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ABSTRACT

Motivation is considered to be the desired positive willingness that prompts a person to action. The factors that influence or lead to this positive willingness, are considered to be motivation factors, and include specific needs, wants, drives or impulses (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

People are motivated by different things, both intrinsic and extrinsic factors. For some, it is power and money that motivate them while for others, it is flexibility or a social workplace. According to Herzberg’s theory, intrinsic factors are motivators or satisfiers and can be described as a person's relationship with what she or he does, many related to the tasks being performed (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005; Mehta, Anderson & Dubinsky, 2000). Extrinsic factors, also known as hygiene factors or dissatisfiers, have to do with a person's relationship to the context or environment in which she or he performs a job (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005; Mehta et al., 2000).

Some individuals are highly motivated by both intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. This is supported in a study amongst medical students (Beswick, 2002). In another study by Shim, Gehrt and Goldsberry (1999), it was found that students entering a career in retail viewed intrinsic aspects as the most important predictor of a retail career, followed by lifestyle flexibility aspects and then extrinsic aspects. Furthermore, research within a service organisation has indicated that various biographical factors have an influence on work motivation (Bezuidenhout, 2001). However, limited research has been conducted to determine whether biographical factors have an influence on work motivation within the retail industry.
The aim of the study was to investigate the motivation of retail managers in a retail organisation in the Western Cape. Furthermore, it investigates whether the motivation levels of retail managers are influenced by their biographical variables. The Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire developed by De Beer (1987) and a self-developed biographical questionnaire was administered to elicit work content, promotion, supervision, reward and recognition in relation to work motivation. The questionnaires were distributed to the target population (n=236) of retail managers which were inclusive of store managers, store assistant managers and department managers. Convenience sampling was used to draw a sample (n=109) of male and female retail managers. Statistical analyses involved both descriptive and inferential statistics (ANOVA, Multiple Regression Analysis, Pearson’s Correlation Co-efficient and Scheffe’s test).

The results revealed that there is a significant positive relationship between the investigated dimensions of work motivation and satisfaction. It was found that the investigated dimensions of motivation only account for 49.5% of the variance in total motivation experienced by retail managers. Furthermore, significant differences were found between the biographical variables and responses to the questionnaire.

It is suggested, for future research that a proportionate stratified random sample be drawn which will allow the findings of the study to be reliably generalised to the population. Furthermore, it is also recommended that future research consider dimensions of motivation, such as, achievement, responsibility, security, autonomy, feedback and morale, which are not investigated in this study.
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CHAPTER 1

INTRODUCTION

1.1 BACKGROUND

Motivation is a crucial concern in most organisations as it is a key factor in getting employees to increase performance (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005; Ströh, 2001). This was confirmed by an extensive survey carried out to determine the perceptions of employees and their supervisors about employee motivation. The results indicated that the greatest factor lacking amongst managers was their ability to accurately perceive the factors that motivate their employees (Kovach, 1995 cited in Ströh, 2001). Bellingan-Timmer (2004) concurs that it is necessary to evaluate what factors influence managers’ job satisfaction levels, as satisfied managers will be able to better cope with pressures exerted by top and junior management for increased overall efficiency.

The world of work has changed dramatically over the past decade, with organisations being assessed against international standards and best practices as a result of downsizing and expanding, globalisation increasing, workforces diversifying, new organisational forms and benchmarking. All these changes have a profound influence on how organisations, including retail organisations, attempt to motivate their employees in order to have a competitive edge. According to Broadbridge (1999), there is a complexity of forces dictating transformations in retailing employment. Buitendach and De Witte (2005) add that South African organisations are being exposed more than ever to the effects of globalisation, and tremendous pressure is placed on organisations to improve their performance and to become increasingly
competitive by finding ways of saving costs. According to Marais and Scheepers (1996), these cost-saving activities include cutting salaries and wages, which is the largest immediate source of cost savings.

Higgs, Malcolm, Renton and Hamish (2003) emphasise that as competition in UK retail increases, retail organisations increasingly realise that the contributions, motivation and behaviour of store employees are the key aspects of competitive advantage and business success. Moreover, Huddleston and Good (1999) concur that the success of retail firms is dependent on a motivated workforce. Furthermore, retailing plays an important role in the economy (Abratt, Bendixen & Drop, 1999). Sales managers have a direct impact on corporate profitability as they are responsible for managing and leading a sales force in its critical direct revenue-generating activities (Czinkota, Kotabe & Mercer, 1997). Thus, their motivation should be a major concern for senior management.

Employees’ motives, socio-economic background and value system could all interact with how employees perform their work and react to efforts to influence their performance. Moreover, it is well established that the manner in which employees are treated has a profound influence on their work performance. However, given the complexity of work itself, the different meanings that can be attached to the concept of work in modern life, as well as the inherent complexity of the human psyche, the link between managerial efforts to motivate employees to higher levels of performance and the actual performance realised by these efforts, is highly complex and only partially understood. Compounding this complexity in the South African situation is the socio-political heritage, the disparities in living standards and the cultural and ethnic diversity. These uniquely South African aspects along with the
problem of developing, utilising and maintaining a high performance workforce make it risky to import concepts and theories from other countries without trying to place them in the South African context (Swanepoel, Erasmus, Van Wyk & Schenk, 1998).

Furthermore, South Africa’s diversity runs throughout the broad geographic spread, with a population of almost 45-million. While KwaZulu Natal is the most populous province, this does not proportionately translate into retail sales. The spending power of South African consumers is located largely in the Western Cape and Gauteng, which register the highest percentage of retail sales. It was found that 50% of the country's retail sales occur in the Western Cape and Gauteng (Ansley, 2005).

1.2 MOTIVATION FOR THE STUDY

Findings reported in the organisation’s internal term report (2005) for the Western Cape highlighted that a fairly high labour turnover of retail managers (i.e. department managers, store managers and store assistant managers) exists. This resulted in negative consequences such as sales staff not being managed for periods of time, an inconsistent quality of service delivered and the company incurring continuous replacement and recruitment costs. As retail managers are seen as key players in the retail business and contribute to company profits, it is imperative that retail organisations retain, develop and constantly ensure that their retail managers are motivated, ensuring continuous high performance and effectiveness.

Based on this premise, the motives for choosing this particular organisation to conduct the research was that it was placed first in the retail sector and twelfth overall in the Best Company to Work For Survey in 2004 (Edcon Vibe, June 2005). It has
been identified as a leader in the industry and nationally recognised as an Employer of Choice. Secondly, it uses a framework which focuses on three clusters, namely, Organisational focus, People focus and Management and Leadership focus, which serve as the primary people drivers within the motivational environment. These levers are used to ensure that strategic business imperatives are achieved through effective management within a motivational climate (Edcon Corporate OPS Report, 2003).

Furthermore, the organisation’s perception survey results are an indication of the organisation reaching its strategic business imperatives, namely, profits, results and performance within its motivational environment. These focus areas are seen to be the key contributing factors in creating the motivational climate within the organisation.

Illustrated in Figure 1.1 below are the employees’ general perceptions of the organisation, which have increased between 2002 and 2004 (Edcon Staff Annual Report, 2004).

**Figure 1.1**

![Organisation Overview](image)

Adapted from Edcon Staff Annual Report (2004).
Figure 1.2 indicates that there are improvements across all the dimensions of the People Focus Cluster between 2002 and 2004, except Work Content, which declined slightly between 2003 and 2004 (Edcon Staff Annual Report, 2004).

Figure 1.2

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Dimension</th>
<th>Average Percentage</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Content</td>
<td>76 82 78 74 68 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationships</td>
<td>74 68 66</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Performance</td>
<td>52 51</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Management</td>
<td>51 30 26</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Rewards</td>
<td>26 60</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Training &amp;</td>
<td>57 57</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Development</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Adapted from Edcon Staff Annual Report (2004).
Figure 1.3 depicts that the organisation has improved its perception in all the dimensions of the Organisational Focus Cluster between 2002 and 2004.

Figure 1.3

![Organisational Focus Cluster](chart.png)

Adapted from Edcon Staff Annual Report (2004).

In summary, the organisation in which the research is conducted appears to be relatively successful in terms of its results with regard to its motivational environment. However, no specific research has been conducted on store level managers, which is imperative as they are key operational role players in reaching organisational objectives. Hence, the need for this research.

As the key objectives of Human Resources in any organisation are to ensure fulfilled and competent staff, and to ensure an environment that enables the organisation to achieve business success through its people, it is important that retail organisations become aware of the factors motivating and fulfilling employees, especially retail managers, who are responsible for leading and managing the sales force.
1.3 RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

In light of the motivation for the study, the objectives of the research are three-fold:

(i) To determine the major motivating factors for retail managers within a leading retail company in the Western Cape;

(ii) To determine whether the dimensions of motivation will statistically explain the variance in total work motivation experienced by retail managers and

(iii) To determine whether motivation is influenced by biographical variables.

1.4 RESEARCH QUESTIONS

Based on the aims of the study stipulated above, the following research questions have been formulated:

(i) Are there statistically significant relationships between the dimensions of work motivation and work content, promotion, supervision, recognition, salary, and working conditions respectively amongst retail managers in a retail organisation?

(ii) Will the dimensions of motivation statistically explain the variance in total work motivation experienced by retail managers?
(iii) Are there statistically significant differences in motivation levels based on designation, level of education, age, race, gender and years employed at the organisation respectively?

### 1.5 RESEARCH HYPOTHESES

Sekaran (1992, p. 79) defines a hypothesis as “a logically conjectured relationship between two or more variables expressed in the form of testable statements.”

**Hypothesis 1**

There are statistically significant relationships between work motivation and work content, recognition, promotion, supervision, salary and working conditions respectively.

**Hypothesis 2**

The dimensions of motivation will statistically significantly explain the variance in total work motivation experienced by retail managers.

**Hypothesis 3**

There are statistically significant differences in motivational levels based on designation, educational level, age, race, gender and tenure.
1.6 DEFINITION OF TERMS

The following constructs are defined to facilitate the understanding of the various terminology used within the study. Terms that have not been referenced are defined according to the researcher’s understanding of the concept.

1.6.1 Motivation

Vroom (1964) cited in Analoui (2000) defined motivation as an internal force, based on an individual’s conscious and unconscious needs that drives him/her to achieve. Robbins (1993) further defines motivation as a needs-satisfying process that reveals that when an individual’s needs are satisfied or motivated by some factors (motivators), the individual will exert high levels of effort towards organisational goals. This construct will be further explored in Chapter 2.

1.6.2 Motivators

Motivators are referred to as “factors of motivation.” Motivators are the factors that influence or lead to positive willingness, and include specific needs, wants, drives or impulses (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). These factors (for example, recognition, work content, promotion, supervision, salary and working conditions) could trigger this willingness to achieve organisational goals.
1.6.3 Intrinsic factors

Intrinsic factors refer to the self-generated factors which influence people to behave in a particular way or to influence issues in a particular direction (Armstrong, 1996). Furthermore, according to Robbins (1993), intrinsic factors are related to job satisfaction.

1.6.4 Extrinsic factors

Extrinsic factors refer to things that are done to or for people to motivate them (Armstrong, 1996). According to Robbins (1993), extrinsic factors are associated with job dissatisfaction.

1.6.5 Retail industry

The retail industry comprises of establishments engaged in retailing merchandise and rendering services incidental to the sale of merchandise. The retailing process is the final step in the distribution of merchandise; retailers are therefore, organised to sell merchandise in small quantities to the general public.

1.6.6 Retail managers

Abratt et al. (1999) define a retail manager as a person in charge of a retail store, regardless of its size. In this study retail managers constitute store managers, store assistant managers and department managers employed in the various chains of the organisation where the study is undertaken.
1.6.7 Job Satisfaction


1.7 DELIMITATIONS OF THE STUDY

The findings are specific to one retail organisation and therefore cannot be generalised to all retail managers in the industry. Furthermore, the research focused on retail managers employed in only the Western Cape and the findings may therefore only be applicable to this region.

Due to the paucity of empirical research available within the retail industry, the literature review is limited to comparisons made to findings from other industries and not specifically to retail industries. Furthermore, literature pertaining to retail managers is practically non-existent.

The study focuses exclusively on content theories of motivation only, more specifically, Herzberg’s two-factor theory, and does not consider the impact of process theories on motivation.
Furthermore, the questionnaire that had been utilized for data-gathering purposes was only available in English. Although the results indicate that the majority of respondents were English speaking, the risk of respondents misunderstanding the questionnaire items, due to possible difficulty in interpreting some of the English terminology, existed. The researcher minimized the risk of respondents misunderstanding questionnaire items through:

(i) the use of uncomplicated, basic and work related language in the questionnaire that was used for gathering the data;

(ii) the official language in the organisation being English, alluding to all employees having at least a basic understanding of English.

1.8 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

The chapter contextualised the research with specific reference made to the challenges facing the retail industry, and the profound influence it has on the motivation of store managers. The motivation for the study, research questions, hypotheses and key constructs were highlighted. The chapter concludes with delimitations of the study. An overview of each chapter is provided below.

1.9 OVERVIEW OF CHAPTERS

Chapter 1 provides the rationale, context and framework of the research. Furthermore, it highlights the delimitations of the study.
Chapter 2 provides a comprehensive discussion of the theoretical background that pertains to the premise of the study. Literature focussing on work motivation, theories of motivation, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, constructs of motivation and job satisfaction, and biographical characteristics impacting on motivation are reviewed.

Chapter 3 provides perspective on the research design adopted to investigate the research problem. Reference is made to the sample’s selection and size, data collection methods and procedures followed, as well as the statistical techniques employed in testing the research hypotheses. The research instruments used to gather the data (biographical questionnaire and the Job Satisfaction and Work Motivation Questionnaire) are also addressed. Furthermore, the findings of the demographic information with regard to the sample characteristics are presented.

Chapter 4 presents and discusses the findings obtained.

Chapter 5 provides a discussion of the results. Furthermore, conclusions are drawn and recommendations made for future research.
CHAPTER 2

LITERATURE REVIEW

2.1 INTRODUCTION

The successful participation of South African organisations in the global economy relies extensively on the competitiveness of their goods and services. All organisations require productive employees to attain production of goods of acceptable quality and to achieve its economic, societal and employee-related goals (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2001).

Furthermore, South African organisations are being faced more than ever with the effects of increasing globalisation, such as a changing world economy, technological advancement and increasing international competition. It is evident that the retail industry is growing in South Africa, and is playing a vital part in South Africa’s contribution and participation in the global economy (Ansley, 2005).

Organisations are under extreme pressure to improve performance and become increasingly competitive (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005). As the success of retail organisations is dependent on a motivated workforce (Huddleston & Good, 1999) it is therefore imperative for South African organisations to be aware of what keeps employees and managers motivated as this would increase their job performance and therefore their productivity (Analoui, 2000; Arnolds & Boshoff, 2001; Ströh, 2001).
According to Oosthuizen (2001), motivation is one of the key factors in getting employees to increase performance. He further adds that “in today’s competitive world and market it is essential that an organisation have positively motivated employees to improve productivity and efficiency” (Oosthuizen, 2001, p. 19).

