

The Effect of Motivation on The Performance of Field Force In Helicon Pharmaceutical Company

Muhammad Asif Jan, Muhammad Imran Khan Khalil,
Khawaja Fawad Latif, Abid Ali and Usman Haider

ABSTRACT

The main purpose of the study is to assess the role of motivation tools on the performance of the field force in an organization. For this purpose the field force of Helicon Pharmaceutical Company was selected and a sample of 100 employees was taken from the total population of 250 field force. A very simple and comprehensive questionnaire was distributed amongst the field force through which one can easily assess different factors and techniques which can motivate the employees to work better for achieving the organization's goal. The data collected through the questionnaire was put in a latest and authenticated software SPSS. This software helped me a lot in obtaining the results of different statistical techniques such as Regression, Pearson Correlation, Independent Sample t-Test and one way ANOVA. From the results we can easily test the hypothesis of the Research study. The Research study reveals that motivation is a strong tool in an organization and has a direct relationship with the performance of the workers. It also shows that motivation techniques have different effects in different working conditions. It is based upon personalities and may vary from person to person. The motivation has significant differences across the gender and different age group. It is expected that this little effort will provide a strong base to effectively analyze different factors which play important role for employees' motivation and for better results for many organizations in near future.

Key Words: Motivation, Performance, Retention, Organization and Factors

INTRODUCTION

In this article we are working on the pharmaceutical field force satisfaction of job and I have taken agency theory more relevant to our objectives as it mentions that organization should think that humans are mainly responsible for the output of organizational objectives achievement.

Concept of Motivation

The theory is mainly based upon that the principal must delegate power to one responsible person which can act on their behalf and make immediate discussions (Antomioni, 1999). The owner of the firm believes that the risk is always there that the manager will look for its own benefits as well as the organization objectives but in real life the situation is a bit different, because it is a fact that most of the employees are not very much fair and are always in search of opportunities. Therefore we should use the agency theory to study the issues between the principals and manager where the manager use the benefits of the principal and it give him his own benefit like bonuses, pension, higher payroll, allowances and incentives, in this way his performance is improved There is a very strong lobby which believes that human resource is the most important tool in achieving the organizational objectives instead of monitory and technological enhancement. So we should make

policies to motivate the human resource in organization favor and these motivation strategies, the financial benefits are no doubt is on the top(Basset-Jone& Lloyd, 2005).

There is strong assumption that human resource and their management are the main source of competitive advantage for any business rather than to access the capital or to use modern technology to boost up the productivity. Hence very logical suggestions would be to concentrate on the needs and the nature of the sources for managing the behavior of human resource and performance consequently. Diener & Diener (1995) pointed out that there is no correlation of organization influence on the effectiveness of performance in the management of labor. Involvement of quality, strategic incorporation and commitment flexibility is suggested for effective employee's motivation and job retention. So the principal in a firm cannot forecast a negotiator behavior in any specified situation so we should try numerous procedures for the purpose of incentives and other benefits to link employee's basic needs and to achieve the organizational goals.

Employee's recognition with reference to the organizational goals enhancement and their commitment level is the ultimate objective of any organization. Whenever one needs to mediate the employment contract some basic human resource strategies can be helpful for ensuring an effective transaction process which will be beneficial for employee's and the management to achieve the organizational needs. The basic issue compact with is which drives force, to impel workforce to develop his/her real energy which they want to do in the company. The basic problem of performance and motivational strategies are direct and favorable related. If we focus on the monetary aspects of the motivation strategies such as employees income, fringe benefits, and other rewards, This portion of motivation it is to investigate the enhancement of employee's performance. Financial or monetary motivational strategies is no doubt the most important factor in present organizations and as per Masllows basic needs, non-monetary reward comes when monetary reward system no positive outcome or results or simply failed. (Fiedlander & Gordon, 1995)

Statement of the Problem

As a research student I am seeking to find out answer to the question, what is the effect of motivation in improving the overall performance and quality of organization? This is only possible if we gather and analyze data collected through a questionnaire from the employees of Helicon Pharmaceutical Company and need accurate data collection.

Objectives of the Study

As I have mention above that we have to find out the answer to the research question and on the basis of the background information, the purpose of the study is to collect and assess the factors which force employees to work best in their relevant field. This will be analyzed by making a detailed survey among the employees and rank the most important factors that is mainly responsible for influencing their best performance and achieving organizational goals and objectives.

