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1. Introduction

The first chapter aims to introduce the reader to the research topic. The background, problem, purpose and limitations of the thesis will be discussed.

1.1 Background

Work provides products and services, which represent the basis for a company's success (Steers, 1991), but it is also an important and highly central aspect in the lives of individuals (Hall, 1994) due to several reasons. First, persons receive some kind of reward, extrinsic (such as money) or intrinsic (satisfaction coming from the work), in exchange for their performance (Steers and Porters, 1991). The individual holds certain personal expectations in terms of form and amount of reward, which he/she should receive for the provided service. Thereby, the performance of a person as well as the decision to remain in the company is influenced by the extent to which such expectations are met (Steers, 1991). Second, the workplace presents opportunities for socialisation with other people (Hall, 1994). Third, the job is often a source of rank, or status, in the society in general (Steers, 1991). In other words, the work may provide a source of social differentiation. Fourth, Steers and Porter (1991) pointed out that work has an individual meaning for each person. This can range from a source of identity and self-esteem, to a source of frustration, boredom, and a feeling of meaninglessness, caused by the nature of the task and the characteristics of the person.

As mentioned before, for some people work is a source of great satisfaction; for many others it is the reason for dissatisfaction. Regarding the fact that employees spend a large part of a day at work for 40 to 45 years, it is important that those employees experience positive feelings towards their tasks. Otherwise, it would be a long time to be frustrated, dissatisfied and unhappy. Moreover, these negative feelings may affect the family or social life as well as the physical and emotional health of an individual (Schultz and Schultz, 1998). Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1999) pointed out that an employee, irrespective of if he/she is working in an office or on a bench, will experience his/her tasks, as well as the workday totally differently if the attitudes toward the job are good or if
they are bad. In addition, they argued that the employees' feelings toward their work have a significant influence on the success and failure of the company. For instance, during hard times the level of morale within the work force may determine whether a company will survive. In other words, motivated employees contribute to a company's survival.

Employees are a valuable resource that may contribute in several different ways to a company's activities, provided that the company gives them an appropriate chance (Morgan, 1997). In order to be successful, a company needs employees who act toward the goals of the organisation and have a strong desire to remain in the company (Molander, 1996). Such loyalty and commitment may be generated by motivation. Furthermore, motivation is aimed to achieve increases in work productivity and job satisfaction (Schultz and Schultz, 1998). Particularly, the impacts of motivation on the work performance and productivity attracted attention towards motivation in the work environment (Huddleston and Good, 1999). Highly motivated persons tend to work harder and perform more effectively in their jobs than less motivated individuals. In addition, several studies showed that job satisfaction leads to a better performance as well as to more customer-orientation (Lau and Huang, 1999). However, according to Molander (1996) and Westerman and Donoghue (1989), the accumulated research evidence suggests that the relation between job satisfaction and performance is quite weak.

The knowledge about needs and expectations of employees at work represents the basis for their motivation. Moreover, the structure of the work and the employees' degree of satisfaction with the job are important in order to increase the actual motivation and satisfaction with their work. Thereby, the differences regarding what people want and actually perceive from their job are of significance. The strongest motivator is, according to Wiley (1997), something that people value, but lack. The knowledge about those strong motivators is of great value and may serve as a starting point for the re-design of work, in order to increase an employee's motivation and satisfaction.
1.2. Problem

In order to be successful, companies need the commitment of employees (Molander, 1996). That includes the commitment to act toward the goals of the company, as well as the commitment to stay in the organisation (Dessler, 1986). Highly committed persons expend considerable efforts toward the achievement of a company’s goals and values (Lau and Huang, 1999) and may represent a corporate strategic advantage (Mak and Sockel, 2001), especially in a rapidly changing world. The achievement of organisational commitment, however, is not easy since it may be influenced by personal and organisational factors (Schultz and Schultz, 1998). The knowledge about what motivates (prompt employees to put efforts into their work) and satisfies people at work may be essential to generate such commitment. In other words, a company has to be aware of what motivates and satisfies the employees at work in order to stimulate them to perform their job as best as possible and to remain in the company.