Furthermore, Ströh (2001) outlined that some employees do not produce the quality of work or maintain a consistent level of work outputs, which they are capable of. This may be attributed to many factors, including the under utilisation of their skills, lack of a challenge, or unstimulating leadership styles. These could result in motivation levels decreasing, and hence overall job satisfaction levels decreasing.

Research shows that employees are motivated by various factors, which in turn should satisfy certain needs and expectations (Luthans, 1989). Analoui’s (2000) research indicates that in terms of motives, managers are interested in power, status, achievement, income and advancement. These are specifically related to the job itself (known as intrinsic factors) and factors related to the work environment (known as extrinsic factors) (Buitendach & De Witte, 2005; Mehta et al., 2000).

Notwithstanding the paucity of literature available in the retail environment, the purpose of this chapter is to explore the theoretical framework on motivation. To accomplish this, the ensuing literature explores the constructs of motivation more extensively.
2.2 DEFINING MOTIVATION

According to Vroom (1964) cited in Analoui (2000), motivation comes from the Latin term “to move”. He defined motivation as an internal force, based on an individual’s conscious and unconscious needs that drive him/her to achieve. Drafke and Kossen (1998) cited in Schulze and Steyn (2003) and Steyn (2002) indicated that an awareness of the concept of needs is important for understanding the behaviour of people in the work situation, and understanding these needs will facilitate attempts of managers to motivate staff. They further state that needs are also known as motives, because they can move or motivate people to act. Robbins (1993; 1998) sees motivation as a needs-satisfying process that reveals that when an individual’s needs are satisfied or motivated by some factors (motivators), the individual will exert high levels of effort towards organisational goals.

Similarly, Banerjee (1995) considers motivation to be the influencing of an individual’s behaviour towards a specific goal whilst taking the individual’s specific motives, desires and reality into account. The specific goal being referred to could be the achievement of organisational objectives. If the individual experiences the “influencing” as positive, the situation or process can be considered to be motivating. If the individual, however, experiences the “influencing” as negative, the situation or process can be considered to be de-motivating.

Various authors (Saal & Knight, 1988; Reeve, 1996, Schermerhorn, Hunt & Osborn, 1997; Alkin & Cardy, 1998 all cited in Schulze & Steyn; 2003; Steyn, 2002) consider all major definitions of motivation to have three components in common that capture the essence and nature of motivation. Namely:
(i) Motivation is regarded to have an *energising* effect on human behaviour. Based on this, Saal and Knight (1988) postulate that motivation is a state that causes, compels and drives people to act and engage in specific behaviour.

(ii) Motivation is considered to have a *directing* function. It is therefore directed at achieving specific goals. This implies that motivated individuals would engage in behaviour and activities that would heighten the likelihood that their goals might be met (Saal & Knight, 1988).

(iii) Motivation is regarded to have a *sustaining* function, which explains why motivated people persevere with specific behaviour or actions until the goals or rewards are achieved (Saal & Knight, 1988).

In light of the above components, motivation therefore comprises of the complex forces, and includes incentives, needs, tensions and other mechanisms that energise, canalise and sustain human behaviour to carry out a particular action (Anderson & Kyprianou, 1994, Drafke & Kossen, 1998, Wevers, 2000 all cited in Steyn, 2002).

Motivation, for the purpose of the study, is considered to be the desired positive willingness that prompts a person to action. The factors that influence or lead to this positive willingness, are considered to be motivation factors, and include specific needs, wants, drives or impulses (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988). For a better understanding, motivation is further differentiated in terms of intrinsic and extrinsic factors.
2.3 **EXTRINSIC VS INTRINSIC MOTIVATION**

Some authors see motivation as being contained within the individual whereas others view it as arising from sources outside the individual. Daft (1999) defines motivation as the forces (either internal or external to a person) that arouse enthusiasm and persistence to pursue a certain course of action.

Harris (1996); McShane and Von Glinow (2000); and Franken (1994) cited in Ströh (2001) view motivation as the driving force in any individual, which moves him or her to act in a certain way. McShane and Von Glinow (2000) further contend that motivated employees are willing to exert a particular level of effort (intensity) for a certain amount of time (persistence) and toward a particular goal (direction). In this case motivation is something that exists within the individual, therefore known as internal or inherent motivation.

External motivation, on the other hand, is viewed as something outside the individual. Hellriegel and Slocum (1989) cited in Ströh (2001); Saal and Knight (1988); Reeve (1996), Schermerhorn et al. (1997), Alkin and Cardy (1998) all cited in Schulze and Steyn (2003) and Steyn (2002) view motivation as any influence that causes, channels and sustains people’s behaviour. Furthermore, according to Megginson (1981), motivation is the process by which managers stimulate employee behaviour and direct it toward achieving desired personal and organisational goals. Similarly, Grensing (1991, p. xi) cited in Ströh (2001, p. 60) states that “… motivated employees are the product of good management – and that is their responsibility.”
Although the responsibility of management is emphasised in the external motivation theory, proponents of this theory do not negate internal motivation theory. They rather consider external motivation as a theory that builds on internal motivation.

External motivation theory, in other words, includes the forces which exist inside the individual as well as the factors controlled by the manager, namely, job context items such as salary and working conditions, and job content items such as recognition and responsibility. It can therefore be said that each individual is already motivated, but that such inherent motivation can and should be stimulated by means of external motivation to inspire performance (Ströh, 2001).

Robbins (1993) contends that intrinsic factors are related to job satisfaction, while extrinsic factors are associated with dissatisfaction. Buitendach and De Witte (2005) and Mehta et al. (2000) state that extrinsic satisfaction refers to satisfaction with aspects that have little to do with the job tasks or content of the work itself (such as pay, working conditions and co-workers) and intrinsic satisfaction refers to the job tasks themselves (for example, variety, skill utilisation and autonomy). Furthermore, according to Hale (1998), Lawler (1981) and Lawler (1987) all cited in Mehta et al. (2000), rewards are critical as a means of motivating employees. Bellenger, Wilcox and Ingram (1984) cited in Mehta et al. (2000), found that sales managers generally place more emphasis on intrinsic rewards than extrinsic rewards.

Lam et al. (2001) citing Tony and Cathy (1995) found that extrinsic factors are much more important motivators than intrinsic factors for employees in the hospitality industry. However, according to Likert (1961) and McGregor (1960) cited in Lam et al. (2001), these findings seem to be different from other schools of thought which
tend to suggest that a more positive correlation emerges between intrinsic motivators and job satisfaction.

2.4 THEORETICAL PERSPECTIVES OF MOTIVATION

According to Muchinsky (1990), motivation has historically been viewed from one of two perspectives, viz, Trait Theory or Environmental Theory.

Trait Theory refers to motivation being largely genetically determined. Therefore, people are considered to be born with either a high level of motivation or a low level of motivation. Trait Theory further suggests that the level of motivation is fairly stable over an individual’s life span alluding to the assumption that motivation cannot really be developed over time. Trait Theory, based on the aforementioned, allows little recognition of the dynamic nature of humans (Muchinsky, 1990).

Environmental Theory is in direct contradiction with Trait Theory. Here, an individual’s level of motivation is a product of that individual’s circumstances. Environmental theory therefore supports the assumption that environmental or situational factors determine an individual’s level of motivation. Environmental Theory further advocates the notion that human nature is dynamic and that a person can become motivated or develop a high level of motivation, given the right conditions. These include work environment, type of work, rewards and relationships with co-workers (Muchinsky, 1990).

Kruger, Smit and Le Roux (1996) however, argue that the causes of differences in human behaviour can be ascribed to both heredity and environmental factors.
Hereditary factors refer to genetic factors such as gender. The environmental or situational factors are related to the influences of the external environment and have been divided into two categories, namely, working conditions and organisational social variables.

*Working conditions* comprise working methods, the design and condition of work equipment, workspace and layout of the work place and the physical work environment (Kruger et al., 1996). According to Singleton (1989), climatic conditions especially have a determining influence on differences in work behaviour.

*Organisational and social* variables mainly refer to factors such as the character or nature of an organisation, the type of training that is offered to workers, the incentive that workers are given, the social environment, and the relationships between the organisation and trade unions (Kruger et al., 1996).

### 2.5 PHILOSOPHIES OF HUMAN NATURE

According to Swanepoel et al. (1998), the degree to which managers succeed in motivating their subordinates depends to a large extent on the closeness of fit between their assumptions about people and empirical reality. Schein (1972) cited in Swanepoel (1998) formulated a useful classification of managerial assumptions about people based on the chronology in which these assumptions held sway in the history of industrial psychology. The four assumptions about the nature of “man” and “organisational man” in particular, which Beck (1983) refers to as the four philosophies of human nature, are: (i) rational-economic (ii) social man (iii) self-actualising man and (iv) complex man. He further points out that these philosophies
form the basis of most traditional approaches to dealing with workers and worker motivation. These are discussed in depth below.

(i) When workers are approached as *rational-economic* beings, it is assumed that they are exclusively motivated by economic considerations. In line with this approach, people-aspects are ignored with the sole consideration being the control of worker output by means of wages and financial incentives (Beck, 1983; Swanepoel et al., 1998). Swanepoel et al. (1998) further describe the rational-economic man as a rational computer, programmed to maximise self-gratitude and interest.

(ii) In viewing workers as *social* beings, it is acknowledged that workers are primarily motivated and driven by social needs. These needs are not necessarily satisfied at work and efforts should be made to meet these social needs at least in part. The focus on the worker as a social being gave rise to management practices like worker participation and group decision-making (Beck, 1983). According to Swanepoel et al. (1998, p. 344), the social man theory is the “notion that workers are at least, if not more, motivated by social factors present in their work environment, rather than by monetary rewards.”

(iii) When workers are approached as *self-actualising* beings, every effort is made in order to make work meaningful and fulfilling. Workers are encouraged to take ownership of their work and the development of pride and achievement is supported (Beck, 1983). Swanepoel et al. (1998) view
Maslow’s hierarchy of needs as the best version of the self-actualising man model of human behaviour as a function of motivational states.

(iv) After viewing the preceding models of man, Schein (1972 cited in Swanepoel et al., 1998) came to the conclusion that these models all contain elements of truth, but that they suffer from the defect of being generalisations that do not reflect the complexities of reality. According to Beck (1983), approaching workers as complex beings implies having due regard for the dynamic and unique nature of the motives, emotions, experiences, abilities and circumstances of workers. This philosophy suggests a unique approach to each worker and discourages approaches in the single strategy or a uniform mould.

2.6 APPROACHES TO MOTIVATIONAL THEORIES

Theories of motivation were divided in an attempt to explain the behaviour and attitudes of employees (Drafke & Kossen, 1998, cited in Steyn, 2002). According to several authors (Oosthuizen, 2001, Barnabè & Burns, 1994, Rowley, 1996, Schermerhorn et al., 1997, Mc Kenna, 2000, Wevers, 2000 all cited in Steyn, 2002), these theories can be divided into two categories when focusing on behaviour of individuals, namely, content theories and process theories.

Content theories explore the factors that influence behaviour and emphasise the needs that motivate people (Oosthuizen, 2001; Swanepoel et al., 1998). These needs translate into internal drives that give rise to specific behaviour intended to fulfil these needs (Hellriegel & Slocum, 1996 cited in Oosthuizen, 2001). Furthermore, Maslow
(1943), Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959), Alderfer (1972), McClelland (1988) all cited by Analoui (2000) argue that content theories identify not only needs, but incentives and the work itself as important factors that contribute to job satisfaction. Schermerhorn et al. (1991) and Steyn (2002) further argue that content theories of motivation lend insight into people’s needs, and attempt to identify factors within individuals and their environments that energise and sustain behaviour.

In contrast, process theories analyse how people behave (Oosthuizen, 2001; Swanepoel et al., 1998). They describe how behaviour is initiated or moderated by personality factors and psychological states to energise, direct and sustain behaviour and how they stop behaviour (Barnabè & Burns, 1994 & Mc Kenna, 2000 cited in Steyn, 2002). Furthermore, process theories view motivation in terms of the explicit thought processes (cognitions) and conscious decisions to select and pursue a specific choice of employees (Ivancevich, Lorenzi, Skinner & Crosby all cited in Oosthuizen, 2001). Examples of process theories include Adam’s equity theory, Vroom’s expectancy theory, Locke’s goal setting theory and Skinner’s reinforcement theory (Oosthuizen, 2001; Steyn, 2002; Swanepoel, 1998). These will not be addressed as the focus of the research relates more to content theories of motivation.

2.7 CONTENT THEORIES OF MOTIVATION

Various theories were developed to enhance the understanding of motivation and uncover the factors leading to motivation. Given the focus of the study to explore the factors that lead to motivation, particular attention is paid to the following content theories of motivation, namely, Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory, Alderfer’s ERG Theory and McClelland’s 3 Need Theory. More
specifically, the research instrument is based on Herzberg’s theory, and attention is therefore accorded to this theory to understand how these factors affect the motivation of retail managers.

2.7.1 Maslow’s Hierarchy of Needs

In the 1930s, motivation was considered to be an important aspect of human behaviour, but no scientifically-based theory could explain it (Luthans, 1989). Maslow, however, postulated motivation in terms of a need hierarchy theory (Oosthuizen, 2001; Pearson, 1991; Robbins, 1998; Swanepoel, 1998). He distinguishes a number of needs ranging from lower order to higher order needs, namely, physiological needs; security and safety needs; belonging, love and social needs; status and self actualisation needs (Newstrom & Davis, 1989; Robbins, 1998; Spector, 2000; Maslow, 1954 cited in Steyn, 2002; Swanepoel, 1998). These are described as follows:

(i) **Physiological needs** are the lowest order of human needs. It consists of the basic survival needs like the need for food, water and shelter (Maslow, 1954 cited in Bezuidenhout, 2001; Steyn, 2002; Swanepoel, 1998).

(ii) **Safety and security needs** represent stability (including financial security) and freedom from physical threats and dangers (Steyn, 2002). Furthermore, according to Maslow (1954) cited in Bezuidenhout (2001), it is the need for physical and emotional security in the form of clothing and shelter. In the modern setting it could include protection in the form of unemployment insurance, retirement benefits and pension.
(iii) **Belonging, love and social needs** include affective relationships and the need to belong to a group or family (Steyn, 2002; Swanepoel, 1998).

(iv) **Status and self-esteem needs** refer to the need to feel valued and respected by oneself and significant others (Steyn, 2002). Furthermore, Maslow identifies it as the need for accomplishment and achievement (Bezuidenhout, 2001).