Hypotheses

- Hypothesis One: There is no association of employee motivation and work performance
- Hypothesis Two: No differences exist in the prevalence of motivation across demographic features of employees.
- Hypothesis Three: No differences exist in the prevalence of workers performance across demographic features of employees.

Hypothesis Four: Employee motivation has a positive effect on employee's performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

The concept and relevant theories in the field of motivation are very important to give facility for a clear understanding of our question. It will also be helpful to clear the concept of financial motivation and comparatively broader introduction of motivation will be there. There are three main parts of motivation according to Greenburg and Baron (2000), the first segment is focused on the energy or drive behind a person's action. People can be guided by their personal interests to do good job so that a very good impression made on others. The second part is about individual choices and direction of their behavior. The last part is the consistency of behavior for achieving their personal organizational goals.

Helepotia (2005) highlighted that, a person actively participation and commitment to achieve the prescribed results. However he further explains the term motivation as an abstract of different definition as different strategies in an environment give specific results at various times and no define single strategy can give guaranteed and desired results all the time. It shows that motivation less or more associated with different factors that move, drive or leads certain human actions in a given period of time under certain condition or environment. It further shows that in any case is most of the theories we have seen there is some invisible force and that may be in any shape depending upon the individual's time, and environment and there is no define rules that can be mentioned as a very clear policy for achieving the organization goals.

According to Greenberg & Baron (2003) the definition of motivation is simpler and appealing. It focuses both on individual and its performance as it is clear from their definitions. The set of process that arouses direct and maintain human behavior towards attaining some goals.

Friedlander (1964) highlighted that, there are two ways to understand the human nature in employee's motivation. The first opinion is that people are basically worked shy and lazy and thus this kind of people can only be motivated by some external stimulant and it is basically based upon Taylorism. The second view focuses on Hawthorne's finding which says that people are motivated to work better for their own sake and for social and financial benefits so we can conclude that it is a kind of internal motivation.

A lot of work exist in the field of financial motivation and a variety of theories were presented on this subject to find out that how the financial benefits can increase the performance of the employee's. Most of the organizational leaders adopt different strategies keeping in view the suggested theories by different researchers and they adopt a better option according to their organizational cultures and social conditions. We will discuss in brief on the different motivational theories which includes Alder's (ERG theory), Maslow (Need theory) Vrooms (Expectancy theory), Adams (Social equity theory) Herzberg (two factor theory) and Mac Gregory (Theory X and Theory Y) for getting an effective idea of the theories. We will mainly focus on Maslow and ERG theories. (Friedlander & Bassett 1966)

According to Gordon (2005) that the human priorities can be segmented five main categories we can make structure of these segments according to their importance in various social and culture conditions. These are explained in step wise as mentioned below:

- Physiological needs
- Personal security needs
- Belongingness needs
- Self-esteem needs
- Self-recognition needs

As it is clear from the above mentioned priorities the most important factor for any individual is physical needs which include his health, food, and shelter. If a worker is not physically fit he is ill then he could not perform well and thus it has direct effect on the performance of the organization. Similarly if proper food is not available then he cannot work according to the expected results of the organization. In the same way the personal security belongingness and self-esteem are the followed factors which comes one after the other in an individual priorities list. Self-recognition is the ultimate requirement of the individual when the above basics are provide to him.

Another theory was introduced by Graham & Messner (1998) they says individuals are motivated by the force or wish to get something and totally depends upon his ability and working atmosphere. Thus it is a combine result of his performance and his ability. As a result various outcomes are derived by different workers.

Harpaz (1990) comes in with an opinion that people motivated to get social equity as a result to their hard work and consistent performance. As per his opinion the job outcomes includes salary, promotion, social recognition and monetary incentives. To get these benefits the employees must insert massive efforts on the job in shape of time education, hard work and consistent attachment to the firm.

Herzberg (1987) observed that some factors are always there in any job that can have greater effect on the performance of the workers. The factor which causes satisfaction during the job is according to him is intrinsic factors or motivator. Similarly the other factor that causes dissatisfaction is called hygiene. Another theory was suggested by Mac Gregory which has explained the case in a different way, he says that there are two sets of people in any organization, one form is lazy while the other one aggressive. He made two symbols for these separate segments of individuals that is lazy people were assigned X and aggressive workers were mentioned with Y. he suggested that X workers should be motivated so that they can work hard to get the desired benefits and hence increase their performance and productivity in the organization.

The detailed discussion of motivational theories clearly shows that the employees or workers motivation is a very key factor for any organization to achieve a competitive position in a very tough market.

