplification	Total	358.180	49			
	Between Groups	56.025	6	9.338	1.450	.218
	Within Groups	276.855	43	6.438		
working conditions	Total	332.880	49			
	Between Groups	13.209	6	2.202	.958	.465
	Within Groups	98.791	43	2.297		
behaviour of coworkers	Total	112.000	49			
	Between Groups	41.168	6	6.861	.904	.501
	Within Groups	326.512	43	7.593		
	Total	367.680	49			

Linear Regression

Table 7 ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	28.462	10	2.846	1.683	.120 ^b
Residual	65.958	39	1.691		
Total	94.420	49			

a. Dependent Variable: need of achievement

b. Predictors: (Constant), behaviour of coworkers, working conditions, appreciation by management, security, interest, position and power, recognition, money and benefits, work simplification, advancement



Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	7.070	9.806		.721	.475
money and benefits	-.029	.188	-.051	-.154	.878
appreciation by management	.131	.204	.201	.641	.525
security	-.208	.201	-.319	-1.034	.307
position and power	-.035	.221	-.058	-.158	.875
advancement	.001	.192	.002	.005	.996
interest	.205	.197	.288	1.039	.305
recognition	.115	.185	.222	.621	.538
work simplification	-.010	.219	-.017	-.048	.962
working conditions	.155	.201	.239	.775	.443
behaviour of coworkers	-.105	.219	-.188	-.478	.635

a. Dependent Variable: need of achievement

Table -8 ANOVA^a

Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
1 Regression	56.784	10	5.678	.812	.618 ^b
Residual	272.596	39	6.990		
Total	329.380	49			

a. Dependent Variable: need of security

b. Predictors: (Constant), behaviour of coworkers, work simplification, interest, security, working conditions, appreciation by management, money and benefits, recognition, advancement, position and power

Coefficients^a

Model	Unstandardized Coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
1 (Constant)	-28.849	49.623		-.581	.564
money and benefits	.714	.959	.468	.745	.461
appreciation by management	.612	.977	.638	.627	.535
security	.787	.889	.586	.886	.381
position and power	.472	1.034	.544	.456	.651
advancement	.561	.936	.492	.600	.552
interest	.465	.887	.438	.525	.603
recognition	.863	.890	.900	.969	.338
work simplification	.841	1.047	.845	.803	.427
working conditions	.681	.883	.397	.771	.445
behaviour of coworkers	.606	.990	.640	.612	.544

a. Dependent Variable: need of security

Table 1 Shows the sum of the ranking given to each factor by the total respondents, the highest the sum of the total rank factor was ranked as a motivational factor. The Mean value of 8.54 for need of Achievement, Mean value of 6.72 for Need of competition, and 6.58 Mean value for need of Position and Power shows the highly powerful pusher for class 1 or For Class 4 the Mean value of 7.82 for need of Security, Mean value of 6.92 for Fundamental Need, and 6.96 Mean value for Need of Social Prestige shows the highly strong pusher of their job motivation.

Hence it could be seen from the Table 3 For Pullers Mean 7.70 for Position and Power, 7.10 Mean value for Advancement, 7.36 Mean value for Interest shows the highly attractive puller for class 1 or For Class 4 Mean 8.36 for Money and Benefits, 8.10 for Security and 6.08 Mean value for Behavior of coworker shows the highly magnetic puller for their job motivation. From the analysis of data with the help of Paired sample mean statistic method reveals that in class 1 employees' category, is significantly different from the class 4. Analysis of variance showing that the different Pullers are Playing their role significantly different to determine their motivational level.

Table 5 and 6. ANOVA shows that there is significance difference between employee of class 1 and class 4 job categories in their level of pulling force of motivation. F ratio is significant at .05 level of significance. Thus Hypothesis is confirmed.

Table 7 Linear Regression reveals that the coefficient of determination is 7.070, therefore about 95.13% of the variation in the puller factor Position and Power and Recognition is explained by need of Achievement the regression equation appears to be very useful for making predictions.

Table 8 linear Regression reveals that the coefficient of determination is 28.849, therefore about 95.07% of the variation in the puller factor Money and benefits or Security is explained by need of Security the Regression equation appears to be very beneficial for making predictions.

Interpretation and Discussion-

The main purpose of selecting class 1 and class 4 employees is to understand the reason that How and Why a person choose or decide his job level? The second purpose of the study was to understand the factors or pullers which are helpful to motivate employers to make productive, conducive, interesting, motivating and harmonious environment for their employee, assured to say that if employee will work in conducive environment they will put their full efficiency to their job.

Needs are the intrinsic push factors that causes that employee move towards specific goal or to get moving and stay moving to the at work place. Pushers (need) creates intrinsic force among employee to achieve the goal.