(v) **Self-actualisation needs** refer to the need to utilise one’s potential to the maximum, working with and for other people and developing one’s capacity (Greenberg & Baron, 2003; Steyn, 2002). This can also be utilising one’s full potential in serving a noble cause (Maslow, 1954 cited in Bezuidenhout, 2001).

According to the theory, needs at lower levels have to be fulfilled to some extent before those at the next higher level can be satisfied (Schulze & Steyn, 2003; Steyn 2002). The lower four needs are called deficiency needs because they motivate people to meet them and until they are met, people find it difficult to respond to higher order or so-called growth needs (Greenberg & Baron, 2003; Newstrom & Davis, 1989; Owens, 1995, Everand & Morris, 1996, Wagner & Hollenbeck, 1998, McKenna, 2000 all cited in Steyn, 2002).

Furthermore, according to Swanepoel (1998), the differentiation between the two orders was made on the premise that higher-order needs are satisfied internally
(within the person), whereas lower-order needs (such as wages, bonus, or tenure) are predominantly satisfied externally.

Research has shown that not all people are able to satisfy their higher-order needs on the job. Greenberg and Baron (2003) reveal that research has found that although lower level managers are able to satisfy only deficiency needs on the job; managers from the higher echelons of organisations are able to satisfy both their deficiency and growth needs.

In general, Maslow’s theory has not received a great deal of support with respect to the specific notions it proposes, namely, the exact needs that exist and the order in which they are activated (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2001; Greenberg & Baron, 2003). Specifically, many researchers could not prove that there are only five basic categories of need and that they are activated in the precise order that Maslow had specified (Steers & Porter, 1991 cited in Arnolds & Boshoff, 2001; Greenberg & Baron, 2003).

### 2.7.2 Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory

In the late 1950s, Frederick Herzberg (considered by many to be a pioneer in motivation theory) interviewed a group of employees to find out what made them satisfied and dissatisfied on the job. From these interviews, Herzberg went on to develop his theory that there are two dimensions to job satisfaction: “motivation” and "hygiene". Based on research investigating the relationship between motivation and job-satisfaction, Herzberg concluded that all variables that make people feel either good or bad about their jobs can be grouped into one of two categories, hence, his
theory being known as the two-factor theory of motivation (Robbins, 1998; Spector, 2000; Swanepoel, 1998). The more intrinsic factors, such as achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility, growth and advancement, seem to be related to job satisfaction; whereas extrinsic factors, such as status, security, company policy, administration, remuneration, supervision, working conditions, and interpersonal relations with subordinates, peers and supervisors, tend to be associated with job dissatisfaction (French, 2003; Newstrom & Davis, 1989; Oosthuizen, 2001; Pitts, 1995; Swanepoel, 1998).

Herzberg suggests that the opposite of satisfaction is not dissatisfaction. Removing dissatisfying aspects (the hygiene factors) from a job does not necessarily make the job satisfying. According to Herzberg, job satisfaction is a function of challenging, stimulating activities or work content (Swanepoel, 1998). This represents the first factor of his two-factor theory of motivation, known as the “motivators” (French, 2003; Pitts, 1995). Steyn (2002, p. 91) refers to this set of factors as “the actual execution of the work.” According to Robbins (1998), if individuals are to be motivated in their jobs, Herzberg suggests emphasising achievement, recognition, the work itself, responsibility and growth, as these are the factors that people find intrinsically rewarding. In addition, Herzberg indicated that a job existed in a context, or the factors extrinsic to the job, which could have the effect of dissatisfying or demotivating a worker. This represents the second factor of Herzberg’s theory, which is known as the “hygiene factors” (Pitts, 1995). According to Steyn (2002) and Swanepoel (1998), this set of factors relates to the work environment. Moreover, Robbins (1998) posits that when these extrinsic factors are adequate, people will not be dissatisfied, however, neither will they be satisfied.
According to Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman (1959) cited in Analoui (2000), hygiene issues cannot motivate employees but can minimize dissatisfaction, if handled properly. These are issues related to the employee's environment and they can only dissatisfy if they are absent or mishandled. Pitts (1995) adds that motivators, on the other hand, create satisfaction by fulfilling individuals' needs for meaning and personal growth. Once the hygiene issues are addressed, the motivators will promote job satisfaction and encourage production.

The six motivators identified (Herzberg, 1968 cited in Oosthuizen, 2001; Robbins, 1998; Swanepoel, 1998) are:

- **Achievement** which refers to the reach or attainment of a goal through effort, the successful accomplishment or completion of a task, the solving of a problem, the maintaining of a position and lastly, the visible results of a person’s work.

- **Recognition** which is the acknowledgement of the contribution of a person, to express appreciation or to reward the individual for the accomplishment of a task.

- **Responsibility** which is giving a person the liability, accountability and answerability for a task or person.

- **Advancement** which is the promotion of an individual.

- **The work itself** which refers to the doing of the work and the type of work. The job can be repetitive or changing, creative or monotonous, easy or difficult.

- **Growth opportunities** which refer to the individual growing in experience, skills, knowledge, status and seniority.
The ten hygiene factors are as follows (Herzberg, 1968 cited in Oosthuizen, 2001; Robbins, 1998; Swanepoel, 1998):

- **Salary** includes all financial rewards, such as the actual salary increase, performance increase etcetera.

- **Supervision** includes all the skills and abilities of the supervisor to lead, to coach and to solve problems. These aspects are crucial for his/her success.

- **Relationship with supervisor** refers to a good relationship with the supervisor resulting in continuous learning, willingness to listen to subordinate proposals, willingness to give credit and to defend an employee.

- **Relationship with colleagues** refers to a pleasant and supportive relationship with co-workers. This develops a sense of camaraderie and teamwork.

- **Company policy and procedures** include human resource policy, work organisation, production and other facilities, procedures and non-financial privileges.

- **Physical working conditions** pertain to the quality of work, availability of resources, and the environment in which the individual works.

- **Personal factors** refer to long working hours and high stress which influences the individual’s personal life resulting in negative feelings toward the job.

- **Status** includes symbols like position title and office furniture.

- **Job security** includes the factors that lead to a feeling of job security, for example, the survivability of the organisation, safety of a person’s specific job/position, medical aid and pension fund.
According to French (2003), Kreitner and Kinicki (2001), Robbins (1998) and Swanepoel et al. (1998), Herzberg concludes that the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction but rather no job dissatisfaction, and similarly, the opposite of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction but rather no job satisfaction.

Diagram 2.1 below illustrates Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory.

**Diagram 2.1: Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Motivators</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>Present</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene factors</td>
<td>Dissatisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Not satisfied</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Satisfied &amp; Motivated</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not present</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Not dissatisfied</td>
<td>3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present</td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


### 2.7.2.1 Application of the Theory

According to Oosthuizen (2001) citing Hellrigel and Slocum (1996), organisations that require workers to perform routine tasks are faced with problems of high turnover, absenteeism, grievances, and low productivity and these firms generally relied on hygiene factors to reduce job satisfaction. However, Oosthuizen (2001) argues that while hygiene factors can reduce job satisfaction, they do not improve performance. In terms of Herzberg’s theory, management should turn to motivators to
solve this problem. According to Higgs et al. (2003), research conducted in a UK retail organisation revealed that implementing an incentive scheme increased sales by 20% and motivated a minority of store managers and staff, however, it had a negative impact on store teamwork, ignored the role of recognition and demotivated staff.

2.7.2.2 Criticisms of Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory

The motivation-hygiene theory is not without its detractors. According to Mullins (1996), there are two common general criticisms of Herzberg’s theory. One is that the theory has only limited application to ‘manual’ workers. The second criticism is that the theory is ‘methodically bound’. Robbins (1998) adds that:

1. The procedure that Herzberg used is limited by its methodology. When things are going well, people tend to take credit themselves. Contrarily, they blame failure on the external environment.
2. The reliability of Herzberg’s methodology is questioned. Since raters have to make interpretations, it is possible that they may contaminate the findings by interpreting one response in one manner while treating another similar response differently.
3. The extent to which the theory is valid, provides an explanation of job satisfaction. It is not really a theory of motivation.
4. No overall measure of satisfaction was utilised. In other words, a person may dislike part of his or her job, yet still think the job is acceptable.
5. The theory is inconsistent with previous research. The motivation-hygiene theory ignores situational variables.
6. Herzberg assumes that there is a relationship between satisfaction and productivity. The research methodology he used looked however, only at satisfaction, not at productivity. To make such research relevant, it must be assumed that a high relationship exists between satisfaction and productivity.

Mullins (1996) states that despite the criticisms of Herzberg’s theory, his work has brought attention to the importance of job design in order to bring about job enrichment. Herzberg has emphasised the importance of ‘quality of life’ and advocates the restructuring of jobs to give greater emphasis to the motivating factors at work, to make jobs more interesting and to satisfy higher level needs. Furthermore, Robbins (1998) adds that it has been very popular over the past 30 years of vertically expanding jobs to allow workers greater responsibility in planning and controlling their work.

2.7.3 Alterfer’s ERG Theory

Alderfer’s Existence, Relatedness, Growth theory (ERG Theory) is similar to Maslow’s theory in that it is also based on the fulfilment of needs (Arnold & Feldman, 1986; Oosthuizen, 2001; Spector, 2000).

However, his theory is based on the fulfilment of three basic needs as opposed to the five levels of basic needs identified by Maslow (Greenberg & Baron, 2003; Spector, 2000). According to Armstrong (1991); Greenberg and Baron (2003); Muchinsky (1990); Oosthuizen (2001); Robbins, (1998) and Spector (2000), the three needs specified by ERG theory are:
(i) **Existence needs** which refer to material needs, necessities for basic survival and environmental factors such as food, water, pay, fringe benefits and working conditions.

(ii) **Relatedness needs** which correspond to Maslow’s social needs and refer to significant relationships in which the individual is involved. These include relationships with an individual’s co-workers, family, community members and friends.

(iii) **Growth needs** which refer to the need of certain individuals to be creative and productive while desiring opportunities for personal development and achievement. Muchinsky (1990) considers these growth needs to correspond to Maslow’s self-esteem and self-actualisation needs.

According to Oosthuizen (2001), Maslow’s need hierarchy is a static system based on fulfilment-progression, whereas the ERG theory presents a flexible three-needs system based on a frustration-progression process. In addition, Greenberg and Baron (2003), Robbins (1993) and Swanepoel (1998) indicate that a major deviation from Maslow’s theory is that individuals can only move from the first factor to the fifth factor; whilst, ERG theory allows for movement in any direction between levels of need and also accommodates the needs of individuals on different levels, simultaneously.

Furthermore, although the need theories are not in complete agreement about the precise number of needs and the relationships between them, they do agree that satisfying human needs is an important part of motivating behaviour on the job (Greenberg & Baron, 2003).
2.7.4 McClelland’s 3 Needs Theory

According to Mullins (1996); Robbins (1998) and Sherman, Bohlander and Snell (1996), McClelland proposes that there are three basic needs that are operative in the workplace, that is:

- The *need for achievement*, which is the desire to exceed some standard of behaviour; the need to excel; the need to be successful.
- The *need for power*, which is the need to make others behave in a way in which they would not otherwise have behaved, the need to control others, to be influential.
- The *need for affiliation*, which is the need for warm and close interpersonal relationships, to be liked and accepted by others.

Swanepoel (1998) states that if the above needs constitute the totality of needs, it remains for the manager to determine his/her subordinates’ dominant need and to offer opportunities whereby the individual’s needs and the organisation’s goals can simultaneously be met.

Robbins (1998) outlined that research undertaken by McClelland and other researchers, has revealed that a person with a high need for achievement prefers jobs with moderate risk, performance feedback and responsibility for performance. According to Swanepoel (1998), under these conditions, high achievers will be strongly motivated. Mullins (1996) adds that a person with a high need for achievement also has a preference for innovativeness. However, the intensity of these
mottoes would vary between individuals, and between different occupations. For example, Swanepoel (1998. p. 356) argues that individuals with a high need for achievement generally do not make good managers, especially in large organisations. For instance, “the hyperenthusiastic salesperson does not generally make a good sales manager. The best managers are people with a high need for power and a low need for affiliation.” Newstrom and Davis (1989) concur that supervisors are usually high achievers who are interested in concrete measures, namely money, as it reflects how well they have done.

2.8 COMPARISON OF CONTENT THEORIES

The differences and similarities between the four content theories, namely, Maslow’s hierarchy of needs, Herzberg’s two-factor theory, Alderfer’s ERG theory and McClelland’s three needs theory, are compared in Diagram 2.2. Its purpose is to focus on the positive relatedness that exists between the various theorists and not to establish exact similarities.
Diagram 2.2: A Comparison of the Content Theories

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Levels</th>
<th>Need level</th>
<th>Maslow Needs Hierarchy</th>
<th>Herzberg Two Factor</th>
<th>Alderfer ERG</th>
<th>McClelland Learned Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>Self-actualisation Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Need for Power, Achievement, Affiliation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>High</td>
<td>Esteem Needs</td>
<td>Motivating Factors</td>
<td>Growth Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td>Social Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td>Relatedness Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>Safety and Security Needs</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Low</td>
<td>Physiological Needs</td>
<td>Hygiene Factors</td>
<td>Existence Need</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Source: Adapted from Oosthuizen (2001, p. 21).

According to Oosthuizen (2001), it demonstrates the following:

- Maslow’s needs hierarchy served as the basis for the ERG model - therefore it is fairly similar. The major difference is that Maslow’s need hierarchy is a static system based on the fulfilment frustration-progression process.

- Herzberg’s theory draws on both the needs models. That is, if hygiene factors are present, the physiological and security needs are likely to be met. Motivator factors focus on the job itself and the opportunity for a person to satisfy higher order needs or growth needs.
McClelland’s model does not recognise lower order needs. The need for affiliation corresponds with level 3 of Maslow’s need hierarchy. McClelland’s need for achievement correlate with the motivators of Herzberg (Menyennett, 1999 cited in Oosthuizen, 2001). Finally, the need for power has no direct correlation with specific need levels in comparison to other theorists but it is recognised, as a high level need (Oosthuizen, 2001). Mullins (1996) is of the view that McClelland’s three needs correspond roughly to Maslow’s self-actualisation, esteem and love needs.

2.9 JOB SATISFACTION

2.9.1 Defining Job Satisfaction

According to Hirschfeld (2000) cited in Buitendach and De Witte (2005), job satisfaction is the extent to which people like their jobs. Schneider and Snyder (1975) cited in Sempane, Rieger and Roodt (2002) on the other hand, define job satisfaction as a personal evaluation of conditions present in the job, or outcomes that arise as a result of having a job. Thus, according to Bellingan-Timmer (2004) and Sempane et al. (2002), job satisfaction has to do with an individual’s perception and evaluation of the job and this perception is influenced by the person’s unique circumstances like needs, values and expectations. People will therefore evaluate their jobs on the basis of factors which they regard as being important to them.
2.9.2 The Relationship between Motivation and Satisfaction

It is often assumed that motivation and satisfaction are very similar if not synonymous terms, however, according to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), they are very different. They state that motivation is influenced by forward-looking perceptions concerning the relationship between performance and rewards, while satisfaction refers to people’s feelings about the rewards they have received. Thus they see satisfaction as a consequence of past events while motivation is a consequence of their expectations about the future.