A person who is satisfied with his/her work may show a higher commitment to put efforts toward the achievement of the company's goals and will not easily change job. However, people differ, they distinguish themselves from each other regarding their needs, backgrounds, expectations, and individual characteristics. In other words, what may satisfy one employee may be different from what will satisfy another, at least in terms of the satisfaction degree. Moreover, some needs may change over time, getting stronger or weaker. How can the company know how to motivate whom in the right way?

The knowledge about similarities and differences in the motivation of employees may make it easier for the company to motivate them and to generate organisational commitment. Thereby, the consideration of individual characteristics such as age, gender, work area, and years a person has been working in the company may provide useful information. General personal features, which can be easily used to distinguish persons from each other, are considered as individual characteristics in this study. These characteristics do not represent very individual traits such as endurance and ambition. They can be recognised easily, and their destination requires no research or personal assessment. A group of employees sharing the same individual features may have the same needs and expectations toward work and may be satisfied in the same way.
Information about the extent to which certain factors of motivation and job satisfaction are present at work (evaluation of the actual work situation) and information about the importance, which is attributed to those factors by the employees, may offer valuable clues to the field of motivation. A comparison of this data may reveal factors whose enhancement may cause higher motivation and job satisfaction of the work force.

The following questions will guide the research process in order to gain a deeper knowledge about the motivation of employees.

- **What are the most critical factors for motivation and job satisfaction?**

- **To what extent are these factors present in a selected company?**

- **How important are these factors for the employees?**

The last two issues will be examined regarding certain individual characteristics - age, gender, marital status, work area (blue-collar/white-collar worker), position (leading /non-leading position), and the years a person has been working in the company - in this study.

Furthermore, I will identify factors which are valued, but also lacked at the same time by the employees. This knowledge of those factors may be of great value for the selected company in order to increase the employees' motivation and satisfaction with the work.

### 1.3. Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to investigate and analyse the factors which motivate employees, under consideration of individual characteristics.
1.4 Limitations

Motivation presents a quite extensive area for research. There is a wide range of theories on what motivates people (content theories) as well as theories, which try to describe how behaviour is initiated, directed and sustained (process theories). However, this thesis concentrates on the content theories that identify specific needs, which initiate and direct human behaviour.

In general, the focus is on the motivation at work and particularly on the job itself. The effects of motivation and job satisfaction such as the impact on the mental health, family life, turnover and so on, are presented in order to show the significance and the scope of that topic. However, they are only considered in the theory, not explicitly in the empirical part.

Age, gender, marital status, work area, position and the years a person has been working in the company are considered as individual characteristics and are examined in this study. These individual characteristics are not individual traits; instead, they are general personal features that can be easily used to distinguish individuals from each other without research or personal assessments.

In addition, in this thesis no distinctions are drawn between managers and workers in terms of the role-play in motivation. That means the word "employee" includes managers as well as all the other persons working in the company. Managers are also considered employees since they are hired by contract like every other employee.

1.5 The selected company

The company where I carried out the empirical research is located in Östergötland. It is a medium sized production company acting in the metal working business sector.

During my company visits I had the possibility to be guided through all departments of the company in order to get an impression of the work and the work environment. During this guided tour, I received information
about the work tasks of the respective employees, which helped me to better understand the results of the mail questionnaire later on.
2. Methodology

The following chapter provides the reader with information about the research process in order to enable him/her to understand and to evaluate the investigation and the results. For these purposes a short overview about the research process, positivism and hermeneutics, the quantitative and qualitative research, the data collection, a reflection on objectivity, reliability and validity as well as criticism towards the chosen methods are presented.

2.1 The research process - a short overview

Each research problem is in some way unique, and therefore requires a tailored research procedure. In the following, the research process of this study is shown (see figure 2:1).
The first step in doing this research was the formulation of the problem and the creation of the research questions. Thereafter, I thought about the methodology which would best fit the problem under research. After that, I gathered secondary data in the form of books and articles in order to improve my understanding of the research problem. At this time, I also started to write the research report. The questionnaire about motivation and work was created, based on the knowledge of the theoretical research. Thereby, several decisions such as the form of the questions, the language used in the questionnaire, as well as the procedure in performing the mail questionnaire had to be made. The questionnaire was tested and several days later sent by mail to each employee of the company. One week later the questionnaires were collected and a period of editing and analysing the data started. These results were used for carrying out interviews with several employees in order to get a deeper understanding of the questionnaire results. After carrying out the interviews, a period of writing down the results of the mail questionnaire and interviews in connection with the theoretical framework followed. During the entire time between determining the methodology and the end of writing down the analysis the frames of reference was created. Finally, the research report was completed by adding the conclusion and the closing comments.

