

# Prioritizing Herzbergs' Motivator Factors: A case of Siemens Inc.

Akif Hasan & Reenu Pinjani

Employee's performance is based upon how motivated an employee is with his/her work. The motivator factors can vary from employee to employee depending on various factors. This study evaluated as to which motivator factor stated by Herzberg motivation theory tended to be the most preferred in the organization by the employees. The motivator factors are: Achievement, Recognition, Work itself, Responsibility, Growth and Advancement. Participants were sixty five employees of Siemens, which were chosen randomly, from each department in the organization. It was single cross-sectional since the participants were interviewed or surveyed just once, through a structured questionnaire. The study concluded that our null hypothesis could not be accepted, supporting the alternate hypothesis, that employees do prefer some of the motivation factor over the others; e.g. one employee does prefer achievement over the other motivation factors listed above. Our inferential statistics tool used for this research was paired sample t-Test. It concluded that employees prefer motivating factors over another. Through the mean of the motivator factors (table 1), we have come to the conclusion that the ranking of the motivator factors in Siemens are as follows: most preferred is Work itself, second is Recognition, third is Achievement, fourth is Advancement and the least preferred is Growth.

## Introduction

In 1959, Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman published their findings in which they concluded that job satisfaction and dissatisfaction must be separated into two different continua. This belief was a departure from the traditional approach that viewed job satisfaction and dissatisfaction as being on opposite ends of the same continuum. The findings supported their belief that job satisfaction was basically determined by one set of

---

Dr. Akif Hasan, Iqra University  
Reenu Pinjani, Iqra University

factors, and job dissatisfaction basically by a different set of factors. Two-factor theory is also known as “Motivator Hygiene Theory” and this theory portrays different factors as primary causes of job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction. According to this theory, hygiene factors are associated with the job context or work setting. Motivator factors are related to job contents i.e. what people actually do in their work (Hertzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Frederick Hertzberg, 1966).

We want to know the perception of different people in organization as to which factors of the motivator factors stated by Hertzberg’s motivation theory tend to be the most preferred among the other stated factors: Achievement, Recognition, Work itself, Responsibility, Growth and Advancement (Shermerhorn, John.R.Jr, Hunt, James G, Richard N. & Osborn, 2005). It is important for the employees to be motivated since they are the assets for any company. By knowing the preference order of the motivator factors, the company will be able to know as to how they can effectively motivate their employees so that they perform better and be satisfied in what work they are doing. Critics consider Herzberg's two factor theory to be simplistic - what motivates me may be a dissatisfier for someone else. For example, increased responsibility for one person may be a motivator as they can grow and develop in their role, allowing them to further their career. But to another person, increased responsibility can be a dissatisfier, particularly if pay does not reflect the new role or if they are over-stretched already. By considering Herzberg's two-factor theory, you can work out what dissatisfies your team, what motivates them and most importantly, what you can do to increase job satisfaction. For example, it may not be possible to influence company holiday policy, but you could relate the team as to how holidays are allocated. Work with what you can change and highlight those you can't to your manager or through the company's employee feedback mechanisms (Lyndsay Swinton, 1988).

The first problem found by the manager who wishes to use job satisfaction for any purpose is to choose among the many methods of measuring job satisfaction available. This study uses the Herzberg factors and techniques (1966). It is particularly interesting to use Herzberg's techniques because the emphasis of his works is not upon turnover but rather upon worker performance. In contrast, turnover may be viewed as a measure of the motivation to participate, i.e. to join and stay with an organization. (March & Simon, 1958) indicate that attitudes toward the job should be a major variable affecting this decision to participate. In fact, attitudes toward the job should affect the decision to participate more than it does performance on the job (J.Atchison & E.A.Lefferts, 1972). Surveys of job satisfaction studies back up March and Simon's thesis (Bray field & Crockett, 1955; Vroom, 1964).

These surveys find that there is little relationship between job satisfaction and productivity as was predicted by the early human religionists. His methods are quite different and he believes that this has led him to different results. In the interview the subjects were first asked to recall a time when they had felt exceptionally good about their jobs. The subjects were then questioned further to determine the causes of their satisfaction and the events that caused return to a normal feeling of satisfaction. The same type of technique was used to determine the major causes of dissatisfaction with their jobs. (Robert B. Ewen & V.H. Vroom, 1964). The revised theory now says, in effect, that Motivators contribute more to satisfaction than to dissatisfaction while Hygiene's contribute more to dissatisfaction than satisfaction. Motivators will improve organizational efficiency as shown by higher productivity, better quality, better attendance and punctuality, lower labor turnover... in short, by improved performance (J. Occup, 1977). By gathering information on this topic, has lead us towards the conclusion as to how the company can mould its strategy to keep its employees motivated towards work, so that they can perform well and contribute towards the success of the company. By this study, we were able to conclude what factors amongst the motivator factors it self, were more important in comparison with other factors. Among the motivator factors namely Achievement, Recognition, Work itself, Responsibility, Growth and Advancement which factors are more preferable over the other factors. Therefore, we used a questionnaire survey to test the hypothesis that one motivator factor is not preferred over the other motivator factor. In the light of the above literature survey, the research problem addressed in this study was analyzed through the following hypotheses.