The phenomena of motivation of workers have been defined and used in various occasions but is often confusing in the past. But some points can be derived from all these discussions. The workers motivation behavior and non-motivated behavior has a slight difference and that is a specified goal. The basis of motivating employees depends mainly upon the directed goals (Herzberg, 1988)

The figure explains that motivation procedure starts with attention within needs of an employee. The next steps starts with search to achieve the or fulfill that need. This may within the organization or may be among the employees to fulfill that need. When need is achieved with monetary benefits then he further adds a second need that might be promotion or recognition within the company and the process goes on. All the researchers

doing their work for years and years were divided into different theories, they are agrees that all these work during the period can be rated as the golden area of motivation theories for workers(Kanungo, 1990)

Never before and some would agree, never since has so much progress been made in explicating the etiology of work motivation(Katz, 2005)

Lindner (1998) the motivational theories are discussed in brief and almost all of them are relevant theories and we have discussed their different aspects in details. The most appealing theories comes from Maslow's Need theory and the EGR theory by Alder and both the theories provides foundation for an ideal platform to study the financial motivation.

Maslow says that one need cannot be fully met but any need which is almost achieved will no longer force to motivate. He also adds that one must know that where a person stands on the hierarchal pyramid and you will be in a better position to focus on the fulfillment of that need at that level (Nelson, 2001).

Similarly as Nelson(2001) the Maslow five needs can be corresponds to three needs of Alder ERG theory. Alder says that the basic human needs are existence, relatedness and growth and that can be created without any priorities or pyramid.

Some of the research worker observed about the needs theory that although lower level of management are satisfied by fulfilling their deficiency in their job while top management are only satisfied when their deficiency and growth are combine achieved (Shipley & Kiely 1998)and this view was recognized by (Shenkel & Gardner, 2004)

Steers, Mowday& Shapiro (1998) in their survey among the population of workers in the city of Los Angeles- USA mentioned that "some factors like aspirations and altitude definitely affects the needs & expectations of employees and their situation identification.

Tietjan & Myers (2005) explain in Whittington & Evans (2005) were also very much relevant to that of the motivation theory of workers.According to them the following unrealistic points should be noticed about the employees,

- i. All the workers are same in nature
- ii. The situation is always the same
- iii. There is only on best way to fulfill the needs of the employees

This assumption was also criticized by Wiley (1997) they argued that it is a natural process that the feelings of employees will be better when their needs are fulfilled and automatically dissatisfied when their basic needs are not fulfilled.

As per Young (2000)at any given time each of us may have to work in any shape because it's really important for our survival and for our inner satisfaction. According to his observation working is a very common phenomenon and the factors that motivate or demotivate must be very logical and should be based upon some solid facts and observations. There should be a very positive debate on this important issue and it should be properly explained. Therefore finding out the key factors that is the cause for motivation or de-motivation is very much important for creating a healthy environment that encourage the employee motivation and improve his performance.

The detailed amount of study and literature available shows that for the better understanding of the key factors for the employee's motivation a series of different survey was carried out in different regions by scientists. These studies were based upon different

situation of job and different environmental factors were given to clearly understand these factors. Similarly in this research survey different techniques and applications were also used. In this regard one strong name is known in history that is (Fiedlander and Gordon, 1995).

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The techniques used in this research methodology are mainly quantitative. The quantitative research procedure is mainly taken with clearly objectives, statistical analysis and measurable reports. It can also be mentioned as the method used in a scientific way for the researches made in management sciences.

Collection of Data

The information which was needed for this research paper is obtained through a designed questionnaire. This is presented to the employees of Helicon Pharmaceutical Company. It is very easy to understand and precise. So that no wastage of time being made and respondents feel easy to answer the simple question. The design of the questionnaire is based on multiple options so as to avoid ambiguity regarding their answers and for obtaining very clear feedback from the employees. The data collection process is time consuming and needs a lot of consideration. Therefore, it has also got some limitations such as absenteeism of the employees, the interest of the respondents, distribution and collection of the questionnaires.

Population of the Study

Population in statistical language is the total number of individuals (employees) from where we are making our research from which a sample is drawn. Total population for this study is 250 which is actually the strength of workers of Helicon Pharmaceutical Company.

Sample Size

The size of the population is very huge and spread across the country so only four branches have been selected from all over the Pakistan. The branches are selected from the provisional headquarters of Punjab, Sind, Khyber Pakhtunkhwa and Baluchistan. As the area is very much dispersed so 64 employees were taken from the field of marketing and 36 from accounts and finance department. The total number of sample size is 100 that is $n = 100$.