The hierarchy of pushing factors (needs) among class 1 employees were founded : (1) Need of achievement, (2) Need of creativity(3) Need of position and power (4) Need of self Esteem, (5) Luxurious Need, (6) Need of self actualization, (7) Need of security (8) Need of competition, (9) Need of social esteem (10) Fundamental need,

Therefore, the hierarchy of needs in class 4 employees categories were founded as : (1) Need of security, (2) Need of social prestige (3) fundamental needs, (4) Needs of self esteem (5) need of self actualization, (6) Need of achievement. (7)Need of creativity (8)Need of position and power (9) Need of competition (10) Luxurious needs

The ranked order of pulling factors which attracts class 1 employees to set new target, to take high risk and challenges or to cross all hurdles at workplace 5 most ranked factors out of 10 factors were: (1) position and Power (2) advancement (3) Interest(4)Recognition(5)behavior of management Hence, among the class 4 employees the most ranked pullers were (1) money and benefits(2) security, (3) behavior of coworkers (4) interest and (5) work simplification.

A comparison of these results to Maslow's need-hierarchy theory provides some interesting insight in to employee motivation. The ranked pushers need of achievement and position and power is a self actualizing factor. The ranked pushing motivators of security is a safety factor. The ranked self prestige is an esteem factor. Therefore, the number one ranked pulling factor by class 1 employee's recognition and position as according to Maslow is also self actualization factor. Thus it is obvious that the class 1 employees are pushing by achievement and position also pulling by the same recognition and position at workplace. In future they can be motivated with the recognition and position .While among class 4 employees the number one pushed ranked factor security needs and the number two ranked pusher is fundamental needs .The number one or two pusher fulfilled by number one and two puller money and security respectively. Thus it is obvious that in future class 4 employees can be motivated by money and security.

Conclusion

Thus it is obvious that motivation is a result of the competing forces of pulls and push factors.For motivation the competing of push and pull factor should be in same direction. So if the organization wishes to motivate their employees they must be focus on the push factor first, then they can pull them by creating environment accordingly, thus it is very obvious through the study that there is a hierarchy of needs or our need patterns determines that what category of job people are going to set for their future.

Therefore, according to Maslow (1993) if organization wishes to address the most important motivational factors; physiological, safety, social and self esteem needs must be

fulfilled. It is obvious by this study class 1 employees are motivated by self actualization because their first two level needs have been already fulfilled. Hence class 4 employees are making their effort to fulfill their fundamental needs and security need that are pulling by money and security. If organization wishes to address second most important motivational factors to pull the employees' money, interest, security, good working conditions position, power advancement, appreciation, good behaviour fulfill would suffice.

Contrary to what Maslow theory suggests the range of motivational factors are mixed in this study. Maslow conclusion that lower level motivational factors must be meeting before ascending to the next level confirm by this study.

References

Books-

Allan Byman and Robert G. Bmguess (1999) "Qualitative research" Prentice Hall pp 89-94.

Carole Wade and Carole Tavis Third Edition(1993) "psychology" Harper Collins College,publishers.

Duane P Shultz, Sydeny Ellen Shultz Eight Edition, Psychology and Work today Dorling Kindersley publishing Inc.

Greenberg J &Baron A.R (2003) "Behaviour in Organisations", Prentice Hall, Vol. 8, pp. 188-215

Herberg, F. Mausner, B & Snyderman, B. (1969) " The motivation to work", John Wiley and Sons, New York.

Kanungo, R.N. (1990) "Work alienation in developing Countries: Western Models and Eastern realities", In A.M. Jaeger & R.N. Kunungo (Eds.), Management in developing Countries. Routledge, London, pp.195-209.

Sekaran Uma (2002) "Research Methods for Business", Vol.4, pp. 197-199.

Nelson, B. (2001), "Motivate employees with intangible benefits", Available at: <http://www.findarticles.com>.

Young, B.C. (2000), "Methods of Motivating: Yesterday and Today" Available at:Harpaz,

Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz (ed.), Advances in experimental social psychology. New York: Academic Press

Antomioni, D. (1999), "What motivates middle managers"? Industrial Management, Nov,- Dec, Vol. 41, No 6, pp. 27-30.

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

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

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

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

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

- Dickson, W. J. (1973). Hawthorne experiments. In C. Heyel (ed.), *The encyclopedia of management*, 2nd ed. (pp. 298-302). New York: Van Nostrand Reinhold.
- Harpaz, I. (1990). The importance of work goals: an international perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21. 75-93
-
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons. Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, N.J, pp.34-35
- Hersey, P. & Blanchard, K. (1996) "Management of Organisational behaviour", Prentice
- Higgins, J. M. (1994). *The management challenge* (2nd ed.). New York: Macmillan.
- Kovach, K. A. (1987). What motivates employees? Workers and supervisors give different answers. *Business Horizons*, 30. 58-65.
- Kreitner, R. (1995). *Management* (6th ed.). Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company.
- Linder, J.R, (1998), "Understanding employ motivation", *Journal of extention*, June, Vol.No3, PP.58-65.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, July 1943. 370-396.
- Skinner, B. F. (1953). *Science and Human Behavior*. New York: Free Press.
- Smith, G. P. (1994). Motivation. In W. Tracey (ed.), *Human resources management and development handbook* (2nd ed.).
- Smith, K. L. (1990). The future of leaders in Extension. *Journal of Extension*, 28 (1).
- Terpstra, D. E. (1979). Theories of motivation: borrowing the best. *Personnel Journal*, 58. 376.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Wiley, C. (1997) "What motivates employees according to over 40 years of Motivation surveys. *International Journal of Mnapower*, Vol. 18, No3, pp. 264-280