2.2 Positivism vs. Hermeneutics

The researcher is directed in his/her choice of methods and methodologies that are best suited for the problem under investigation by paradigms (Clarke, and Dawson, 1999). According to Gummesson (1991), two schools of philosophy -the natural science school and its antithesis, the humanistic school, are influential in the field of business administration.

Positivism, rooted in the traditional science school seeks to discover laws by the use of quantitative methods (Silverman, 1993). It assumes the existence of an objective truth in the world, and emphasis is put on the measurement of relationships between variables in order to reveal that truth. These measurements are done in a systematic and statistical way. Thereby, the main focus is on reliability, validity and generalisation of the measurement and its predictions of cause and effect (Cassell and Symon, 1995). Moreover, according to McNeill (1985), the knowledge that is generated by the use of quantitative methods is objective and factual. In
other words, it is assumed that this knowledge is valid, independent of time and place, and will not be different according to the respective discoverer.

Hermeneutics has its roots in the Western world (Gummesson, 1991). It emphasises constructivist approaches. That means there is no clear-cut objectivity or reality (Cassell and Symon, 1995). In addition, Clarke and Dawson (1999) pointed out that gaining insight and the development of understanding are the tasks of a hermeneutic researcher. Silverman (1993) argued that the interpretative social science deals with observation and descriptions and aims to generate hypotheses from field research, whereas positivism is concerned with testing correlation between variables.

According to the literature, positivism is often related to the quantitative research, whereas hermeneutics is frequently related to the qualitative research. Both types of research will be explained in the next section.

2.3 Quantitative and qualitative research

Research methodology is often divided into the quantitative and qualitative research. Both of these types of research are considered in research design, data collection, analysis, and reporting (Bickman and Rog, 1997). As mentioned before, the quantitative method allows the measurement of relationships between variables in a systematic and statistical way and is therefore best suited for the positivistic researcher. The qualitative method, on the other hand, is most appropriate for the hermeneutic researcher in order to gain a deeper understanding of a special research problem (Cassell and Symon, 1995). According to Bickman and Rog (1997), a researcher has to find the tools which best fit the research questions, context, and resources at hand. Thereby, multiple tools are often needed to research a topic thoroughly and to provide results that can be used. Cassell and Symon (1995) pointed out that a combination of quantitative and qualitative methods in the same study is called the pragmatic view. That means tools that are available and appropriate to best serve the research problem should be used. Furthermore, Gordon and Langmaid (1988) argued that the results of quantitative and/or qualitative research might permit various interpretations. In other words, there is no 'right way' or 'only way' to interpret the findings of the research.
The quantitative research approach focuses on questions such as "How many?" and "How often?", which is easily processed in the form of numbers. In other words, the collected material can be expressed and analysed in numbers. However, according to Gordon and Langmaid (1988), the quantitative research holds not only the advantage of statistical and numerical measurement, but also the advantages of sub-group sampling or comparisons. Moreover, the quantitative research offers the possibility to repeat the survey in the future and to compare the results.

Qualitative research on the other hand tends to answer questions such as "What?", "Why?" or "How?". Data is gathered in the form of words rather than numbers (McNeill, 1985). In other words, the collected data cannot be analysed and interpreted in numbers. According to Gordon and Langmaid (1988), the qualitative research permits the use of various techniques in order to gather data. In addition, the qualitative research has the advantages to be open-ended, dynamic, and flexible. It focuses on the depth of understanding, and considers a broader and deeper database. The individual's creativity is used and rationalised, and superficial responses are penetrated. This research approach is, according to Gordon and Langmaid (1998), concerned with understanding things rather than with measuring them.

Both types of research have their strengths and weaknesses. According to Jick (1979), qualitative and quantitative methods can be considered as complements to each other. Looking at things from several directions may provide the researcher with a better view of them (McNeill, 1985). Partial views may be overcome and a complete, holistic picture may be presented by this called triangulation (Silverman, 1993). According to Clarke and Dawson (1999), the confidence of a researcher in the results is higher when using multiple methods instead of applying only one single method. Furthermore, the use of several methods enables the researcher to compensate the weakness of one employed method by the strengths of another method (McNeill, 1985). Moreover, Gummesson (1991) pointed out that reliability might be enhanced by the use of two or more methods on the same research problem. In addition, according to Clarke and Dawson (1999), triangulation reduces measurement errors and is helpful in overcoming problems of bias.