Methods for Data Analysis

For analysis of different variables simple percentages and tables were used and for the testing of the hypothesis the most comprehensive and authenticated software SPSS was used for Regression analysis Pearson Correlation, Independent Sample t-Test and One Way ANOVA tests. The collective data was entered in SPSS software for specific tests and analysis. The results were obtained from this software. This software is currently the most reliable in the field of research across the world for saving time and getting accurate results.

Level of Significance

The significance level was 5% that means 95% confidence level is there for the data collected and 5 percent is error margin.

Questionnaires Distribution and Collection

The design questionnaires were issued to 100 selected employees of Helicon Pharmaceutical Company in the selected branches after the completion of questionnaire 80 of them were returned duly filled and properly answered.

The scales and their reliability

Table 6. Reliability of Scales

| Subscales | Reliability (α) | N of Items |
|------------------------|--------------------------|------------|
| Employee's Attitude | 0.822 | 22 |
| Employee's Performance | 0.796 | 10 |

The above table shows that, Cronbach's Alpha is 0.822, which indicates a high level of internal consistency for scale of Employee's Attitude, whereas the reliability of second scales Employee's Performance is 0.796 which also shows the high internal consistency and reliability.

RESULTS AND DISCUSSIONS

Testing of Hypotheses One:

H0: There is no association of employee motivation and employee performance

A Pearson Product-Moment Correlation has used to find the relationship between the employee motivation and employee performance. The result shows a strong and positive relationship between employee motivation and employee performance, therefore it shows that there is a significant relationship between the two variables ($p < 0.000$, $n = 80$, $r = 0.906$), Thus we reject the null hypothesis. Refer to table 7

Table 7. Correlation test results of Hypothesis one

| | | Employee's Motivation | Employee performance |
|-----------------------|---------------------|-----------------------|----------------------|
| Employee's Motivation | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .906** |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | | .000 |
| | N | 80 | 80 |
| Employee performance | Pearson Correlation | .906** | 1 |
| | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | |
| | N | 80 | 80 |

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Testing of Hypotheses Two:

H0: No differences exist in the prevalence of employee motivation across demographic features of the employees.

The objective of this hypothesis is to find out the differences between employee motivation across demographics such as gender, age, cadre, work type and marital status. For this purpose an Independent Sample T-Test was used to review the differences among employee motivation across sex, work type, and marital status. Another statistical test that is One Way ANOVA is also used for the same purpose across various age group, Cadre and educational background.

This result shows insignificant differences in employee motivation for male and female, single and married and work type. Refer to tables 8, 9 and 10

Table 8. Test results of Gender

| Scale | Male | Female | F/P value |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|------------------|
| | (N = 70) | (N = 10) | |
| Employee's Motivation | 3.8805 | 3.9545 | 2.317, P = 0.681 |

Table 9. Test results of Work Type

| Scale | Field Staff | Office Staff | F/P value |
|-----------------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| | (N = 61) | (N = 19) | |
| Employee's Motivation | 3.8614 | 3.9809 | 0.134, P = 0.392 |

Table 10. Test results of Marital Status

| Scale | Single | Married | F/P value |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|------------------|
| | (N = 56) | (N = 24) | |
| Employee's Motivation | 3.9602 | 3.7254 | 0.466, P = 0.068 |

Table 11. Test results of Age

| Scale | 21 – 30 | 31 – 40 | 41 – 50 | Above 50 | F/p value |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|------------------|
| | (N = 24) | (N = 50) | (N = 6) | (N = 0) | |
| Employee's Motivation | 3.9489 | 3.8636 | 3.8712 | 0 | 0.211, P = 0.810 |

Multiple Comparisons

Employee's Motivation, LSD

Table 12. Post Hoc Test results age

| (I) Age | (J) Age | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---------|---------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 20-30 | 31-40 | .08523 | .13237 | .522 | -.1784 | .3488 |
| | 41-50 | .07765 | .24330 | .750 | -.4068 | .5621 |
| 31-40 | 20-30 | -.08523 | .13237 | .522 | -.3488 | .1784 |
| | 41-50 | -.00758 | .23030 | .974 | -.4662 | .4510 |
| 41-50 | 20-30 | -.07765 | .24330 | .750 | -.5621 | .4068 |
| | 31-40 | .00758 | .23030 | .974 | -.4510 | .4662 |

There are insignificant differences found in employee motivation across different age levels as shown in table 11 and 12.