Kreitner and Kinicki (2001) indicate that studies reveal a significant positive relationship between motivation and job satisfaction. They indicate that managers can potentially enhance employees’ motivation through various attempts to increase job satisfaction. Sorge and Warner (1997, p. 459) state, “work satisfaction is the most prominent result of work motivation.” They further indicate that motivational concepts are often used to analyse and predict a wide range of individual expressions relevant to organisations such as attitudes, perceptions, emotions and behaviour.

2.9.3 Consequences of Job Satisfaction

Since job satisfaction involves employees’ affective or emotional feelings, it has major consequences on their lives. Locke (1976) cited in Buitendach and De Witte (2005) and Sempane et al. (2002) identified that the most common consequences of job satisfaction impact on an individual’s physical health and longevity, mental health and social life in general. Coster (1992) supports the view that work can have an important effect on total quality of life of employees. Furthermore, Visser, Breed and
Van Breda (1997) emphasise that job satisfaction may also impact on employee absenteeism, complaints and grievances, frequent labour unrest and termination of employment. Similarly, Newstrom and Davis (1989) and Sorge and Warner (1997), mention that the consequences of work satisfaction affect turnover, absenteeism and job performance. In addition, French (2003) states that defensive behaviour and sabotage of company equipment or products are also consequences of job dissatisfaction.

Huddleston and Good (1999) and Newstrom and Davis (1989) are of the opinion that if workers are not motivated, then turnover will increase and workers will become apathetic and decrease their productivity. This is supported by various other researchers who found a relationship between job satisfaction and job performance (Khaleque, Hossain & Hoque, 1992, Babin & Boles, 1996, VanYperen & De Jong, 1997, Robbins, 1998 all cited in Louw, Meyer & Van Schalkwyk, 2000).

However, according to French’s (2003) research, focussing solely on satisfying workers will not result in high performance and productivity. High performance may cause high job satisfaction, which is re-inforced by the rewards that accompany performance. In other words, performance leads to rewards that in turn produce satisfaction. On the other hand, according to Furnham (1992) cited in Louw et al. (2000), researchers have found no relationship between job satisfaction and job performance. The effect of satisfaction on performance is, according to him, indirect and coincidental.

In terms of turnover, it is important to managers because it both disrupts organisational continuity and it is very costly (Williams & Hazer, 1986). Studies
demonstrate a significant negative relationship between satisfaction and turnover. That is, the higher the level of overall job satisfaction, the lower the degree of turnover intentions (Kreitner & Kinicki, 2001; Lam et al., 2001; Muchinsky & Tuttle, 1979; Porter & Steers, 1973; Robbins, Odendaal & Roodt, 2001). Furthermore, Muchinsky and Tuttle (1979) and Vroom (1964) cited in Lam et al. (2001) found employee turnover rate to be inversely related to the level of job satisfaction. According to Sorge and Warner (1997), meta-analysis studies on turnover and absenteeism clarify that a strong relationship between work satisfaction and turnover and absenteeism cannot be expected.

Absenteeism is seen to be disruptive to management and colleagues alike, and planning for it is difficult (Pearson, 1991). Wolpin and Burke (1985) point out that voluntary absence could be the first suggestion of an employee’s dissatisfaction with an organisation and voluntary termination could be final confirmation. Furthermore, Robbins et al. (2001) established a consistent inverse correlation between absenteeism and job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is concerned with the conceptions of fair outcomes, treatment, and procedures. If employees do not feel that their supervisor, the organisation’s procedures, or pay policies are fair, their job satisfaction is likely to suffer significantly, whereas, if these are perceived positively employees are more willing to assist beyond their formal job requirements (Pearson, 1991).
2.10 DIMENSIONS OF JOB SATISFACTION IMPACTING ON MOTIVATION

Locke (1976) cited in Buitendach and De Witte (1995) and Sempane et al. (2002) describes the most common aspects or dimensions of job satisfaction as work, pay, promotions, recognition, benefits, working conditions, supervision, co-workers, company and management. Similarly, Robbins (1993) mentions the more important factors conducive to job satisfaction are mentally challenging work, equitable rewards, supportive working conditions and supportive colleagues. He further posits that good personality-job fit and an individual’s genetic disposition (for example, a positive outlook on life) should also be considered. Spector (1997) concurs with the above-mentioned factors, and includes, status and job content as probable causes of job satisfaction and conversely organisational structure as a probable source of dissatisfaction.

2.10.1 Work itself

According to Oosthuizen (2001, p. 23), “the work itself refers to the doing of the work and the type of work. The job can be repetitive or changing, creative or monotonous, easy or difficult.” According to Pearson (1991), jobs that are both motivating and satisfying are said to be those that provide skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback. Analoui’s (2000) research indicated that the ‘nature of the job’ is a major source of satisfaction for senior managers, particularly if the job is challenging and direct feedback is provided on their efforts. Similarly, Pearson (1991, p. 180) states, “continuing challenge provides continuing satisfaction and motivation.” However, contrary to Analoui’s research, Pearson (1991) states that
feedback, although an important aspect of job design, refers not to the job itself but to the environment in which work is carried out.

Oosthuizen (2001) concurs that the types of work individuals do influences their satisfaction. He states that managers must make the work content as interesting as possible in order to build strong levels of motivation. Lam et al. (2000) found that the job itself is an influential factor in predicting overall job satisfaction. They concur that a job itself should be seen as challenging and interesting. Therefore, variety and flexibility in managers’ work are important.

2.10.2 Payment

Arnolds and Boshoff (2001) found that top managers are significantly motivated by monetary rewards. They added that remuneration packages of top managers should be linked to motivational interventions that satisfy the self-actualisation and growth needs of top managers, for example, by linking salary increases and performance bonuses to the successful completion of challenging assignments.

According to Oosthuizen (2001), payment (also referred to as salary or remuneration) virtually always appear as a strong dissatisfier and adds that most people are never satisfied with their remuneration. Steyn’s (2002) research concurs with this finding, revealing that educators feel that their salaries are inferior to the amount of work they do. Similarly, Analoui (2000) found that senior managers in the public sector were excessively concerned with their remuneration, stating that great intrinsic motivation is required to persevere in their job.
On the other hand, Fox’s (n.d.) research found that fifty-five percent of the respondents (radio personalities) felt adequately compensated. This finding is however, in terms of comparisons in the field and not in terms of the amount of work they do. Pearson (1991) argues that pay has symbolic importance, giving feedback to the employee of his or her worth to the organisation.

In light of Herzberg theory, Fox (n.d.) identified that in order to prevent dissatisfaction, management needs to continue to observe competitors’ salaries and keep their staff’s salaries in line with competitors. Furthermore, Lam et al. (2001) revealed that in the hospitality industry, rewards (including salary) affected positively to job satisfaction as it played a dominant factor in motivating employees.

2.10.3 Promotion

According to Oosthuizen (2001), promotion, otherwise known as advancement, is a motivator, and should therefore build strong levels of motivation. His research indicated that this factor contributes significantly to the dissatisfaction of employees. According to Alpander (1990), Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992), McCampbell (1996) all cited in Arnolds and Boshoff (2001), satisfaction in the workplace, by providing promotion opportunities, has been shown to impact positively on employee job performance, especially in the case of top managers. According to Steyn (2002) citing Wever (2000), most educators indicated that promotion to a higher post level was one of their goals.
2.10.4 Recognition

Recognition is the acknowledgement of an individual’s contribution showing appreciation and to reward the individual for an accomplishment of a task (Oosthuizen, 2001) or in recognition for good performance. Ströh (2001) adds that when rewarding individuals for good performance, the element of recognition must be present.

Whilst Fox’s (n.d.) research discovered that recognition by supervisors and peers were desired by employees in order to perform well, Analoui (2000) found that good work and high quality performance are not often recognised. This, according to Analoui (2000), may be a result of traditional managerial styles, bureaucratic organisational structures, or insufficient interpersonal skills on the part of management.

2.10.5 Benefits

Lam’s et al. (2001) research found that reward (including benefits) has a positive relationship with overall job satisfaction. In fact, the variable ‘reward’ emerged as the most important factor in predicting overall job satisfaction.

2.10.6 Working conditions / Environment

Pearson (1991) identifies that organisational values, supervisory style and physical conditions are factors related to work environment. According to Kruger (1996) and
Oosthuizen (2001), physical working conditions pertains to the quantity of work and availability of resources, such as machines and tools, ventilation, lighting, workspace and air conditioning. Furthermore, according to Singleton (1989), climatic conditions play an influential role in differences in work behaviour.

In Lam’s et al. (2000) research, work environment emerged as an influential factor in predicting overall job satisfaction for Chinese restaurant managers. They add that focusing strategically on this factor would enhance managerial employee’s job satisfaction level and improve their retention rate.

2.11 BIOGRAPHICAL FACTORS IMPACTING ON MOTIVATION

In light of the research on motivation in terms of biographical characteristics (namely, gender, age, tenure, level of education, language and level of occupation / designation), there appears to be contradictory findings in terms of variables impacting on motivation. According to Gilbert and Walker (2001), Newstrom and Davis (1989) and Robbins et al. (2001), there are many variables that impact on job satisfaction. They outline motivation, amongst others, as one of the variables that is difficult to assess, and highlight that analysing workforce demographics or biographical characteristics in this regard would provide knowledge on how to manage individuals in the workplace. According to Louw et al. (2000), the genetic disposition of the individual influences job satisfaction more decisively than organisational factors.

Louw et al. (2000) citing Struempfer, Danana, Gouws and Viviers (1998) state that dispositional and situational factors are modest predictors of job satisfaction, but
researchers differ about the degree of effect they have on job satisfaction. Yousef (1998), for example, found that age, educational level, monthly income, tenure, job level, marital status and an organisation’s activity contribute to the variations in satisfaction with job security among employees.

The biographical characteristics impacting on motivation and job satisfaction are discussed below:

2.11.1 Gender

According to Murgui (1999), differences in the levels and nature of motivation between males and females are expected, based on a few assumptions. Firstly, the Needs Fulfillment Theory postulates that job motivation is determined by the biological, psychological and social needs of an individual. These needs are believed to influence the behaviour of an individual on the job. As males and females differ at least on the biological aspects, the possibility of differences in job motivation, in terms of this theory, can be expected.

Secondly, Social Learning Theory accentuates environmental factors as opposed to individual factors. In line with this, societal norms and social interactions could lead to males being reared with expression of aggression being encouraged and achievement being rewarded, whilst females might be reared being docile and behaviour supporting others is rewarded (Murgui, 1999). This could, according to Murgui (1999), explain the gender differences in job motivation.
According to Pearson (1991) and Robbins et al. (2001), there is no evidence indicating that an employee’s gender affects job satisfaction. Gilbert and Walker (2001) concur with this finding. They conducted an investigative survey in the construction industry in Melbourne, Australia, to evaluate the relationship between motivation at work and gender. The survey also aimed to ascertain if professional men and women in the construction industry were motivated and demotivated by the same variables. The research concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in total motivation and demotivation levels between male and female employees (Gilbert & Walker, 2001).

Similarly, Newstrom and Davis (1989) and Schultze and Steyn (2003) found that there were no significant differences between factors that motivated male and female employees. On the other hand, Oosthuizen (2001) found that significant differences exist between males and females regarding the motivators recognition and responsibility and the hygiene factors status and factors influencing their personal life. He found that females are most satisfied with recognition and males with responsibility. Males were dissatisfied with status, while females reported the highest dissatisfaction due to work factors that were influencing their personal life.

Furthermore, in a study in the information technology industry in South Africa, Mould (2004), found that male and female respondents showed some differences in their responses. The rankings by females were firstly the job itself, thereafter salary, achievement was ranked third and possibility of growth was ranked fourth. The males on the other hand, ranked the job itself first, achievement second, salary third and recognition for achievements in fourth place.
Kanters, Yardley and Nogradi (1992) indicate that results of a regression analysis using demographic variables as predictors of work motivation, identified gender as the only significant predictor. A subsequent t-test confirmed that women had significantly higher work motivation scores than men. Results of the male-subsample regression analysis indicated that satisfaction with intrinsic factors was the only significant predictor of work motivation. Results of the female-subsample regression analysis indicated that satisfaction with intrinsic factors, extrinsic factors, and co-workers were significant predictors of work motivation. Similarly, Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that female educators are significantly more motivated than their male counterparts by working with learners, by special privileges and by relations with colleagues.

Bialeschki and Henderson (1984) cited in Kanters et al. (1992) implied that the fact that co-workers were significant predictors of work motivation is supportive of the notion that women are more ‘people-oriented’ than men. According to Newstrom and Davis (1989), female employees may place greater importance on interpersonal relationships and communications than male employees. In their research, females ranked ‘appreciation of work’ as most important, whereas men ranked it second. They argue that females in the workplace have different problems than men; many have to cope with playing a traditional role of housewives along with their roles as workers. This possible role conflict could as a result cause women to seek more appreciation of work. Similarly, Broadbridge (1998 cited in Broadbridge, 1999) found that female retail managers experience higher pressure levels resulting from the potential stressors in their work and family lives.
Robbins et al. (2001) further reveal that there are differences between men and women that will affect their job performance. These differences comprise inconsistent male-female differences in problem solving ability, analytical skills, competitive drive, motivation, sociability and learning ability. However, Kruger et al. (1996) do not support this view indicating that little research has been done on the difference between men and women in job performance and that most differences are based on the learned perception of a gender role that arises from a person’s cultural background.

In South Africa, research on absence as a possible consequence of job satisfaction revealed that women have higher rates of absenteeism (Robbins et al., 2001). They further state that the most logical explanation for this finding is that the South African culture has historically placed domestic and family responsibilities on women. Similarly, according to Huddleston and Good (1999), in Poland and Russia, where it is not uncommon for professionals to have more than one job, a large percentage of women in retail firms reported that they could only hold one job as there is no time for a second job due to their responsibility of taking care of the family needs.