## **Hypothesis:**

**H<sub>1</sub>: Achievement is not preferred over other factors.**

**H<sub>2</sub>: Recognition is not preferred over other factors.**

**H<sub>3</sub>: Work itself is not preferred over other factors.**

**H<sub>4</sub>: Responsibility is not preferred over other factors.**

**H<sub>5</sub>: Growth is not preferred over other factors.**

**H<sub>6</sub>: Advancement is not preferred over other factors.**

The main theme was that respondents remain indifferent as to the factors of motivation; in turn the alternate hypothesis would be that some of the factors of motivation are preferred over the others.

## **Method**

### Participants

Sixty five employees of Siemens participated in this research. The respondents were chosen on random basis from five departments

Marketing/Sales (Product), Marketing/Sales (Project), Contract Management, Proposal group & Project Management. All the employees were males and with a mean age 35 to 44 years.

### Materials

The respondents were provided with a questionnaire to fill in with the options provided to them for every question. In the questionnaire, ordinal scale was used. Options for rating were from 1 to 5. Where, 1 depicted most preferred situation where as option 5 depicted least preferred situation, and option 3 being neutral or having no preference in the questions. Question 9 contained 6 motivator factors with their respective meanings stated, for which the respondents had to state the rank in order of preference where 1, stating highly preferable and 5, being the least preferable. Also, the questionnaire contained the respondent's personal information about their age, gender, time spent in the organization, monthly income, and their designation.

### Procedure

Respondents were provided with a questionnaire be filled. The entire procedure of survey took almost 2 weeks of time, after which the survey forms were collected for further research analysis by applying the relevant statistical tool of paired sample t-Test. The data was collected as to which factor is preferred by the respondents over others from a set of six factors i.e. Achievement, Responsibility, Growth, Work itself, Advancement and Recognition. A paired sample t-Test was used to identify possible equivalence or otherwise of preference by the respondents for one factor over the others. All variables were paired independently so that possible similarity or otherwise could be identified. Once the results were obtained an analysis and interpretation of the tables and the figures was prepared for our conclusion. The test was applied at 95% confidence interval with  $df = 64$ . The null hypothesis for each pair of variable was that the respondents do not prefer one variable over the other.

## **Results**

The results indicated that none of the null hypothesis could be accepted. This meant that the preference of one factor over the other existed and based on this, the following preference-order was made.

1. Work itself
2. Recognition
3. Achievement
4. Advancement
5. Responsibility
6. Growth

**Statistics**

		Achiev1	Recog1	work3	Responsibility4	Advanc5	Growth6
N	Valid	65	65	65	65	65	65
	Missing	1	1	1	1	1	1
Mean		22.3077	25.8615	27.3342	18.5538	21.5692	15.5231
Std. Deviation		2.93643	3.42270	3.88784	3.04667	3.51768	2.41161

**Table 1**

The preference order was made by interpreting the results shown in the table 1. This table is showing frequencies of the six motivator factors. By looking at the mean of these six variables, we conclude the preference order that Work itself has highest mean value of 27.3342 and thus is ranked as first in the order preference. Similarly, Growth is ranked lowest at sixth as it has lowest mean value of 15.5231 among all other motivator factors.

The descriptive statistics of paired samples are as follows:

**Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Achiev1	22.3077	65	2.93643	.36422
	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453
Pair 2	Achiev1	22.3077	65	2.93643	.36422
	work3	27.3342	65	3.88784	.48223
Pair 3	Achiev1	22.3077	65	2.93643	.36422
	Responsibility4	18.5538	65	3.04667	.37789
Pair 4	Achiev1	22.3077	65	2.93643	.36422
	Advanc5	21.5692	65	3.51768	.43631
Pair 5	Achiev1	22.3077	65	2.93643	.36422
	Growth6	15.5231	65	2.41161	.29912
Pair 6	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453
	work3	27.3342	65	3.88784	.48223
Pair 7	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453
	Responsibility4	18.5538	65	3.04667	.37789
Pair 8	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453
	Advanc5	21.5692	65	3.51768	.43631
Pair 9	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453
	Growth6	15.5231	65	2.41161	.29912
Pair 10	work3	27.3342	65	3.88784	.48223
	Responsibility4	18.5538	65	3.04667	.37789
Pair 11	work3	27.3342	65	3.88784	.48223
	Advanc5	21.5692	65	3.51768	.43631
Pair 12	work3	27.3342	65	3.88784	.48223
	Growth6	15.5231	65	2.41161	.29912
Pair 13	Responsibility4	18.5538	65	3.04667	.37789
	Advanc5	21.5692	65	3.51768	.43631
Pair 14	Responsibility4	18.5538	65	3.04667	.37789
	Growth6	15.5231	65	2.41161	.29912
Pair 15	Advanc5	21.5692	65	3.51768	.43631
	Growth6	15.5231	65	2.41161	.29912