Table 13. Test results of education

| Scale | Intermediate | Graduate | Post Graduate | Total | F/p value |
|-----------------------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------|------------------|
| | (N = 23) | (N = 51) | (N = 6) | (N=80) | |
| Employee's Motivation | 3.7708 | 3.9332 | 3.9773 | 3.8898 | 0.836, P = 0.437 |

Multiple Comparisons

Employee's Motivation, LSD

Figure 14. Post Hoc Test results of Education

| (I) Education | (J) Education | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Intermediate | Graduate | -.16240 | .13282 | .225 | -.4269 | .1021 |
| | Post Graduate | -.20652 | .24241 | .397 | -.6892 | .2762 |
| Graduate | intermediate | .16240 | .13282 | .225 | -.1021 | .4269 |
| | Post Graduate | -.04412 | .22823 | .847 | -.4986 | .4103 |
| Post Graduate | intermediate | .20652 | .24241 | .397 | -.2762 | .6892 |
| | Graduate | .04412 | .22823 | .847 | -.4103 | .4986 |

There are insignificant differences found in employee motivation across different education levels as shown in table 13 and 14.

Table 15. Test results of cadre

| Scale | Junior | Middle | Senior | Total | F/p value |
|-----------------------|----------|----------|----------|--------|------------------|
| | (N = 33) | (N = 35) | (N = 12) | (N=80) | |
| Employee's Motivation | 3.9807 | 3.9234 | 3. | 3.5417 | 3.362, P = 0.040 |

Multiple Comparisons

Employee's Motivation, LSD

Table 16. Post Hoc Test results of Cadre

| (I) Cadre | (J) Cadre | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Junior | Middle | .05734 | .12438 | .646 | -.1903 | .3050 |
| | Senior | .43905* | .17280 | .013 | .0950 | .7831 |
| Middle | Junior | -.05734 | .12438 | .646 | -.3050 | .1903 |
| | Senior | .38171* | .17148 | .029 | .0403 | .7232 |
| Senior | Junior | -.43905* | .17280 | .013 | -.7831 | -.0950 |
| | Middle | -.38171* | .17148 | .029 | -.7232 | -.0403 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

There are significant differences were found in employee motivation across with different combinations of cadre such as Junior and Senior, Middle and senior, Senior and Junior, senior and Middle as shown in table no. 15 & 16. The results suggest that differences are prevalent in employee motivation for field and office staff, however the study failed to record differences in employee motivation between gender and marital status, thus hypothesis two was marginally supported.

Testing of Hypotheses Three:

H0: No Differences exist in the prevalence of employee performance across demographic features of employees.

The objective of this hypothesis is to find out the differences between employee performance across demographics such as gender, age, cadre, work type and marital status. For this purpose an Independent Sample T-Test was used to review the differences among employee motivation across sex, work type, and marital status. Another statistical test that is One Way ANOVA is also used for the same purpose across various age group, Cadre and educational background.

Table 17. Test results of gender

| Scale | Male | Female | F/P value |
|------------------------|----------|----------|------------------|
| | (N = 70) | (N = 10) | |
| Employee's performance | 3.9029 | 4.0000 | 1.307, P = 0.677 |

Table 18. Test results of work type

| Scale | Field Staff | Office Staff | F/P value |
|------------------------|-------------|--------------|------------------|
| | (N = 61) | (N = 19) | |
| Employee's Performance | 3.8885 | 4.0000 | 0.780, P = 0.539 |

Table 19. Test results of Marital Status

| Scale | Single | Married | F/P value |
|------------------------|----------|----------|------------------|
| | (N = 56) | (N = 24) | |
| Employee's Performance | 4.0071 | 3.7000 | 0.035, P = 0.066 |

This result shows insignificant differences in employee performance for male and female, single and married and work type. Refer to table's no. 17, 18 and 19

Table 20. Test results of age

| Scale | 21 – 30 | 31 – 40 | 41 – 50 | Above 50 | F/p value |
|------------------------|----------|----------|---------|----------|------------------|
| | (N = 24) | (N = 50) | (N = 6) | (N = 0) | |
| Employee's Performance | 3.9333 | 3.8800 | 4.1333 | 0 | 0.373, P = 0.690 |