While males and females were found to be fairly similar on issues like task orientation, perseverance, future orientation and competitiveness, Murgui’s research on gender differences found that a significant difference exist between the genders on reaction to success and failure (and thus the potential of job-achievement to motivate), fear of failure (and thus the potential of sanctions to achieve) increased productivity and social acceptance (Murgui, 1999).
2.11.2 Age

In terms of the relationship between age and job satisfaction, most studies indicate a positive association between age and satisfaction, at least up to age 60 (Pearson, 1991; Robbins et al., 2001). Oosthuizen (2001) identified that there are statistically significant differences between age groups and the motivators – achievement, advancement and the possibility of growth, as well as the hygiene factors - company policy, status and security. Findings indicated that employees under the age of forty experienced the most satisfaction in terms of achievement, advancement and the possibility of growth whereas, those over forty indicated dissatisfaction with the possibility of growth and advancement. According to Menyennett (1999) cited in Oosthuizen (2001), the latter group also experienced the most dissatisfaction with company policy and procedure, status and security.

Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that there are significant differences in motivational factors for educators of diverse age groups. In general, older educators were significantly more motivated than the younger educators by factors such as a sense of professional growth, power and authority as well as explicit role definition.

Mould (2004) found that in a study conducted in the information technology industry in South Africa, that the job itself was consistently the highest ranked factor across all groupings except for respondents below age 27, or above age 50, and respondents with no post-Matric qualifications. For each of these three groups, salary was ranked the highest, and the job itself was ranked second. Similarly, Newstrom and Davis (1989) found a statistically significant difference between employees under thirty who were motivated by good wages, job security and promotion and growth, and older employees (that is, thirty-one to forty) were more concerned with job security. This
illustrates Maslow’s theory - the younger employees need to fulfil their basic needs; these basic needs become less important as individuals move through the age groups and more emphasis is placed on their social and ego needs.

Robbins et al. (2001) add that other studies have found a U-shaped relationship. In general, research indicates decreased satisfaction as employees move towards middle age, but increased satisfaction from around age forty and above. Furthermore, considering professionals and non-professionals separately, satisfaction tends to increase continually among professionals as they age, whereas it falls among non-professionals during middle age and then rises again in the later years leading to retirement. Possible reasons for this could be a result of economic insecurity, the organisation’s reduced interest in the employee and fewer challenging tasks.

Furthermore, Robbins et al. (2001) found that older or tenured employees are less likely to leave an organisation. They state that as workers get older, they have fewer alternative job opportunities and older workers are usually more satisfied with their jobs because of higher income, paid vacations, and pension benefits. The degree of satisfaction may also decrease because prospects for promotion are reduced, as is future job security.

There is also a widespread assumption that productivity declines with age. It is believed that an individual’s skills – particularly speed, agility, strength and coordination - deteriorates with time, and that prolonged job boredom and lack of intellectual stimulation all contribute to reduced productivity. However, evidence contradicts these beliefs and assumptions. Other reviews of the research indicate that
age and job performance are unrelated and this finding seems to be true for all types of jobs, professional and non-professional (Robbins et al., 2001).

2.11.3 Race

There appears to be little research that looks at the relationship between race and job satisfaction. According to Pearson (1991), race does not have an effect on perceived job satisfaction. Robbins et al. (2001) however, found that amongst women, job satisfaction varies between races. They highlight that pay and benefits were reasons cited for dissatisfaction among African female employees within the human resources profession. Both groups (that is, African and non-African female employees) indicated that flexible working hours, recognition, support, social interaction and teamwork are important to job satisfaction. This may be a result of their traditional roles as housewives.

2.11.4 Tenure

According to Bellingan–Timmer (2004); Oosthuizen (2001) and Schulze and Steyn (2003), there is a statistically significant relationship between length of service and factors that motivate employees. Bellingan–Timmer (2004) analysed middle managers of the South African Police Service and discovered that middle managers with over five years service in their current rank are more dissatisfied with their advancement and independence in the organisation. The middle managers with less than five years service are also more dissatisfied with their activity levels in the work, with middle managers with five years and more service in the current rank being more satisfied with the supervision in terms of human relations.
According to Robbins et al. (2001), if seniority is defined as time on a particular job, then their research demonstrates a positive relationship between seniority and productivity. Therefore, tenure expressed as work experience, appears to be a good predictor of employee productivity. Evidence indicates that tenure and satisfaction are positively related and that age coincides with experience (Schulze & Steyn, 2003). Robbins et al. (2001) adds that when age and tenure are treated separately, tenure appears to be more consistent and stable predictor of job satisfaction than chronological age.

Oosthuizen’s (2001) research revealed that there are statistically significant differences between the number of years employed at Telkom and the motivational factors, that is, advancement and possibility for growth. Further significant differences were found between the employment period at Telkom and the hygiene factors, namely, policy and procedures, status, and security. The highest level of dissatisfaction for advancement is present in employees that have been employed for more than twenty years at the organisation. Findings also indicated that while these employees are very dissatisfied with the possibility of growth, strong levels of satisfaction are present amongst employees that have been employed for less than ten years.

Riseborough and Poppleton (1991) cited in Schulze and Steyn (2003), indicated that novice educators are generally more motivated than experienced educators. However, Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that there are significant differences in motivational factors for educators for various periods of experience. This indicates that experience significantly influences what educators experience as motivational. They found that
the more experienced educators were significantly more motivated than the educators with less experience. Experienced educators were especially motivated by factors such as power and authority, support from supervisors and in-service education.

Furthermore, Duffy, Ganster and Shaw (1998) cited in Louw et al. (2000) found a strong negative relationship between job satisfaction and negative outcomes for high-positive affectivity in individuals with longer tenure.

2.11.5 Level of occupation / designation

According to Pearson (1991), satisfaction is positively related to occupational level. Research suggests that there is a relationship between level of occupation and factors that motivate employees. Oosthuizen (2001) found that there are significant differences between position and job level, and the motivators and the hygiene factors. Some of the findings include strong levels of no satisfaction in some levels, specifically with reference to achievement; strong levels of dissatisfaction in some levels, specifically with responsibility; and significant differences in some levels when looking at the possibility of growth.

According to Analoui (2000), evidence suggests that, in terms of motives, managers are more concerned with factors such as achievement, power, status, income and advancement. For example, Morse and Weiss (1955) cited in Analoui (2000) found that from amongst several different occupational groups, none viewed achievement and accomplishment as more important to their motivation than the management group. Although there is evidence that achievement need may be different with respect to cultural differences, basically the similarities in the motivational needs of
managers across various countries are considerable (Haire, Ghiselli & Porter, 1966 cited in Analoui, 2000).

In a study conducted on senior managers in the Romanian public sector, it was found that hygiene factors such as salary, supervision and working conditions were not perceived as the sole contributing factors for a decision to change job and move to the private sector, but the need to be effective and to do the right thing was important to them (Analoui, 2000). It was identified that senior managers stayed in their job, despite financial problems, simply because they liked their job and because they had the opportunity to maximise learning, knowledge, skills, competence and self-development. Despite this, and what makes the phenomenon of motivation so complex is that, recognition and appreciation and money and salary were identified as the main factors contributing towards increased effectiveness. In fact, factors such as improved skill, promotion, teamwork and involvement were described as “the compensatory nature of motivating factors in the absence of superior recognition, inadequate pay and increasing self and career development” (Analoui, 2000, p. 337).

Similarly, Lam et al. (2001) conducted an empirical study of work motivation and job satisfaction among managers in Chinese restaurants in Hong Kong. The findings indicated that work environment, job itself, and rewards are critical factors in predicting managers' satisfaction in this specific catering sector.

Bellenger, Wilcox and Ingram (1984 cited in Mehta et al., 2000) found that most senior managers within the retail industry, placed less emphasis on pay than did junior managers; most junior sales managers considered job security to be less important than did other more senior groups. They further found that junior sales managers
were more interested in promotion opportunities and personal growth than senior managers.

Huddleston and Good (1999) found that for Russian sales employees, the most important job motivators were pay and friendliness of co-workers, while their managers thought that friendliness of co-workers was the most important motivator for sales employees. They further found that Polish sales employees rated pay, a chance to do something important and friendliness of co-workers as the most important of the motivators, while their manager thought employees would rate pay as the most important motivator. Similarly Dubinsky, Jolson, Michaels, Kotabe and Lim (1993) cited in Huddleston and Good (1999) found that American salespeople ranked pay as most desirable from a list of seven job characteristics. Furthermore, Laabs (1998) cited in Huddleston and Good (1999) also found that in terms of intrinsic rewards, employees in US companies rated appreciation for work done and feeling part of a team as the top motivators.

Newstrom and Davis (1989) found a statistically significant difference when comparing lower level employees to middle and higher level non supervisory employees. The lower organisational employees rated ‘good wages’ first and ‘job security’ second, and the middle and higher non-supervisory level rated ‘interesting work’ first and ‘appreciation of work’ second. This further supports previous evidence that basic needs must be satisfied before the higher needs are expressed.
2.11.6 Education

According to Pearson (1991), satisfaction is found to be positively related to educational achievement. Oosthuizen (2001) found that there is a relationship between level of education and factors of motivation. He found that there are two significant differences between educational and the motivational factors, that is, responsibility and the general level of satisfaction. He further found that employees with Matric or less are least satisfied in terms of responsibility.

Mould (2004) concluded in her research that the job itself was consistently the highest ranked factor across all educational groupings except for respondents with no post-Matric qualifications. For this group (that is, respondents with no post Matric qualification), salary was ranked the highest, and the job itself was ranked second. Newstrom and Davis (1989) are of the opinion that these employees would generally be lower level employees, who would rank ‘good wages first. Overall, the differences in Mould’s research, however, according to demographics, were fairly small with most differences in rankings being of only one position (Mould, 2004).

According to Yousef (1998), in terms of the dimension job security, it is expected that individuals who hold graduate or post-graduate degrees might be more satisfied with job security than those with no or with little education. However, he found that those who do not hold university degrees are more satisfied with job security than those who hold graduate or post graduate degrees.
2.11.7 Language

Little research has been conducted on the relationship between language and factors that motivate employees. However, Bellingan–Timmer (2004) found in her analysis of middle managers in the South African Police Service, that African speaking middle managers are more dissatisfied with the SAPS company policies and practices, as well as with their activity levels. Afrikaans and English speaking middle managers, on the other hand, are more dissatisfied with their advancement in the organisation. Afrikaans middle managers are also more dissatisfied with the moral values prevalent in the organisation and more satisfied with the opportunity to render a social service to the community. English middle managers are also more satisfied with their social status in the community. Further findings of the research indicate that Afrikaans speaking respondents were more satisfied with their chance to be of service to others than their African language-speaking counterparts, especially the Nguni speaking grouping. The significant difference could be attributed to the perceptions that exist in their respective communities. She adds that for the Afrikaans community, it is honourable to be a member of SAPS, whereas for the African speaking community it is still perceived as to be associated with the apartheid arm of government.

2.12 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter explored the theoretical premise of the study, providing an extensive literature review on motivation (that is, defining motivation, including intrinsic and extrinsic motivation prevalent within different environments, and reviewing some theories of motivation).
Although prolific research has been conducted on motivation and factors influencing motivation of employees, the vast majority of studies were however, conducted in industries such as construction, information technology, education and hospitality. Notwithstanding the paucity of research on motivation within the retail industry, and even more so literature pertaining to managers, research findings were reviewed in other industries.

The importance of motivation has been presented in various literature (Bellingan-Timmer, 2004; Huddleston & Good, 1999; Lam et al., 2001). Furthermore, the literature explored the influence that biographical variables has on the motivation of employees.
CHAPTER 3

RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

3.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter addresses the research design employed to investigate the research hypotheses. It focuses on the population and characteristics of the sample and presents the demographic results of the biographical questionnaire. Furthermore, the procedure followed and measuring instruments (namely, the biographical questionnaire and the Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction Questionnaire) used to gather the data is discussed. The statistical analysis used to assess the hypotheses concludes the chapter.

3.2 RESEARCH DESIGN

A population refers to the entire group of people from which data can be sourced and investigated and from which the researcher can make inferences (Cooper & Schindler, 2001; Saunders, Lewis & Thornhill, 2000; Sekaran, 2000). In this study the population consisted of 236 retail managers.

Notwithstanding the shortcomings involved, a non-probability sampling design, namely, convenience sampling was used to draw the sample. Convenience sampling involves collecting information from members of the population who are most easily accessible and conveniently available to provide the required information (Kerlinger, 1986). The rationale for using this method is that it is convenient, quick and cost-effective (Neuman, 1997; Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). The disadvantage
however, is that the properties of the sample are likely to under or overestimate the true population values (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). Moreover, the sample may misrepresent the population and the results cannot easily and accurately be generalised (Neuman, 1997; Sekaran, 2000).

The data was gathered by means of self-report questionnaires. Rosnow and Rosenthal (1996) have outlined the advantages of using questionnaires as follows:

- It can be administered to large numbers of individuals,
- The method also allows anonymity and
- It is relatively more economical to use.

Linde, Rothmann and Sieberhagen (1999 cited in van Zyl, 2002) add that as self-evaluation questionnaires are usually quantified, it is easier to compare the scores of different individuals. Weiers (1988) further postulates that the analysis of questionnaires is easy due to the structured information in the questionnaire with minimal or no open-ended questions.

Kerlinger (1986) however, found that the main problems experienced using questionnaires involve poor levels of response and the limitation of not being able to test the given responses for accuracy. Furthermore, the validity of self-evaluation questionnaires may differ from situation to situation as some items are ambiguous and could be viewed as having two possible answers (Smith, 1981 cited in van Zyl, 2002; van Zyl & van der Walt, 1994).
3.2.1 Sample

The data used in this study was obtained from retail managers employed in a retail organisation in the Western Cape region. At the time the study was undertaken, there were 236 retail managers who were permanently employed in the various chains of the organisation in this region. Retail managers in this study are classified as store managers, store assistant managers and department managers.

According to Sekaran (2000), the ideal sample size for this population size should consist of approximately 108 respondents. To ensure a greater response rate, all the retail managers were invited to participate. Of the 236 retail managers, 115 completed the questionnaires. Six of the 115 returned questionnaires were, however, discarded as respondents failed to complete all the questionnaire items; thus only 109 questionnaires were used. The response rate for this study was forty six percent (46%). Sekaran (2000) indicates a response rate of thirty percent (30%) is considered acceptable for most purposes.

3.2.1.1 Demographic information with regard to sample characteristics

The biographical information of the 109 retail managers who participated in the study is presented in graphical format and explained by means of frequencies and percentages.
Figure 3.1 illustrates the racial composition of the sample. The largest represented group were respondents from the Coloured group (n=67) or 61% of the sample, followed by 29% (n=32) of the sample being White. The least represented groups were respondents from the Indian group (n=5) or 5% of the sample and Africans only representing 4% (n=4) of the sample. One percent (n=1) did not indicate their racial group.
Figure 3.2 presents the gender distribution of the sample. The sample was more representative of females than males. Sixty of the respondents (55%) are females and forty nine (45%) are males.
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Figure 3.3 depicts the first language of the respondents. From the graph it can be seen that 61% (n=67) of the respondents speak English as their first language; 35% (n=38) speak Afrikaans, 2% (n=2) speak Xhosa and 1% (n=1) indicated other as their first language. One percent (n=1) did not indicate their language.
The graph in figure 3.4 shows that the majority of the respondents (i.e. n=68 or 62%) have a Grade 12 qualification. Twenty eight (26%) of the respondents have a diploma and only eleven (10%) of the respondents have a Grade 8-11 education. Two respondents (2%) obtained a degree. It can therefore be deduced that the retail organisation in which the research was conducted mostly employs individuals with an educational level of Grade 12.
Figure 3.5 indicates that of the 109 respondents who completed the questionnaire, 36% (n=39) of the respondents are between 31-39 years, 27% (n=30) are between 26-30 years, 23% (n=25) are 40 years and older and 14% (n=15) of the respondents are between 20-25 years.