In this study I employed quantitative as well as qualitative methods (triangulation). The use of a questionnaire provided predominantly quantitative data and to a minor extent qualitative data. Furthermore,
personal interviews provided qualitative data to the study. This qualitative data was used to shed some light on the quantitative data. This enabled me to investigate the research problem in more depth.

2.4 Collection of data

The collection of data represents a prerequisite for carrying out a research and can be derived from a number of different sources. These sources are classified into secondary and primary data (Clarke and Dawson, 1999). McNeill (1985) pointed out that secondary data is material that has been gathered previously, and primary data consists of new material collected by the researcher for the purpose at hand by the use of questionnaires, interviews, and participant observation.

2.4.1 Secondary data

Secondary data, in comparison with primary data holds the advantage that it is cheap and most of the time easy to access (Churchill, 1995). However, it may also entail a large amount of flawed and/or inappropriate data (Bickman and Rog, 1997). According to the literature, the researcher should first focus on secondary data in the process of data collection. Although a problem is not completely solved by secondary data, it contributes to a better statement of the problem under investigation. It offers improved methods or data.

I have used several forms of secondary data in my research. These include books, articles and course literature with useful information for this study. Thereby, I received not only an indication of the content as well as an idea of their quality, but I also gained a deeper understanding of the presented research problem. This secondary data was then used for writing the theoretical framework and the background.

2.4.2 Primary data

As mentioned above, secondary data rarely solves a research problem completely. Therefore, additional information to the problem at hand - primary data - is needed. Once secondary data has been examined, primary
data can be selected by communication or observation (Churchill, 1995). Communication involves the asking of questions to respondents in an oral or written form by the use of questionnaires. According to Churchill (1995), communication may be served by mail questionnaires and interviews conducted either in person or over the telephone. Observation means that the researcher observes particular situations in order to record facts, actions, or behaviours that may be of interest for solving the research problem. The selection of primary data by communication is faster and cheaper than observation, and holds the advantage of versatility. On the other hand, according to Churchill (1995), observational data is more objective and accurate due to the fact that the collected information is not influenced by a person's memory, mood, or reluctance to provide the desired data.

As mentioned before, (see 2.3) the combination of several methods allows the researcher to consider the units under study from several directions and to enhance the understanding (Jick, 1979). The methodology employed in this research consisted of a mail questionnaire and the use of sample interviews. For instance, the questionnaire gathers only data about issues, which are a part of it, and may neglect other important things. This weakness might be compensated by the use of interviews additionally to the mail questionnaire. The use of observations was not considered since the extent to which an individual perceives satisfaction with his/her job features as well as the importance, which is attached to certain job features by this person, may be difficult to observe, particularly, in such a short time span that was available to accomplish this study.

2.4.2.1 Questionnaire about motivation and work

The primary advantage of mail questionnaires is the opportunity to reach a high number of respondents. Moreover, there is no interviewer bias and the costs are relatively low. In addition, respondents may be more willing to provide information about certain issues, have time to answer questions, and may answer the questions at times that are convenient (Bickman and Rog, 1998). On the other hand, it may consume a lot of time when waiting for answers, non response rates may be high, existing bias due to non response, especially where response is slow, and certain types of questions cannot be asked (Douglas and Craig, 1983). Furthermore, misinterpretations and misrepresentations are common with questionnaires. However, provided that the survey is carried out properly, the results are,
according to McNeill (1985), reliable and represent a wider population than that directly investigated. Moreover, the received data can be easily used in a statistical form, which makes comparisons between different groups possible.