Multiple Comparisons

Employee performance, LSD

Table 21. Post Hoc Test Results of age

| (I) Age | (J) Age | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---------|---------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| 20-30 | 31-40 | .05333 | .17136 | .756 | -.2879 | .3946 |
| | 41-50 | -.20000 | .31497 | .527 | -.8272 | .4272 |
| 31-40 | 20-30 | -.05333 | .17136 | .756 | -.3946 | .2879 |
| | 41-50 | -.25333 | .29814 | .398 | -.8470 | .3403 |
| 41-50 | 20-30 | .20000 | .31497 | .527 | -.4272 | .8272 |
| | 31-40 | .25333 | .29814 | .398 | -.3403 | .8470 |

There are insignificant differences found in employee motivation across different age levels as shown in table 20 and 21

Table 22. Test results of education

| Scale | Intermediate | Graduate | Post Graduate | Total | F/P value |
|------------------------|--------------|----------|---------------|--------|------------------|
| | (N = 23) | (N = 51) | (N = 6) | (N=80) | |
| Employee's Performance | 3.7478 | 3.9843 | 3.9667 | 3.9150 | 0.963, P = 0.386 |

Multiple Comparisons

Employee performance, LSD

Table 23. Post Hoc Test Results of education

| (I) Education | (J) Education | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|---------------|---------------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| intermediate | Graduate | -.23649 | .17202 | .173 | -.5790 | .1061 |
| | Post Graduate | -.21884 | .31396 | .488 | -.8440 | .4063 |
| Graduate | intermediate | .23649 | .17202 | .173 | -.1061 | .5790 |
| | Post Graduate | .01765 | .29559 | .953 | -.5710 | .6062 |
| Post Graduate | intermediate | .21884 | .31396 | .488 | -.4063 | .8440 |
| | Graduate | -.01765 | .29559 | .953 | -.6062 | .5710 |

There are insignificant differences found in employee motivation across different education levels as shown in table 22 and 23

Table 24. Test results of cadre

| Scale | Junior | Middle | Senior | Total | F/p value |
|------------------------|----------|----------|----------|--------|------------------|
| | (N = 33) | (N = 35) | (N = 12) | (N=80) | |
| Employee's Performance | 3.9818 | 3.9943 | 3.5000 | 3.9150 | 2.709, P = 0.073 |

Multiple Comparisons

Employee performance, LSD

Table 25. Post Hoc Test results of cadre

| (I) Cadre | (J) Cadre | Mean Difference (I-J) | Std. Error | Sig. | 95% Confidence Interval | |
|-----------|-----------|-----------------------|------------|------|-------------------------|-------------|
| | | | | | Lower Bound | Upper Bound |
| Junior | Middle | -.01247 | .16262 | .939 | -.3363 | .3114 |
| | Senior | .48182* | .22593 | .036 | .0319 | .9317 |
| Middle | Junior | .01247 | .16262 | .939 | -.3114 | .3363 |
| | Senior | .49429* | .22420 | .030 | .0478 | .9407 |
| Senior | Junior | -.48182* | .22593 | .036 | -.9317 | -.0319 |
| | Middle | -.49429* | .22420 | .030 | -.9407 | -.0478 |

*. The mean difference is significant at the 0.05 level.

There are significant differences were found in employee performance across with different combinations of cadre such as Junior and Senior, Middle and senior, Senior and Junior, senior and Middle as shown in table's no 24 and 25 Since no differences were recorded for employee performance across demographics we fail to reject the null hypothesis.

Testing of Hypotheses Four:

H0: Employee Motivation has a positive effect on employee performance.

Model summary table shows under the column headed R square that 0.822 variation in the value of the dependent variable is due to the change in the independent variables (employee's motivation).

Model Summary

Table 26. Regression Model summary of employee performance

| Model | R | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|--------------------|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1 | 0.906 ^a | 0.822 | 0.819 | 0.29096 |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee's Motivation

Output table that shows ANOVA statistics includes F statistics value as 359.324 and significant at 5%. This means that the model is statically reliable.