Figure 3.6 displays the designation of the sample. According to the graph, 46% (n=50) of the respondents are store assistant managers; 39% (n=43) of the respondents are store managers and 14% (n=15) of the respondents are department managers. One percent (n=1) of the sample did not indicate their designation.
Figure 3.7 shows that the majority (30% or n=33) of the respondents have been employed at the organisation between 0-3 years, whilst 28% (n=31) has more than 11 years of service with the organisation. Twenty three percent (n=25) have been employed between 4-7 years, and 17% (n=18) have been employed at the organisation for 8-10 years. Two percent of the respondents (n=2) did not indicate how long they have been employed at the organisation.

3.2.2 Procedure

Permission was obtained from the HR Director to conduct the research within the organisation and permission was granted from the Divisional Operations managers for the researcher to administer the questionnaires. The questionnaires were e-mailed to all 236 retail managers in the Western Cape. A cover letter was attached to the questionnaires inviting them to participate. It explained the purposes of the research, that participation was voluntary and what the results would be used for. Furthermore, respondents were assured that all responses would remain confidential, respondents
would remain anonymous and that only grouped data would be presented. The format of the questionnaires and instructions were also outlined. Upon completion, respondents were requested to return the questionnaire directly to the researcher either by means of e-mail or fax-to-e-mail within the specified time frame. It was however, indicated that should respondents return the questionnaires via e-mail, their anonymity could be jeopardised, and they were encouraged to rather return them by means of fax-to-email. Respondents were given a month to complete the questionnaires and thereafter, in order to encourage participation, follow-up e-mails were sent after 2-3 weeks as reminders.

3.2.3 Data Gathering Instruments

A quantitative method was used to gather data for the research. The measuring instruments included the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire developed by De Beer (1987) and a self developed biographical questionnaire.

3.2.3.1 Biographical Questionnaire

The biographical questionnaire was used to determine the demographic profile of the sample. Questions tapped into the following personal information of the individual: age, race, gender, designation, years employed at the organisation, educational level, and language spoken.
3.2.3.2 Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire

The questionnaire incorporates the sixteen factors of Herzberg’s two-factor theory (De Beer, 1987).

3.2.3.2.1 Dimensions

The following categories were measured:

- **Work itself**

  According to Hackman and Oldman’s job characteristics model, the core job dimensions are skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback (Pearson, 1991; Robbins, 1998).

- **Promotion**

  Promotion and advancement refer to all changes in status or organisational hierarchy that include more responsibility and power (Prinsloo, 1996).

- **Recognition**

  Recognition is the perception of rewards that is related to performance and what is required to earn this recognition (Sherman et al., 1996). Recognition can be received from management, colleagues or clients (Prinsloo, 1996).

- **Supervision**

  An individual can have an agreeable relationship with a supervisor because there are certain characteristics of the supervisor’s role that need to be learnt. The competence
and the proficiency of the supervisor entail job knowledge, leadership skills and solving of problems (Prinsloo, 1996).

- **Payment**
  Payment refers to the employee’s monthly salary, overtime, and increases. It considers whether these are fair and equitable (Kruger et al., 1996).

- **Working Conditions**
  Working conditions refer to the physical working environment, the availability of facilities and aids and the quantity of work (Prinsloo, 1996). It also includes the general work rules that apply to an individual (French, 2003).

- **Benefits**
  Benefits are an indirect form of compensation that is mainly intended to improve the quality of work life for an employee (Sherman & Bohlander, 1992 cited in Swanepoel, 1998).

- **Personal**
  Personal refers to whether the individual’s qualities, knowledge and skills are utilised appropriately (Prinsloo, 1996).

- **General (Security)**
  General (Security) refers to overall satisfaction and whether the employee has considered resigning or changing jobs. According to Prinsloo (1996), an individual can experience a sense of security in the work that an individual does.
3.2.3.2.2 Questionnaire Structure

According to Prinsloo (1996), the questionnaire consists of 43 positively stated items / statements classified into nine categories taken from Herzberg’s hygiene and motivational factors. The three alternatives are coded as follows:

True = 1 ; Not Sure = 2 ; False = 3

A total score is calculated for each respondent in terms of the nine categories. The individual scales are then placed on a continuum of 1 being that of extreme satisfaction (in terms of a specific need) and 3 being that of extreme dissatisfaction (in terms of the same need).

3.2.3.2.3 Reliability and Validity of the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire

Reliability is “a matter of whether a particular technique, applied repeatedly to the same object, would yield the same result each time” (Babbie & Mouton, 2001, p. 119). According to Prinsloo (1996), reliability is determined with the aid of SPSSX-program in conjunction with Cronbach coefficient-alpha. According to Prinsloo (1996), the internal consistency of the instrument was determined by computing the coefficient alphas, conducting an item analysis and factor analysis. It indicated a coefficient alpha that is consistently high, ranging from 0.82 to 0.93, with a median of 0.90 for the instrument.

De Beer (1987) conducted an item analysis to determine the inter-item consistency of the instrument. This indicates consistency of responses to all the items delineated in a
measuring instrument. The Cronbach-Alpha reliability coefficients for the subsections of the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire are as follows: Work content \((r = 0.78)\), payment \((r = 0.86)\), promotion \((r = 0.84)\), recognition \((r = 0.90)\), working conditions \((r = 0.77)\), benefits \((r = 0.84)\), my leader/supervisor \((r = 0.72)\), and general \((r = 0.75)\).

Furthermore, Prinsloo (1996) posits that the results of the item analysis provided an indication that each item had a positive correlation with the total score for the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire. The average correlations ranged from a low of .42 to .74, with a median correlation of .64. It is therefore suggested that the 43 items of the instrument are relatively homogenous with respect to the underlying attitude construct they measure. Likewise, the factor analysis also indicates that the items measure a single common underlying construct.

*Validity* refers to “the extent to which an empirical measure adequately reflects the concept’s meaning” (Babbie & Mouton, 2001, p. 122). The instrument has face validity, as it appears to measure the construct of work motivation.

### 3.2.4 Statistical Techniques

The Statistical Package for the Social Sciences (SPSS) was used for all statistical calculations. This assisted in describing the data more succinctly and to make inferences about the characteristics of populations on the basis of data from the sample. Correlation analysis was used to ascertain the relationship between the motivation dimensions and work motivation. Furthermore, ANOVA was employed to determine whether there is a difference in the motivation dimensions based on
biographical factors (namely gender, race, age, level of education, language, years of service, and designation). The data is presented in graphical format.

3.2.4.1 Descriptive Statistics

Descriptive analysis aims to describe the data by investigating the distribution of scores on each variable, and by determining whether the scores on different variables are related to each other (Terre Blanche & Durrheim, 1999). The descriptive statistics used in this study included means, frequencies, percentages and standard deviations. The mean is a measure of central tendency, which provides an arithmetic average for the distribution of scores (Coolican, 1999; Neuman, 1997).

3.2.4.2 Inferential Statistics

Neuman (1997) defines inferential statistics as a subfield of statistical data analysis that concerns drawing inferences. Furthermore, according to Coolican (1999, p.23), inferential tests are “used to infer whether differences or relationships between samples of data are ‘significant’- whether they reflect real effects in the population. More specifically, these tests help to decide whether the difference or relationship between data could plausibly have occurred if there is no real effect in the population.” The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient, Multiple Regression Analysis, Analysis of Variance (ANOVA), and Scheffe’ Multiple Comparison Procedure were used to test the research hypotheses.
3.2.4.2.1 The Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient

According to Coolican (1999), the Pearson Product-Moment Correlation Coefficient shows the degree of correlation between two interval level variables. In this study, this statistical method is used to determine if a significant statistical relationship exists between the dimensions of work motivation as specified in the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire.

Furthermore, Rosnow and Rosenthal (1996) state that correlation procedures are used to measure the strength of association between two variables. Hinkle, Wiersma and Jurs (1982) add that correlation coefficients serve as an index of the linear relationship between two variables and that it can be used in inferential tests of hypotheses.

3.2.4.2.2 Multiple Regression Analysis

According to Guyatt, Walter, Shannon, Cook, Jaeschke and Heddle (1995), multiple regression analysis is used to establish the extent to which various differing variables add to predict another variable. Moreover, Coolican (1999, p. 372) states that “in multiple regression a statistical prediction of one variable is made using the correlations of other known variables with it.” This method will be used to determine if selected dimensions of motivation will statistically significantly explain the variance in total work motivation experienced by retail managers.
3.2.4.2.3 Analysis of Variance (ANOVA)

According to Coolican (1999), ANOVA procedures test the significance of the differences between sample means where more than two conditions are used, or when several independent variables are involved. In this study, this statistical method is used to establish if a statistically significant difference exists between levels of motivation and biographical variables.

According to Hinkle et al. (1982, p. 253), “in ANOVA, the hypothesis is that the mean performance in the population is the same for all groups (equality of population means).” They add that mean differences are tested for statistical significance. Mouton and Marais (1990) further state that ANOVA makes it possible to appraise the separate and joint influence of several independent variables on the experimental criterion.

3.2.4.2.4 Scheffe’ Multiple Comparison Procedure

Hinkle et al. (1982) state that when a statistically significant F ratio is obtained in an ANOVA, and the null hypothesis is rejected, it can be concluded that at least one population mean is different from the others. Furthermore, they add that all the population means could differ or that any combination differs and, therefore, in order to establish which pairs of means differ it is necessary to do a follow-up analysis like the Scheffé’ Multiple Comparison Procedure. This procedure involves computing an F value for each combination of two means. Moreover, Coolican (1999) states that the Scheffé’s Test is a post hoc test or procedure whereby all possible combinations of
means are tested against others. In this study, this statistical method is used to determine where differences lie between groups.

3.3 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter outlined the description of the research design, provided a description of the sample and discussed the demographics of the sample. The data collection procedure and statistical techniques that were followed in the execution of the research were presented. The instruments used to gather the data were highlighted and described, and reference was made to the reliability and validity of the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire. The statistical analyses included both descriptive and inferential statistics. The chapter concluded with an explanation of the statistical techniques used to test the hypotheses.
CHAPTER 4

DISCUSSION OF RESULTS

4.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter focuses on the results pertaining to the study and provides an explanation thereof. The descriptive statistics are presented for the dimensions of work motivation and satisfaction and the inferential statistics are presented in the form of correlations, analysis of variance and multiple regression analysis.
4.2. DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE WORK SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE

Table 4.1: Descriptive statistics for the dimensions of work motivation and satisfaction

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Content</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader/supervisor</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With respect to the dimensions of work motivation assessed by the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire, Table 4.1 indicates that the means for the work content, payment, promotion, recognition, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader/supervisor and general ranged from a low of 1.24 to a high of 2.37. It therefore appears that staff in the sample are relatively motivated, however, the mean values for payment, promotion, recognition and benefits were the lowest. These mean values indicate the areas that employees were most likely to be demotivated and dissatisfied. Table 4.1 thus shows that the retail managers in the sample are most likely to be motivated due to their working conditions, personal and general dimensions. They are least motivated by the remuneration they receive and promotion opportunities.
Furthermore, the rank order of dimensions of motivation from most motivated to least motivated by the retail managers in the sample are indicated in Table 4.2:

Table 4.2: Rank order of motivational factors from most motivating to least motivating

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variable</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Dev</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>1.24</td>
<td>.72</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>1.33</td>
<td>.64</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>1.35</td>
<td>.54</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader/supervisor</td>
<td>1.52</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Content</td>
<td>1.54</td>
<td>.69</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>1.86</td>
<td>.63</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1.88</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>2.10</td>
<td>.62</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>2.37</td>
<td>.65</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4.3 THE PEARSON PRODUCT-MOMENT CORRELATION CO-EFFICIENT

**Hypothesis 1**: There are statistically significant relationships between work motivation and work content, recognition, promotion, supervision, salary, and working conditions respectively.
Table 4.3: Pearson Correlation Matrix

INTERCORRELATION MATRIX

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Work Satisfaction and Motivation</th>
<th>Work Content</th>
<th>Payment</th>
<th>Promotion</th>
<th>Recognition</th>
<th>Working Conditions</th>
<th>Benefits</th>
<th>Personal</th>
<th>Leader/Supervisor</th>
<th>General</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Satisfaction and Motivation</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Content</td>
<td>0.46*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.62**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.64**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>0.66**</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>0.70**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>0.75**</td>
<td>0.34</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.68**</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.37</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>0.78**</td>
<td>0.73**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.44*</td>
<td>0.83**</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader/Supervisor</td>
<td>0.80**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.59*</td>
<td>0.47*</td>
<td>0.45*</td>
<td>0.82**</td>
<td>0.72**</td>
<td>0.48*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>0.76**</td>
<td>0.77**</td>
<td>0.67**</td>
<td>0.43*</td>
<td>0.49*</td>
<td>0.84**</td>
<td>0.74**</td>
<td>0.63**</td>
<td>0.58*</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* p < 0.05
**p < 0.01
As viewed in Table 4.3 the following relationships are significant at the 99% level:

- Work satisfaction and payment ($r = 0.82; p < 0.01$)
- Work satisfaction and promotion ($r = 0.74; p < 0.01$)
- Work satisfaction and recognition ($r = 0.66; p < 0.01$)
- Work satisfaction and working conditions ($r = 0.70; p < 0.01$)
- Work satisfaction and benefits ($r = 0.84; p < 0.01$)
- Work satisfaction and personal ($r = 0.78; p < 0.01$)
- Work satisfaction and leader/supervisor ($r = 0.80; p < 0.01$)
- Work satisfaction and general ($r = 0.76; p < 0.01$)
- Work content and payment ($r = 0.62; p < 0.01$)
- Work content and promotion ($r = 0.64; p < 0.01$)
- Work content and working conditions ($r = 0.73; p < 0.01$)
- Work content and benefits ($r = 0.68; p < 0.01$)
- Work content and personal ($r = 0.73; p < 0.01$)
- Work content and leader/supervisor ($r = 0.72; p < 0.01$)
- Work content and general ($r = 0.77; p < 0.01$)
- Payment and promotion ($r = 0.63; p < 0.01$)
- Payment and benefits ($r = 0.74; p < 0.01$)
- Payment and personal ($r = 0.67; p < 0.01$)
- Payment and general ($r = 0.67; p < 0.01$)
- Promotion and recognition ($r = 0.78; p < 0.01$)
- Promotion and working conditions ($r = 0.75; p < 0.01$)
- Promotion and benefits ($r = 0.82; p < 0.01$)
♦ Working conditions and benefits (r = 0.72; p < 0.01)
♦ Working conditions and personal (r = 0.83; p < 0.01)
♦ Working conditions and leader/supervision (r = 0.82; p < 0.01)
♦ Working conditions and general (r = 0.84; p < 0.01)
♦ Benefits and personal (r = 0.76; p < 0.01)
♦ Benefits and leader/supervisor (r = 0.72; p < 0.01)
♦ Benefits and general (r = 0.74; p < 0.01)
♦ Personal and general (r = 0.63; p < 0.01)