**Creation of the questionnaire and carrying out of the survey**

The questionnaire about motivation and work was based on a job description questionnaire created by Hackman and Oldham (1980) and was addressed to every employee of a production company. The questionnaire comprised of eight pages, including the cover sheet, and was divided in four parts. The cover page provided the respondent with information about the content and the general procedures. In addition, it included among others the remark that the answers will be kept confidential as well as the deadline for return. In the first part the respondents were asked to describe their job and to evaluate their extent of satisfaction/dissatisfaction with the respective job feature. For that purpose, the persons had to choose a number out of a scale from one ("little extent" or "dissatisfied") to eight ("much" or "satisfied"). The second section included statements about certain job aspects, which had to be evaluated by the respondents according to the extent of importance that they attach to them. The persons had the opportunity to choose a figure out of a scale from one ("less important") to eight ("very important"). To sum up, the first part was aimed to investigate the extent of the presence of certain job features as well as the employees' level of satisfaction with them, whereas the second part was used to realise the strength of certain work motives. Part three deals with certain kinds of benefits that are offered by the company. The respondents had to evaluate how important these benefits are for them. A scale from one ("less important") to eight ("very important") was used as well. Furthermore, they had the opportunity to propose additional benefits. The last part was dedicated to gather general information such as the current age range, the gender, the marital status, the years a person has been working in that company as well as the work area and the position within the company. This individual data comprised the subgroups that represent the basis for the analysis. Finally, the respondents had the possibility to write down additional information about their job that could be helpful to understand that job.

After I had prepared the first draft in English, consisting of part one, part two, and part four of the final questionnaire, I went to the company to talk with my contact persons about the questionnaire. I asked them to have a
In order to minimise misinterpretations and misrepresentations, the questions as well as the instructions have been designed in a clear and precise way so that different persons would not interpret them differently. Predominantly fixed-alternative questions but also open-ended questions, albeit only to a minor extent, were used to gather information. Therefore, the structure of this questionnaire can be described as some kind of intermediate. Most of the fixed-alternative questions employed a scale from one to eight to capture the responses. The other fixed-alternative questions are multichotomous questions, which permit the respondents to choose an alternative out of several possible answers. Only a limited amount of open-ended questions allowed the respondents to answer in their own words.

The questionnaire together with a letter, a neutral envelope, and a slip of paper was sent by mail to all employees of the company. The letter contained among others background information, information about the purpose of this survey, the handling of the received information, the return date and the return procedure of the questionnaire. To return the questionnaire, the respondents might tuck the answered questionnaire into the neutral envelope and drop it into a box in the Cafeteria. Moreover, the respondents were meant to write their name on the slip of paper and to drop it into the box as well. This enabled me to remind the employees to return the questionnaires. The entire procedure, as well as the fact that no names and codes were written on the questionnaire, was designed to give the respondents an increased feeling of trust and to persuade them that the answers will be kept anonymously.

In order to ensure a good quality of the data in terms of representation and size of the sample, the questionnaire was distributed to all employees of the company. From the total of 140 questionnaires 86 were returned, yielding a response rate of 61.4%. However, one questionnaire could not be used
since no information about the individual characteristics were given by the respondent.

**Analysis of the questionnaire results**

The questions in part 1 consisted of two parts. The first part dealt with the actual situation at work, whereas the second part considered the satisfaction with the respective job features. The figures of both parts were added and divided by two. Furthermore, the questions asked in the questionnaire (part one and two) were clustered into 8 factors (see table 2:1), which are according to the literature research critical factors for the motivation and job satisfaction. These are skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, environment, job security, and compensation. The questions regarding the benefits provided by the company were divided into four groups - benefit, food, sport, and work (see table 2:1).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor/benefit</th>
<th>Part 1</th>
<th>Part 2</th>
<th>Part 3</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>1 - 4</td>
<td>1 - 5</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>6 - 8</td>
<td>7</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>8 - 9</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>10 - 11</td>
<td>10 - 12</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>12 - 14</td>
<td>13 - 14</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15 - 16</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>16 - 17</td>
<td>17 - 18</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Benefit</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Food</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>2 - 3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sport</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>5 - 6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2:1 Clustering of the questions

Thereafter, the answers of the respondents were analysed by using the mean. Thereby, certain subgroups such as age, gender, marital status of the respondents, the work area (blue-collar/white-collar worker), the position (leading/non-leading position), and the years a person has been working in the company represented the basis for the analysis. I decided to choose those subgroups due to my previous experiences and observations as an employee in a service company.
The size of the employee population of the entire company, as well as of the sample regarding the respective subgroups (except for the marital status due to missing information) is presented in table 2:2. In consideration of this data, it may be stated that the sample is a quite good representation of the employee population of the company.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Subgroups</th>
<th>Employee population of the company in numbers</th>
<th>Sample in numbers</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>in %</td>
<td>in %</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Age</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; = 30 years</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45 years</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>40</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; = 46 years</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>20</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Gender</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>119</td>
<td>71</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>14</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Work area</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>61</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>24</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Position</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leading position</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-leading</td>
<td>131</td>
<td>78</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Years in the company</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>45</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt;5 - 10 years</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>22</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 2:2 Sample