ANOVA^b

Table 27. Regression analysis test results

| Model | | Sum of Squares | df | Mean Square | F | Sig. |
|-------|------------|----------------|----|-------------|---------|-------------------|
| 1 | Regression | 30.419 | 1 | 30.419 | 359.324 | .000 ^a |
| | Residual | 6.603 | 78 | .085 | | |
| | Total | 37.022 | 79 | | | |

a. Predictors: (Constant), Employee's Motivation

b. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

Co-efficients^a

Table 28: Co-efficients results

| Model | | Unstandardized Coefficients | | Standardized Coefficients | t | Sig. |
|-------|-----------------------|-----------------------------|------------|---------------------------|--------|------|
| | | B | Std. Error | Beta | | |
| 1 | (Constant) | -.659 | .243 | | -2.706 | .008 |
| | Employee's Motivation | 1.176 | .062 | .906 | 18.956 | .000 |

a. Dependent Variable: Employee performance

The regression table titled Coefficients is of the main interest. In the column titled "Unstandardized Coefficients" column, two statistics B, which is the regression coefficient and the standard error, are reported. Notice that there are two statistics reported under B: one labeled as (Constant), the other labeled as Employee's motivation, and this is regression coefficient which measure slope of the line.

The constant and employees motivation are statistically significant as shown by the t-statistics and / or P values provided. The result shows a positive and significant influence on employee performance. Thus we reject the null hypothesis.

FINDINGS

1. The research study reveals that motivation is a strong tool in any organization for the employees and it has a direct relationship with the performance of the workers.
2. The motivation techniques have different effects in specific time and in different working conditions. The motivation techniques cannot be fixed for all the organization and for all the time. It must be changed according to situation and according to organization structure.
3. The study also shows that the people are motivated to work better for their own sake and for social & financial benefits which clearly reflects that in majority cases the motivation is raised from internal sources.
4. The study further analyzes that motivation is based upon personalities and it is in most of the cases different from one person to another.
5. The motivation policies vary from one gender to another and have got significant relationship across male & female.
6. There are significant differences between different age groups as for as the motivational effects are concerned which means that these effects vary from age to age and it should be kept in mind while making the policies of organization.
7. The study shows insignificance for gender and married or single employees.
8. The study also shows that there are significant differences between employee motivations across the education level.

RECOMMENDATIONS

As a primary strength the article provides a sound base for the organizations to effectively analyze what factors are the most important for employees that push them to work better and should be focused.

The use of scientific methods and data collection process further enhance the analysis that

there should be continuous survey and procedures for organizations to assess the key factors that can positively boost the performance of employees.

A healthy work environment is the most important for all demographic level of the employees and must be focused for better performance. I would suggest that this kind of survey should be made on continuous bases because the condition and change the behavior of course affects the performance of the workers also. The motivation of employees is still a burning issue even around 50 years of research work is there but still there if a difference of opinion. Moreover the modern technological advancement, retrenchment and globalization etc. also leaves the employee with uncertainty regarding their future and most of the organization currently does not guarantee employment for lifetime.

CONCLUSION

The primary objective of the study was to analyze the effect of motivation tools on the performance of the employees. A questionnaire was designed in such a way that should be precise simple and clear so that solid feedback can be taken from the respondents.

The respondents in the study shows that there are mainly five factors that is actually having strong effect on the performance of employee, that is job satisfaction, promotion, better salary, recognition and management style. Regardless of the demographic factors such as age, cadre and gender etc, the respondent in the questionnaire shows that job satisfaction is the most important and key factor that affects the performance.

The study reveals a significant and strong association between motivation of employees and employee performance, however in relation to the motivation across demographics, differences were prevalent in employee motivation for field and office staff, no differences was found in employee motivation between gender and marital status. Hypothesis 3 revealed no differences in employee performance between gender, work type and marital status. The study found significant influence of employee motivation on employee performance.

In conclusion, it is suggested that for the long-term survival of any organization, the motivation of its employees is most important factor, either it may be in financial or non-financial. The organization should continuously conduct surveys within the company so as to find out the factors that is affecting the performance their workers. The management should adopt different attractive policies for different cadre and it should be the specific time. These information and continuous feedback will help to analyze what employee want from their job and motivates them to use their full capabilities for attaining their personal objectives and organizations goals.

REFERENCES

- Antomioni, D. (1999). What Motivates Middle Managers? *Journal of Industrial Management*, 41(6), 27-30.
- Basset-Jone, N., & Lloyd, G. (2005). Does Herzbergs Motivational Theory have staying power. *Journal of Management Development*, 24(10), 57-56.
- Diener, E., & Diener, M. (1995). Cross-Cultural Correlates of Life Satisfaction and Self-Esteem. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 68(4), 161-163.