**Table 2**

The conclusion for the hypotheses is as follows:

**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Achiev1 - Recog1	-3.55385	4.03899	.50098	-4.55466	-2.55303	-7.094	64	.000
Pair 2	Achiev1 - work3	-5.02646	4.59081	.56942	-6.16401	-3.88892	-8.827	64	.000
Pair 3	Achiev1 - Responsibility4	3.75385	4.05444	.50289	2.74921	4.75849	7.465	64	.000
Pair 4	Achiev1 - Advanc5	.73846	3.72188	.46164	-.18378	1.66070	1.600	64	.115
Pair 5	Achiev1 - Growth6	6.78462	3.29058	.40815	5.96925	7.59998	16.623	64	.000
Pair 6	Recog1 - work3	-1.47262	4.92671	.61108	-2.69339	-.25184	-2.410	64	.019
Pair 7	Recog1 - Responsibility4	7.30769	4.25339	.52757	6.25375	8.36163	13.852	64	.000
Pair 8	Recog1 - Advanc5	4.29231	4.64261	.57585	3.14192	5.44269	7.454	64	.000
Pair 9	Recog1 - Growth6	10.33846	3.40164	.42192	9.49558	11.18135	24.503	64	.000
Pair 10	work3 - Responsibility4	8.78031	4.20101	.52107	7.73935	9.82127	16.851	64	.000
Pair 11	work3 - Advanc5	5.76492	4.58947	.56925	4.62771	6.90214	10.127	64	.000
Pair 12	work3 - Growth6	11.81108	3.74232	.46418	10.88377	12.73838	25.445	64	.000
Pair 13	Responsibility4 - Advanc5	-3.01538	4.18514	.51910	-4.05241	-1.97836	-5.809	64	.000
Pair 14	Responsibility4 - Growth6	3.03077	3.27857	.40666	2.21838	3.84316	7.453	64	.000
Pair 15	Advanc5 - Growth6	6.04615	3.67181	.45543	5.13632	6.95598	13.276	64	.000

**Table 3**

The above table is showing both the aspects which are mean and the paired sample t-Test. With reference to this table all the null hypotheses could not be accepted, that means one motivator factor is preferred over another.

The conclusion of each hypothesis is given below.

**$H_1$ : Achievement is not preferred over other factors.**

The results indicated that for  $H_1$ , i.e. no preference between Achievement and Recognition, we could not accept the null hypothesis, as the test showed a t-value of -7.094 significant at 0.000 and df = 64. (Refer table 3) Hence, employees prefer recognition to achievement as per paired difference of -3.553.

**Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Achiev1	22.3077	65	2.93643	.36422
	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453

**Table 1.1**

**Paired Samples Correlations**

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Achiev1 & Recog1	65	.200	.110

**Table 1.2**

**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Achiev1 - Recog1	-3.55385	4.03899	.50098	-4.55466	-2.55303	-7.094	64	.000

**Table 1.3**

***H<sub>2</sub>: Recognition is not preferred over other factors.***

The results for  $H_2$ , i.e. no preference between Recognition and work, we could not accept the null hypothesis, as the test showed a t-value of -2.140 significant at 0.019 and  $df = 64$ . (Refer table 3)

Hence, employees prefer work over recognition as per paired difference of -1.473.

**Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453
	work3	27.3342	65	3.88784	.48223

**Table 2.1**

**Paired Samples Correlations**

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Recog1 & work3	65	.096	.446

**Table 2.2**

**Paired Samples Test**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 Recog1 - work3	-1.47262	4.92671	.61108	-2.69339	-.25184	-2.410	64	.019

**Table 2.3**

***H<sub>3</sub>: Work itself is not preferred over other factors.***

The results of  $H_3$ , i.e. preference between work over responsibility, we could not accept the null hypothesis, as the test showed a t-value of 16.851 significant at 0.000 and  $df = 64$ . (Refer table 3) Hence, employees prefer work over responsibility as per paired difference of 8.780.