### 2.4.2.2 Interviews

After analysing the questionnaire results by using the mean, personal interviews were conducted with five employees of the company. The interviewees differed in the age, gender, marital status, position, work area, and years in the company. In other words, almost all individual characteristics as well as the respective subgroups were covered by the sample. It has to be mentioned that all interviewees may be associated to the group of white-collar workers. However, two persons had been working several years as blue-collars before they became white-collar workers.
The interviews were performed to gain a deeper knowledge of the results received by the questionnaire respondents. Those results were presented in diagrams. In order to not affect the answers of the respondents I asked them how they would interpret the data and to give reasons why those differences might occur. The interviews were structured in order to ensure the objectivity of the research, and open-ended questions were used. Moreover, all interviews lasting between 60 and 90 minutes were conducted in English. During the interviews a tape recorder was used in order to be able to give undivided attention to the respondents and their answers.

2.5 Objectivity, reliability, validity, and criticism

Objectivity means being able to conduct the investigation without involving personal opinions. But researchers are not objective individuals; instead, they are individuals that consciously and/or unconsciously influence their surroundings (Macionis and Plummer, 1997). However, being aware of that fact and that I am not a professional interviewer, I tried to be as objective as possible. Furthermore, in order to ensure objectivity of the research I decided to use structured interviews. In addition, according to Churchill (1995), interviewees may be affected by the interviewer through his/her way of acting. Aware of these effects I tried to minimise their occurrence.

Reliability means that the operations of a study, such as the data collection process, can be repeated and the researcher should arrive at the same findings and conclusions (McNeill, 1985). Therefore, I attributed much attention to the creation of the questionnaire. I formulated the questions and instructions as clearly as possible in order to avoid different interpretations by different respondents. Moreover, the use of a scale, as well as the analysis by using the mean, grants for a high reliability of the data. Regarding the interviews, which have been carried out in English, it has to be noted that English is not my mother tongue and not the mother tongue of the interviewees and, therefore, there might have been misunderstandings. However, I tried to minimise this risk by repeating and summarising the answers of the respondents from time to time during the interviews.
Validity deals with the aspect if a method actually measures what it suggests to measure (Cassell and Symon, 1995). Considering the purpose, the methods that have been used to carry out this research and results, I hold the opinion to have used appropriate methods in order to investigate the research problem.

The choice of literature and its misinterpretation may represent another risk. The literature may not be current or relevant enough to the study (Zigmund, 1998). Sometimes I used quite old books and articles, but in consideration of their importance to the problem under investigation it is essential to use them. Furthermore, the articles used for this thesis were collected from well-known databases such as the Swedish University catalogue of Libris, which at least to a certain degree should grant their quality. Regarding the risk of misinterpretation, I think any possible misinterpretations have not led to any major mistakes, which may reduce the validity of the study results.
3. Frames of Reference

This part of the thesis provides the reader with important facts, theories, and models in order to increase the understanding of the area under investigation. Motivation, needs and expectations, job satisfaction, and some important motivation theories respectively studies are explained. These presented information serve as foundation to the analysis.

3.1 Motivation

Motivation is a highly complex phenomenon (Bent, et al., 1999) that influences and is influenced by a large number of factors in the organisational environment (Porter and Steers, 1991). The study of motivation is concerned with why individuals think and behave as they do (Mullin, 1999; Weiner, 1992; Wagner, 1999). A great amount of definitions are presented by literature, e.g. Vignali (1997) points out that motivation is a process that triggers individuals to act as they do. Analoui (2000) sees motivation as a drive within the individual necessary to direct that person's actions and behaviour towards the achievement of some goals, and focuses, according to Luthans (1995) and Mullins (1999), on the fulfilment of certain needs and expectations. Moreover, Westerman and Donoghue refer to motivation as

"...a set of processes which energize a person's behaviour and direct him or her towards attaining some goal, or put more simply getting people to do willingly and well those things which have to be done." (1989, p. 79).