- Fiedlander, F., & Gordon, G. (1995). Importance of Work versus Non Work Among Social Occupationally Stratified Groups. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(6), 437-443.
- Friedlander, F. (1964). Job Characteristics as Satisfies and Dissatisfies. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48(6), 388-399.
- Friedlander, F., & Basset, J. (1966). Motivation to Work and Organizational Performance. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(2), 143-152.
- Gordon, G. (2005). The Relationship of Satisfied and Dissatisfied to Productivity, Turnover and Morale. *International Journal of American Psychologist*, 40(1), 499-504.
- Graham, M., & Messner, P. (1998). Principals and Job Satisfaction. *International Journal of Education Management*, 12(5), 196-204.
- Greenberg, J., & Baron, A. (2003). *Behavior in Organizations* (Vol. 8). Prentice Hall.
- Harpaz, I. (1990). The importance of Work Goals: An International Perspective. *Journal of International Business Studies*, 21(1), 75-100.
- Helepota, H. (2005). Motivational Theories and their application in contruction. *Cost Engineering*, 47(3), 14-35.
- Herberg, F. (1987). One More Time: How Do You Motivate Employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 81(8), 86-96.
- Herberg, F. (1988). Workers Needs: the Same around the World. *Harvard Business Review*, 29-34.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1996). *Management of Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall, Inc, Englewood Cliffs, N.J, 34-35.
- Kanungo, R. (1990). Work Alienation in Developing Countries: Western Models and Eastern Realities. London: A.M. Jaeger & R.N. Kunungo (Eds.).
- Katz, R. (2005). Motivating Technical Professionals Today. *Journal of Research Technology Management*, 48(8), 21-30.
- Kovach, K. (1987). What Motivates Employees? Workers and Supervisors give different answers. *International Journal of Business Horizons*, 30(6), 58-65.
- Lindner, J. (1998). Understanding Employee Motivation. *Journal of Estension*, 4(1), 1-8.
- Nelson, B. (2001). Motivate Employees with Intangible Benefits. Retrieved from <http://www.findarticles.com>
- Saleh, S. (1964). A Study of Attitude Change in the pre-retirement Period. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48(6), 310-318.
- Shenkel, R., & Gardner, C. (2004). Five Ways to Retain Good Staff. *Internation Journal of Family Practice of Management*, 57-59.

Shiple, D., & Kiely, J. (1998). Motivation and Dissatisfaction of Industrial workers - How relevant is Maslows theory. *European Journal of Marketing*, 22(1), 17-24.

Steers, R., Mowday, R., & Shapiro, D. (1998). The future of work motivation theory. *Academy of Management Review*, 29(3), 379-387.

Tietjan, M., & Myers, R. (2005). Motivation and Job Satisfaction. *Journal of Management Decision*, 29(4), 226-231.

Whittington, J., & Evans, B. (2005). General Issues in Management, Problems and Perspectives in Management. *International Journal of Business Management*, 5(2), 114-122.



Muhammad Asif Jan: Business Unit Manager (BUM) in Helicon Pharmaceutical Company, Pakistan. He has MS degree in Human Resource Management from Agricultural University Peshawar, Pakistan and over 16 years work experience in HR and Marketing. Areas of interest are Human Resource Management, Organizational Development, Conflict Management, Corporate Finance, Risk Management and Project Management.

Email : asif.bionexus@gmail.com



Muhammad Imran Khan Khalil: Lecturer at department of Computer Science & Information Technology, University of Engineering and Technology, Peshawar, Pakistan. MS in Information Technology and Project Management. Over 10 years of teaching and research experience. Areas of interest are Computer Network, software Engineering, Management information System, and Project Management.

Email : imrankhalil79@gmail.com



Khawaja Fawad Latif: Lecturer at City University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar. M.A. Human Resource Management from University of Westminster, London, UK. Broad experience is teaching and research. Currently pursuing Ph.D in Human Resource Management. Area of interest are Human Resource Management, Job Satisfaction, Organizational Culture and Change, Learning and Development.

Email : kfls_83@hotmail.com



Abid Ali: Business Unit Manager (BUM) in Helicon Pharmaceutical Company, Pakistan. He has MS degree in Human Resource Management from Agricultural University Peshawar, Pakistan and over 15 years work experience in HR and Marketing. Areas of interest are Human Resource Management, Conflict Management, Organizational Development, Corporate Finance, Risk Management and Project Management.

Email : abid.bionexus@gmail.com



Muhammad Usman Haidar: Lecturer at City University of Science and Information Technology, Peshawar. MS in Marketing and currently pursuing Ph.D in Marketing. More than 8 years teaching and research experience in the fields of Management and Marketing.

Email : muhaider321@gmail.com