**Paired Samples Statistics**

	Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1 work3	27.3342	65	3.88784	.48223
Responsibility4	18.5538	65	3.04667	.37789

**Table 3.1**

**Paired Samples Correlations**

	Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
				Lower	Upper			
Pair 1 work3 - Responsibility4	8.78031	4.20101	.52107	7.73935	9.82127	16.851	64	.000

	N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1 work3 & Responsibility4	65	.285	.021

**Table 3.2**

**Paired Samples Test**

**Table 3.3**

***H<sub>4</sub>: Responsibility is not preferred over other factors.***

The results of *H<sub>4</sub>*, i.e. preference between responsibility and advancement, we could not accept the null hypothesis, as the test showed a t-value - 5.809 significant at 0.000 and df = 64. (Refer table 3)

Hence, employees prefer advancement over responsibility as per paired difference of -3.015.

**Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Responsibility4	18.5538	65	3.04667	.37789
	Advanc5	21.5692	65	3.51768	.43631

**Table 4.1**

**Paired Samples Correlations**

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Responsibility4 & Advanc5	65	.193	.123

**Table 4.2**

**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Responsibility4 - Advanc5	-3.01538	4.18514	.51910	-4.05241	-1.97836	-5.809	64	.000

**Table 4.3**

***H<sub>5</sub>: Growth is not preferred over other factors.***

The results of *H<sub>5</sub>*, i.e. preference between recognition and growth, we could not accept the null hypothesis, as the test showed a t-value 24.503 significant at 0.000 and df = 64. (Refer table 3)

Hence, employees prefer recognition over growth as per paired difference of 10.338.

**Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Recog1	25.8615	65	3.42270	.42453
	Growth6	15.5231	65	2.41161	.29912

**Table 5.1**

**Paired Samples Correlations**

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Recog1 & Growth6	65	.361	.003

**Table 5.2**

**Paired Samples Test**

		Paired Differences					t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
		Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference				
					Lower	Upper			
Pair 1	Recog1 - Growth6	10.33846	3.40164	.42192	9.49558	11.18135	24.503	64	.000

**Table 5.3**

**$H_6$ : Advancement is not preferred over other factors.**

The results of  $H_6$ , i.e. preference between advancement and growth, we could not accept the null hypothesis, as the test showed a t-value 13.276 significant at 0.000 and  $df = 64$ . (Refer table 3)

Hence, employees prefer advancement over growth as per paired difference of 6.046.

**Paired Samples Statistics**

		Mean	N	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Pair 1	Advanc5	21.5692	65	3.51768	.43631
	Growth6	15.5231	65	2.41161	.29912

**Table 6.1**

**Paired Samples Correlations**

		N	Correlation	Sig.
Pair 1	Advanc5 & Growth6	65	.277	.025

**Table 6.2**

### Paired Samples Test

	Paired Differences	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)
					Lower	Upper			
					Pair 1	Advanc5 - Growth6			

Table 6.3

## Discussion

Our results conclude that Growth is given the least priority or preference as we compare the mean responses of all the factors (Refer table 1). Where as, Work itself has tend to the most preferable factor in terms of motivation for the respondents. Our hypotheses have not been accepted as respondents do prefer one motivation factor over another. In this research it has been proved that most preferable is Work, then recognition, achievement, advancement, responsibility and least is growth. All this has been concluded by using paired sample t-test (refer table 3). We made fifteen pairs of these six motivator factors so that we could know which factor is more preferable over another factor. We then reached to the above stated conclusion. Also mean frequencies of these variables proved that work was the most preferable factor among all other motivator factors.

Therefore, it has been proved that for Siemens, Work itself has tended to be the most important factor for motivation. Similarly, same research can be conducted on other organizations in order to know which factor motivates their employees and it could help in further efficiency and increased productivity of the workers of that organization. Also the same research can be conducted on industry as a whole. Overall, in the research which could be done on industry it could be analyzed as to which is important factor of motivation in particular industry. In relation to that we could also compare results of two industries as which factors of motivation are important for workers in particular industries; thus it could be concluded that with help of particular factor, employees could be motivated and also the reasons for selection of particular factor of motivation could be analyzed in the particular industry and results could be generalized accordingly.

## References

1. Frederick Herzberg, 1966, Work and the Nature of Man, New York: The World Publishing Company.

2. Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959, *The Motivation to Work*, New York, John Wiley & Sons.
3. J. Atchison & E. A. Lefferts, 1972, *The Prediction of Turnover Using Herzberg's job satisfaction technique*, NY.
4. J. Occup. 1977, *Psycho*: 50, 197-204.
5. Robert B. Ewen, 1964, *Some Determinants of Job Satisfaction: A Study of the Generality of Herzberg's Theory*, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 48, W2.
6. Shermerhorn, Johan.R.Jr, Hunt, James G, Richard N. & Osborn, 2005, *Organizational Behavior*, 9<sup>th</sup> Edition, NY: John Wiley & Sons.
7. V. H. Vroom, 1964, *Work and Motivation*, New York: John Wiley & Sons.