Generally, motivation deals with forces, which initiate, direct and sustain behaviour towards the attainment of certain goals (Bent et al., 1999). Particularly, in terms of the organisational aspect, motivation focuses, according to Molander (1996), on an individual's willingness to put efforts into his/her work, and on the amount of efforts, which are made in order to obtain incentives or a special form of incentives. Molander's definition of motivation represents the basis for this thesis.
The discussion of motivation in the literature (recent and less recent) refers to three aspects:
(1) what is the arousal or energising source of the individual behaviour,
(2) what directs or channels such behaviour (Vroom, 1964; Wagner, 1999; Atkinson et al., 1975), and
(3) the maintenance and sustain of this behaviour (Bent et al., 1999).
The first issue deals with driving forces inherent in the individual that lead to a certain behaviour, and with environmental forces that often cause these drives (Porter and Steers, 1991). The second feature involves the direction of behaviour towards a goal (Wagner, 1999). Furthermore, Porter and Steers (1991) refer to the third matter as forces within the individual and environmental forces that provide the individual with feedback. This feedback either reinforces the individual to intensify his/her drive and the direction of his/her energy, or discourages the individual to pursue his/her course of action and redirects his/her efforts.

The motivational process (see figure 3:1) represents a very general model of human behaviour (Mullins, 1999). Steers (1991) argued that this model assumes that individuals hold a number of needs, desires and expectations in varying strengths. Based on these needs and expectations, people act or behave in a certain way that they believe will lead to the desired goal. Thereby, according to Steers and Porter (1991), the individual will be provided with feedback about the impact of his/her behaviour. That, in turn may induce the individual to alter his/her present behaviour, or may reassure the individual that his/her current way of acting is correct and may confirm the person in pursuing this course of action.

Figure 3:1 A simplified illustration of the basic motivational model (Source: Mullins, 1999, p. 407)
The motivational process is not as simple and straightforward as it seems. It is, according to Atkinson et al. (1975), a far more complex study. Porter and Steers (1991) refer to Dunnette and Kirchner (1965) and others who identified four aspects, which complicate the simplicity of the model. The first aspect refers to the fact that motives cannot directly be observed and therefore a need to deduce them exists (Baron, 1983). However, the inference of motives from observed behaviour is associated with difficulties traced back to at least five reasons mentioned by Atkinson et al. (1975). These five reasons are: (1) several motives may be expressed through any single action; (2) motives may occur in disguised forms; (3) similar or identical actions may represent several motives; (4) different behaviour may embody similar motives; and (5) the modes of expression of certain motives may be mitigated by personal and cultural variations.

The second complication of the model deals with the fact that any person has a host of motives. These motives may change over time and conflict with each other (Baron, 1983). Third, Porter and Steers (1991) point out that the selection of certain motives over others, as well as the intensity with which such motives are pursued, may differ from person to person. In addition, they refer to the fourth complication, the fact that an attainment of certain needs, desires and expectations may prompt a person to direct his/her attention to other motives, or to intensify the pursuit of these motives.

3.2 Needs and expectations at work

Individuals are different and therefore also have different needs and expectations, which they attempt to fulfil in many different ways. These needs and expectations, altering and often conflicting with each other over time, may be classified in several ways. Two out of the variety of classifications will be explained more detailed in the following.

3.2.1 Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation

Needs and expectations (motivators) are often considered in terms of being internal (see 3.1 Analoui) or external to an individual. Internal motivators are, according to Mak and Sockel (2001), concerned with intrinsic needs that satisfy a person, whereas external motivators are considered as environmental factors brought by the company to the individual.
Intrinsic motivation is the desire of an individual to perform his/her work well, in order to achieve the satisfaction of intrinsic needs (Hui and Lee, 2000). In other words, an individual performs a task in order to achieve certain types of internal states, which he/she experiences as rewarding (Deci, 1975). Intrinsic motivation relates to psychological rewards such as the recognition of a task completed (Mullins, 1999). External rewards such as food, money, praise, and so on, are not the main reason for a person to engage in activities (Deci, 1975). Intrinsic motives can be satisfied by the work itself. In other words, the task itself is the main source of motivation, since it provides interest, stimulation, challenges, and opportunities for personal growth and achievement to the individual (Molander, 1996). Deci (1975) refers to intrinsically motivated behaviour as behaviour that is determined by an individual's need for feeling competent and self-determining. On the one hand, a person will seek out challenges that allow him/her to behave in ways that provide him/her with a sense of competence and self-determination. On the other hand, an individual is engaged in a process of conquering challenges.