As viewed in Table 4.3 the following relationships are significant at the 95% level:

♦ Work motivation and work content (r = 0.46; p < 0.05)
♦ Recognition and work content (r = 0.45; p < 0.05)
♦ Payment and recognition (r = 0.47; p < 0.05)
♦ Working conditions and payment (r = 0.59; p < 0.05)
♦ Promotion and personal (r = 0.45; p < 0.05)
♦ Promotion and leader/supervisor (r = 0.47; p < 0.05)
♦ Promotion and general (r = 0.43; p < 0.05)
♦ Personal and leader/supervisor (r = 0.48; p < 0.05)
♦ General and leader/supervisor (r = 0.58; p < 0.05)
♦ Personal and recognition (r = 0.44; p < 0.05)
♦ Leader/supervisor and recognition (r = 0.45; p < 0.05)
♦ General and recognition (r = 0.49; p < 0.05)
♦ Payment and leader/supervision (r = 0.59; p < 0.05)
As viewed in Table 4.3 the following relationships are not significant at the 95% level:

- Working conditions and recognition ($r = 0.34$)
- Benefits and recognition ($r = 0.37$)

It can be noted that for all the correlation coefficients between the above variables a positive relationship exists, as the correlation coefficient ($r$) is positive for all the relationships. The results depicted in Table 4.3 clearly indicate that there is a significant statistical relationship between the dimensions of work motivation and satisfaction. *Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.*

### 4.4 MULTIPLE REGRESSION ANALYSIS

**Hypothesis 2:** The dimensions of work motivation will statistically significantly explain the variance in total motivation experienced by retail managers.
Table 4.4: Stepwise Regression: Dependent variable (Work Motivation)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables in the equation</th>
<th>B</th>
<th>Standard Error for B</th>
<th>T</th>
<th>P</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Work Content</td>
<td>-2.7949</td>
<td>1.1857</td>
<td>2.36</td>
<td>0.05</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Payment</td>
<td>-1.5232</td>
<td>0.2863</td>
<td>5.32</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Promotion</td>
<td>-0.68232</td>
<td>0.2903</td>
<td>3.65</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>-2.7949</td>
<td>1.1857</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>0.04*</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working conditions</td>
<td>-1.5232</td>
<td>0.2863</td>
<td>1.34</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefits</td>
<td>-0.68232</td>
<td>0.2903</td>
<td>1.65</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Personal</td>
<td>-3.7542</td>
<td>0.1452</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leader/supervisor</td>
<td>-2.4332</td>
<td>1.7683</td>
<td>1.43</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>General</td>
<td>-1.6432</td>
<td>0.2301</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>0.00**</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

* * p < 0.05  
** p < 0.01

The results shown in Table 4.4 suggest a moderate percentage of the variation in work motivation and satisfaction explained by the variables entered in the equation ($R^2 = 63.27\%$; $R^2$ (adjusted) = 49.51%). Thus, 63.27% of the variance in work motivation and satisfaction can be explained by work content, payment, promotion, recognition, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader/supervisor and general dimensions. The F-ratio of 15.69 ($p = 0.00$) indicates the regression of work motivation and
satisfaction on the dimensions assessed, expressed through the adjusted squared multiple \( R^2 \text{ (adj.)} = 49.5\% \) is statistically significant. These variables account for 49.5\% of the variance in work motivation and satisfaction. This finding suggests that other unexplored variables could account for the other variance in work motivation and satisfaction. Based on the above findings, the null hypothesis is rejected.

4.5 ANALYSIS OF VARIANCE (ANOVA)

Hypothesis 3: There are statistically significant differences in motivational levels based on designation, educational level, age, race, gender and tenure.

Table 4.5: Designation and levels of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>PRESENT DESIGNATION</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Scheffe’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Store manager</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>4.10</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>( \infty ) Levels of work motivation and satisfaction amongst departmental managers differ significantly from the other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Store assistant manager</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.67</td>
<td>50</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Department manager ( \infty )</td>
<td>2.03</td>
<td>.53</td>
<td>15</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** \( p < 0.01 \)

Table 4.5 indicates that there is a significant mean difference in the work motivation and satisfaction levels of employees based on their present designations. Departmental
managers evidenced the lowest work motivation and satisfaction (Mean = 2.03, s = .53), followed by Store assistant managers (Mean = 1.79, s = .67), while those in store management positions reported the highest levels of work motivation and satisfaction (Mean = 1.71, s = .69).

Table 4.6: Educational level and levels of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>EDUCATIONAL LEVEL</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Scheffe’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Grade 8-11 ∞</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>.60</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3.95</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>∞ Respondents with educational levels up to grade 11 differ significantly from the other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Grade 12</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.47</td>
<td>68</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>1.73</td>
<td>.57</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Degree</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.69</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

Table 4.6 indicates that there is a significant mean difference in the work motivation and satisfaction experienced by employees with lower levels of education. In this instance, those with education levels between grades 8-11 indicated the least work motivation and satisfaction relative to the other education levels. Employees with the educational level of grade 8-11 reported the lowest levels of work motivation and satisfaction (Mean = 2.1, s = .60) than employees at the educational levels of up to grade 12 (1.67, s = .47), diploma (Mean = 1.73, s = .57), degree (Mean = 1.67, s = .69).
Table 4.7: Age and levels of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>AGE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Scheffe’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>20-25 years</td>
<td>1.71</td>
<td>.56</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2.48</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>26-30 years</td>
<td>1.69</td>
<td>.35</td>
<td>37</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31-39 years</td>
<td>1.94</td>
<td>.92</td>
<td>102</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Respondents in the age category 31-39 years differed significantly from the other groups.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>40 years +</td>
<td>1.63</td>
<td>.48</td>
<td>43</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

Table 4.7 shows that there is a significant mean difference in the work motivation and satisfaction levels of employees in the age group 31-39 years and employees in other age groups. Employees in the age group 31-39 years reported lower levels of work motivation and satisfaction (Mean = 1.94, s = .92) than employees in the age groups 20 to 25 years (Mean = 1.71, s = .56), 26-30 years (Mean = 1.69, s = .35), and 40 years and older (Mean = 1.63, s = .48).
Table 4.8: Race and levels of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>RACE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Scheffe’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>African</td>
<td>1.98</td>
<td>.27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3.92</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>∞ African respondents differed significantly from the other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Coloured</td>
<td>1.56</td>
<td>.43</td>
<td>67</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Indian</td>
<td>1.62</td>
<td>.31</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White</td>
<td>1.64</td>
<td>.45</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

Table 4.8 indicates that there is a significant mean difference in the motivation and satisfaction levels of employees based on their race. African employees reported the lowest levels of motivation and satisfaction (Mean = 1.98, s = .27) than white employees (Mean = 1.64, s = .45), Indian employees (Mean = 1.62, s = .31) and coloured employees (Mean = 1.56, s = .43).

Table 4.9: Gender and levels of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GENDER</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Scheffe’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1.67</td>
<td>.62</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.21</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>∞ Females were less motivated.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>1.82</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>60</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

Table 4.9 indicates that there is a significant mean difference in the overall levels of work motivation and satisfaction experienced by male and female employees (p <
Females reported lower levels of motivation (Mean = 1.82, s = .59) than males (Mean = 1.67, s = .62).

Table 4.10: Tenure and levels of motivation

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>YEARS OF SERVICE</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>S</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p</th>
<th>Scheffe’s Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>0-3 years</td>
<td>1.87</td>
<td>.58</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>3.55</td>
<td>.000**</td>
<td>∞</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4-7 years</td>
<td>2.12</td>
<td>.20</td>
<td>25</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Those employed between 4 and 7 years differ significantly from those in the other groups</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8-10 years</td>
<td>1.76</td>
<td>.65</td>
<td>18</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11 years+</td>
<td>1.79</td>
<td>.59</td>
<td>31</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

** p < 0.01

Table 4.10 indicates that there is a significant mean difference in the work motivation and satisfaction levels of employees with 4 – 7 years of service (Mean = 2.12, s = .2) compared to those with fewer or more years of service. Those with 4 – 7 years of service reported the lowest work motivation and satisfaction compared to the other groups.

The Scheffe’s Test reflected the following findings in terms of levels of work motivation and satisfaction based on the biographical variables of the sample:

- Department managers indicated they were the least motivated and satisfied.
- Respondents with educational levels up to grade 11 were the least motivated and satisfied.
- Respondents in the age category 31-39 years evidenced the lowest levels of work motivation and satisfaction.
• African respondents indicated lower levels of work motivation and satisfaction relative to the other race groups.

• Female employees experienced lower levels of work motivation and satisfaction relative to their male counterparts.

• Those employees who had been working for the organisation for between 4 and 7 years were the least motivated and satisfied.

*Hence, the null hypothesis is rejected.*

### 4.5 SUMMARY OF THE CHAPTER

This chapter provided an overview of the findings which emerged from the descriptive and inferential analysis. It was found that retail managers in the sample are most likely to be motivated due to their working conditions, personal and general dimensions and are least motivated by the remuneration they receive and promotion opportunities. It was identified that various significant relationships between biographical and work motivation variables exist. Multiple regression analysis indicated that selected dimensions of motivation significantly explained the variance in total work motivation. However, it was found that other unexplored variables could also account for the variance in work motivation and satisfaction as the tested dimensions only accounted for 49.5%. Intercorrelations indicated that significant positive statistical relationships exist between the dimensions of work motivation.
CHAPTER 5

DISCUSSION, CONCLUSIONS AND RECOMMENDATIONS

5.1 INTRODUCTION

This chapter discusses the prominent findings of the research in relation to the hypotheses and relevant research available. Furthermore, it focuses on the significant differences between the biographical variables, the dimensions of work motivation, correlations between the dimensions of work motivation, and multiple regression analysis. Conclusions are drawn from the results obtained and recommendations for future research are suggested.

5.2 DISCUSSION

5.2.1 Descriptive Results

The sample consisted of 109 retail managers of which store managers were the largest representative group in the sample (cf. figure 3.6). With reference to figure 3.1, the majority of respondents were Coloured (N=67; 61%). This could possibly be attributed to the fact that more Coloureds than any other race are employed in the organisation in the Western Cape region. The sample was more representative of females (N=60; 55%) than males (c.f. figure 3.2). Most of the respondents have a Grade 12 level education (N=68; 62.5%) with the majority of the sample falling in the age category of 31-39 years old (N=39; 36%). The majority of the respondents have been employed with the organisation between 0-3 years (N=33; 30%).
With respect to the dimensions of work motivation assessed by the Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire, respondents were most motivated by their working conditions, personal and general dimensions. Remuneration and promotion opportunities were ranked as indicators which least motivated them (cf. Table 4.1).

These findings are contrary to Bellinger’s et al. (1984 cited in Mehta et al., 2000) research, which revealed that remuneration and promotion opportunities were among the factors that most motivated sales managers. This could be as a result of the managers in this study being more at a junior level.

5.2.2 Inferential Results

5.2.2.1 Hypothesis 1

There are statistically significant relationships between work motivation and work content, recognition, promotion, supervision, salary, and working conditions respectively.

Research indicates that there is a relationship between work motivation and the dimensions of motivation. Likert (1961) and McGregor (1960) cited in Lam et al. (2001) suggest that a positive correlation emerges between intrinsic motivators and job satisfaction. Tony and Cathy (1995) cited in Lam et al. (2001) pointed out that extrinsic factors are important to motivate employees in the hospitality industry.

The results of this study reflected that there is a significant relationship at the 99% and 95% level between the dimensions of work motivation and satisfaction. All the
correlation coefficients between the dimensions of motivation indicated positive relationships. Furthermore, there is a high correlation between the dimensions of motivation and total work motivation.

Hence, the null hypothesis that there are no statistically significant relationships between work motivation and work content, recognition, promotion, supervision, salary, and working conditions respectively is rejected.

5.2.2.2 Hypothesis 2

The dimensions of work motivation will statistically significantly explain the variance in total motivation experienced by retail managers.

According to Newstrom and Davis (1989) and Robbins et al. (2001), there are many variables that could impact on job satisfaction. The results indicated in Table 4.4 suggest a moderate percentage of the variation in work motivation and satisfaction explained by the variables entered in the equation ($R^2 = 63.27\%$; $R^2$ (adjusted) = 49.5%). Thus 63.27% of the variance in work motivation and satisfaction can be explained by work content, payment, promotion, recognition, working conditions, benefits, personal, leader/supervisor and general dimensions. The F-ratio of 15.69 ($p = 0.00$) indicates the regression of work motivation and satisfaction on the dimensions assessed, expressed through the adjusted squared multiple ($R^2$ (adj.) = 49.5%) is statistically significant. These variables account for 49.5% of the variance in work motivation and satisfaction. Hence the null hypothesis is rejected.

This finding suggests that other unexplored variables could account for the other variance in work motivation and satisfaction. These unexplored variables could be
attributed to other complex forces, incentives, needs and tensions (Anderson & Kryprianou (1994), Drafke & Kossen (1998), Wevers (2000) all cited in Steyn, 2002). French (2003); Newstrom and Davis (1989); Oosthuizen (2001); Pitts (1995) and Swanepoel (1998) indicate motivational factors such as responsibility, growth and advancement, status, security and company policies to be associated with work motivation and satisfaction.

5.2.2.3 Hypothesis 3

There are statistically significant differences in motivational levels based on designation, educational level, age, race, gender and tenure.

5.2.2.3.1 Designation

There is a significant difference in the work motivation and satisfaction levels of department managers compared to the other respondents in the study. Department managers evidenced the lowest work motivation and satisfaction.

This may be due to department managers having to deal with expectations set by store managers and store assistant managers, as well as employees. These expectations thus result in them being more pressurised and experiencing lower levels of work satisfaction and motivation.

Oosthuizen’s (2001) research indicates that there are significant differences between position and job level, and motivation. Some of the findings include strong levels of no satisfaction in some levels, specifically with reference to achievement; strong
levels of dissatisfaction in some levels, specifically with responsibility; and significant
differences in some levels when looking at the possibility of growth. A study by
Bellinger et al. (1984 cited in Mehta et al., 2000) conducted within the retail industry
found that while junior sales managers were more interested in promotion
opportunities, personal growth and pay, senior managers were more concerned with
factors such as job security.

5.2.2.3.2 Educational level

There is a significant difference in the work motivation and satisfaction of employees’
based on education levels. Findings indicate those with education levels between
grades 8-11 indicate the least work motivation and satisfaction compared to
respondents with higher education levels. This may account for the lower motivation
levels, as their progression within the organisation is limited. It is noted that only
10% of the respondents fall within this group. This could be a result of recruitment
requirements where Grade 12 was not a prerequisite for all positions.

Despite the above finding of the current study, Oosthuizen (2001) and Yousef (1998)
found that there is a relationship between level of education and motivation.
Oosthuizen (2001) found that there are significant differences between educational
and the motivational factors, namely, responsibility and the general level of
satisfaction. His study also identified that employees with matric or less, are least
satisfied in terms of responsibility. According to Yousef (1998), it is expected that
individuals with a graduate or post-graduate degree might be more satisfied with their
job than those with no or little education. However, he found that those who do not
hold university degrees are more satisfied than those who hold graduate or post
graduate degrees.
Similarly, empirical research conducted by Groot and Maassen van den Brink (1999) indicated that more highly educated workers are less satisfied with their job than less educated workers. This may be because individuals who have degrees may have higher expectations and therefore are not easily motivated or satisfied.

Further reasons are cited by Commins and Preston (1997) as to why highly educated employees may be less motivated which could explain their dissatisfaction. Their study showed that retail management is considered to be an unattractive career by many graduates, and secondly, that undergraduates’ knowledge of what a retail management career would involve was limited. Their study further revealed that, although graduates are attracted to aspects such as the autonomy to make decisions, they responded less positively to factors like long working hours. Added to this, Gush (1996) found that in the retail industry, which is considered to be traditionally, a non-graduate sector, there was extensive disparity between graduates’ expectations and their actual experience.

5.2.2.3.3 Age

In this study there appears to be a significant difference in the work motivation and satisfaction levels of employees in the age group 31-39 years than employees in other age groups. These employees reported lower levels of work motivation and satisfaction than the other age groups. A plausible reason for this may be a result of the challenges that face individuals within this age group.
According to studies reported by Schulze and Steyn (2003), the challenges that confront individuals between the ages of 28 and 33 include, having to deal with career issues, marriage, parenting, location and owning a home. They add that for individuals between the ages of 34 and 39, if these challenges are not accomplished they might experience intense stress and this could influence their motivation levels.

Robbins et al. (2001) found that satisfaction levels decrease as employees move towards middle age, but increased from around age forty and on. Clark, Oswald and Warr’s (1996) research concurs and indicates that as employees get older the novelty of employment may wear off and boredom with the job may set in. He adds that later in life workers become accustomed to their roles. On the other hand, Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that the years between 40 and 47 were a time of disillusionment for many due to unfulfilled ambitions and feelings. These results were however, specific to educators. Furthermore, Menyenett (1999) cited in Oosthuizen (2001) mentions that employees over 40 years old may view younger employees as a threat to their promotion opportunities.

The finding in this study is contrary to other research. Studies indicate a positive association between age and satisfaction (Oosthuizen, 2001; Robbins et al., 2001; Schulze & Steyn, 2003, Yousef, 1998). Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that there are significant differences in motivational factors for educators of diverse age groups. In general, older educators were significantly more motivated than the younger educators. Similarly, Oosthuizen’s (2001) research conducted in a telecommunications environment identified that there are statistically significant differences between age groups and the motivators.
Further explanations for the correlation between age and job satisfaction are mixed. Sarker, Crossman and Chinmeteepituck’s (2003) research indicate that there are limited career prospects at a certain age, that older workers may be more tolerant and have developed coping strategies, or that intrinsic motivators become less important as people grow older.

5.2.2.3.4 Race

The finding of this study indicates that there is a significant difference in the motivation and satisfaction levels of employees based on their race. African employees reported the lowest levels of motivation and satisfaction relative to the other groups.

A plausible explanation could be that Africans and Whites in South Africa differ on factors and levels of motivation due to their cultural heritage and furthermore the influence that apartheid policies and practices played especially in the workplace (Franks, 2002).

In support of the above, McFarlin, Coster and Mogale-Pretorius (1999) posit that South African organisations need to embrace leadership approaches that reflect African values in order to develop management. In light of this, given the findings of the current study, it is possible that African employees do not value the highlighted dimensions of motivation.

However, research findings have been mixed with respect to racial differences and job satisfaction. Some studies have found African employees reporting higher levels of
job satisfaction than White employees and in other instances, there are studies indicating White workers reporting higher levels of job satisfaction than African workers (Friday & Friday, 2003).

Franks’ (2002) research within an IT environment indicated African specialists were more motivated by harmonious teamwork, personal principles, ethical standards and when competing with other professionals. He further found that White specialists were less motivated by working in a rigid environment, and preferred flexible environments.

5.2.2.3.5 Gender

According to Gilbert and Walker (2001); Newstrom and Davis (1989) and Robbins et al. (2001), there is no evidence indicating that an employee’s gender affects job satisfaction. Gilbert and Walker (2001) conducted an investigative survey in the construction industry in Melbourne, Australia to evaluate the relationship between motivation at work and gender. Their research concluded that there was no statistically significant difference in total motivation and demotivation levels between male and female employees.

In the current study, the researcher found that there is a significant difference in the overall levels of work motivation and satisfaction experienced by male and female employees (p < 0.00). Females reported lower levels of motivation than males. The researcher posits that this is due to long working hours and weekend trading which may affect females’ traditional roles of caregivers.
Furthermore, according to Broadbridge (1998) cited in Broadbridge (1999), female managers also reported experiencing higher pressure levels resulting from the potential stressors in their work and family lives. These factors may account for lower levels of motivation and satisfaction within females.

Numerous studies also found statistically significant differences in total motivation and demotivation levels between male and female employees (Kanters et al., 1992; Mould, 2004; Schulze & Steyn, 2003). A study by Schulze and Steyn (2003) on educators report that female educators are significantly more motivated by working with learners than their male counterparts. Similarly, Clark (1993 cited in Groot & Maassen van den Brink, 1999) supported the finding that women reported higher levels of overall job satisfaction than men.

5.2.2.3.6 Tenure

According to Robbins et al. (2001), tenure appears to be a consistent and stable predictor of job satisfaction. Oshagbemi (2000) and Robbins et al. (2001) found tenure to be positively and significantly related to overall job satisfaction.

The study indicated a significant difference in the work motivation and satisfaction levels based on tenure. Respondents with 4 – 7 years of service differ significantly from those with fewer or more years’ service. Those with 4 – 7 years of service reported the lowest work motivation and satisfaction compared to the other groups who are more motivated and satisfied.
This difference may be due to experiencing little responsibility, interest, recognition or achievement and may therefore experience dissatisfaction (Savery, 1996). The respondents with longer service may experience higher satisfaction because they have found a job that matches their needs (Clark et al., 1996).

According to Bellingan–Timmer (2004); Oosthuizen (2001); Schulze and Steyn (2003), there is a statistically significant relationship between length of service and factors that motivate employees. Bellingan–Timmer (2004) analysed the middle managers of the South African Police Service and discovered that middle managers with over five years service in their current rank are more dissatisfied with their advancement and independence in the organisation and were more satisfied with the supervision in terms of human relations. Those with less than five years service reported being more dissatisfied with their work activity levels.

In another study, Schulze and Steyn (2003) found that more experienced educators were significantly more motivated than less experienced educators. However, these factors of motivation refer specifically to power and authority, support from supervisors and in-service education. On the other hand, Riseborough and Poppleton (1991) cited in Schulze and Steyn (2003) found novice educators to be generally more motivated than experienced educators.

The results of this study indicate that there are statistically significant differences in motivational levels based on designation, educational level, age, race, gender and tenure. Therefore, the null hypothesis is rejected.
5.3 CONCLUSIONS

The central purpose of the study was to investigate the motivation of retail managers at a retail organisation in the Western Cape. Data was gathered regarding their work satisfaction and motivation as well as the biographical background of the respondents.

A relationship was found between work motivation and the dimensions of motivation, namely, work content, recognition, promotion, supervision, salary and working conditions. All the dimensions were positively correlated. Furthermore, a high correlation between the dimensions of motivation and total work motivation was indicated.

The factors of motivation explored in the instrument accounted for less than half of the variance in work motivation and satisfaction. Therefore a number of other unexplored variables should be considered in future research.

The results also indicate that differences exist in motivational levels based on the biographical variables. However, the study did not investigate the influence that the respective biographical variables would have on the specific dimensions of motivation. Therefore, determining which factors of motivation influence individuals based on their biographical categories was outside the scope of this study.

5.4 RECOMMENDATIONS

Future research is warranted given the paucity of literature and empirical studies available in the retail industry. Although quantitative research was conducted and was suitable for this study, qualitative research would allow for better understanding
of the perceptions and views of retail managers, as well as the organisational and wider contexts in which they work. Notwithstanding the disadvantages of using qualitative research, such research would further eliminate the limitation of relying on self-reports exclusively. According to Schaufeli, Maslach and Marek (1993 cited in Buitendach & De Witte, 2005) the exclusive use of self-report measures causes a problem in validation studies.

A proportionate stratified random sample should ideally be utilised comparing various regions using a larger sample. A larger stratified sample will allow the findings to be reliably generalised to the population. Furthermore, future studies need to examine the possibility of stratifying samples on key demographic variables such as gender and race.

It is also suggested that income and marital status be included as variables on the biographical questionnaire in order to determine the influence that these variables have on the motivation levels of employees.

As the research instrument focussed on Herzberg’s theory, only certain variables were considered for this study and not all the factors of work motivation and satisfaction were taken into account. It is therefore recommended that future research explore other factors of motivation, for example, achievement, responsibility, security, autonomy, feedback and morale as these variables may account for an increased variance in work motivation and satisfaction.
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APPENDIX A

COVER LETTER

Dear Manager

I am conducting a research study on work motivation within the organisation for academic purposes. It would be greatly appreciated if you would assist by completing the attached questionnaire.

The research will identify what factors motivate the Store Managers, Store Assistant Managers and Department Managers employed in the organisation in the Western Cape region.

There are two sections to be completed. Firstly, there is a biographical questionnaire and secondly, there is a Work Satisfaction and Motivation Questionnaire.

It should take approximately 15 minutes to complete both questionnaires. Please note that there are no right or wrong answers.

Please be assured that all responses will remain confidential, all respondents will remain anonymous and only grouped data will be presented.

Thank you for your willingness to complete this questionnaire.

Regards

…………………………

Gail Carr
APPENDIX B

BIOGRAPHICAL INFORMATION

Please complete the following details for purposes of the research study by marking the box (with an X) that it appropriate for you.

1. Present Designation
   Store Manager ☐  Store Assistant Manager ☐  Department Manager ☐

2. Highest level of education
   Grade 8-11 ☐  Grade 12 ☐  Diploma ☐  Degree ☐  Honours / Masters ☐

3. Age
   20-25 yrs ☐  26-30 yrs ☐  31-39 yrs ☐  40 yrs + ☐

4. Race
   White ☐  Coloured ☐  Indian ☐  African ☐

5. Gender
   Male ☐  Female ☐

6. First Language
   English ☐  Afrikaans ☐  Xhosa ☐  Other ☐
   If other, please specify, ……………………………

7. Number of years with the organisation
   0 - 3 yrs ☐  4 – 7 yrs ☐  8 - 10 yrs ☐  11yrs+ ☐
APPENDIX C

WORK SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION QUESTIONNAIRE

CONFIDENTIAL

1. INTRODUCTION
It is fairly obvious that people differ from one another in what they need and expect to get from different areas of their lives. Please think about the work you do and because most jobs are not perfect, consider what would make it better from your point of view.

2. METHOD
With each question, you have a choice of three answers. Choose one of the following:

TRUE = T
NOT SURE = NS
UNTRUE = U

Mark your answer with a cross.

3. WORK CONTENT

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>3.1</td>
<td>I am interested in my work</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.2</td>
<td>My work consists of a variety of work</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.3</td>
<td>I receive training daily which teaches me something new</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>My work is easy</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.5</td>
<td>The amount of work is easy to handle</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.6</td>
<td>I control the amount of work I do myself</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.7</td>
<td>I am completely independent of others</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.8</td>
<td>I regard the content of my work as responsible</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.9</td>
<td>I know exactly what my tasks are</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.10</td>
<td>I am allowed to decide on the methods for doing the work</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.11</td>
<td>I am proud to say what kind of work I do</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.12</td>
<td>My work is the way to future success</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.13</td>
<td>I will not be dismissed without good reason</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.14</td>
<td>I have the opportunity to take part when decisions are made</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.15</td>
<td>I feel that my work is of value in my department</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.16</td>
<td>There is not time for idleness</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3.17</td>
<td>I have a certain degree of authority in my work</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

4. PAYMENT

<p>| | | |</p>
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th></th>
<th></th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>My salary is satisfactory in relation to what I do</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>I earn the same as or more than other people in a similar job</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>The basis of payment, for example overtime payment,</td>
<td>T</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Salary increases are decided on a fair manner  1  2  3

5.  PROMOTION

5.1 I will be promoted within the next two years  1  2  3
5.2 Everyone has an equal chance to be promoted  1  2  3
5.3 Staff are promoted in a fair and honest way  1  2  3

6.  RECOGNITION

6.1 I am praised regularly for my work  1  2  3
6.2 I receive constructive criticism about my work  1  2  3
6.3 I get credit for what I do  1  2  3
6.4 I am told that I am making progress  1  2  3

7.  WORKING CONDITIONS

7.1 My working hours are reasonable  1  2  3
7.2 I am never overworked  1  2  3
7.3 I get the opportunity to mix with my colleagues and to communicate on aspects of our work.

8.  BENEFITS

8.1 My pension benefits are good  1  2  3
8.2 My medical scheme is satisfactory  1  2  3
8.3 I never have problems with my arrangements for leave  1  2  3

9.  PERSONAL

9.1 I am given work in accordance with my qualifications and skills  1  2  3
9.2 I work in the department of my choice  1  2  3

10. MY LEADER / SUPERVISOR

10.1 Is satisfied easily  1  2  3
10.2 Will support me if there are problems  1  2  3
10.3 Can be convinced and persuaded  1  2  3
10.4 Is a warm-hearted person  1  2  3

11. GENERAL

11.1 I have considered changing jobs  1  2  3
11.2 I have been looking out for another job  1  2  3
11.3 I am thinking of resigning  1  2  3

THANK YOU

Please check to make sure that you have not missed any questions.