Extrinsic motivation, on the other hand, refers to tangible rewards such as pay, fringe benefits, work environment, work conditions, and job security (Mullins, 1999). Extrinsic motives cannot only be satisfied by the work itself. That means pleasure comes from something the task leads to, such as money. According to Jung (1997,) the effects of work as well as its contributing factors are also of importance for the need satisfaction. Thereby, the work is seen as a means to pursue other motives.

3.2.2 Broad classification for motivation to work

According to Mullins (1999), needs and expectations can be distinguished in economic rewards, intrinsic satisfaction, and social relationships. Economic rewards such as pay, fringe benefits, and material goods are an instrumental orientation to work. Intrinsic satisfaction is provided by the work itself and represents a personal orientation to work. Friendships, teamwork, and the need for affiliation are part of the social relationship that constitutes the relational orientation to work. The relative strength of all these categories of needs and expectations together with the extent to which they are satisfied determines an individual’s motivation, job satisfaction and job performance. People differ in their preferences, e.g. some persons may prefer economic rewards, whereas other individuals will favour
intrinsic satisfaction and/or social relationships. These preferences may change over time.

3.3 Job satisfaction

Satisfaction is an internal state (Mullins, 1999). Various authors define it as the outcome of a motivational process (Bent et al., 1999). Job satisfaction is the positive and negative feelings and attitudes which an individual holds about his/her work (Schultz and Schultz, 1998). In other words, it is the extent to which an individual favours his/her job (Molander, 1996). Positive attitudes toward the job are equivalent to job satisfaction, whereas negative attitudes represent job dissatisfaction. Job satisfaction is a complex phenomenon (Sell and Shipley, 1979; Bent et al., 1999) and depends on many work-related as well as personal factors. That means personal factors such as age, gender, and job experience as well as the characteristics of the job influence a person's degree of job satisfaction (Lawler and Porter, 1967). Even though personal characteristics are unchangeable by the company, they can be used for predictions of satisfaction among groups of employees. The redesign of the work, as well as of the work environment, may lead to increases in job satisfaction and productivity (Schultz and Schultz, 1998). For example, a redesign of work may provide an employee with the opportunity for personal growth and development (Hackman and Oldham, 1980; see 3.4.4). Individuals may be satisfied with some aspects of their work and dissatisfied with others. However, all attitudes are not measured by the overall job satisfaction. Therefore, it might be of use to break down an individual’s attitude toward his/her work as a whole, into attitudes held toward single facets of the job such as pay, security, social conditions, and so on (Molander, 1996). In other words, since the overall job satisfaction does not measure all positive and negative attitudes of a person toward his/her work, it would be of avail to measure single facets of job satisfaction.

Job satisfaction is a main factor for the motivation of employees (Mak and Sockel, 1999) and is closely related to customer-orientation (Lau & Huang, 1999). According to Blankertz and Robinson (1996), individuals who are satisfied with their job to a high extent, are very motivated and do not prefer to leave their job. The relationship between job satisfaction and work performance is not explicit. Some theorists think that job satisfaction leads to a better performance (e.g., see 3.4.3). However, the accumulated
research evidence only suggests a quite weak correlation between job satisfaction and performance (Molander, 1996). Vroom (1964) pointed out that there exists no simple relationship between job satisfaction and performance. Correlation between these two variables varies to a large extent, with an average of 0.14. According to Vroom (1964), this figure is too low to be of theoretical or practical relevance. Moreover, the opinions of theorists differ in terms of whether job satisfaction leads to improved productivity or the reverse (Mullins, 1999). Lawler and Porter (1967), for instance, described the fact that increased performance leads to satisfaction with the help of a third variable - rewards. They assumed that good performance leads to rewards either in the form of extrinsic or intrinsic rewards (see 3.2.1), which in turn will cause satisfaction. Furthermore, job satisfaction and life satisfaction are related positively and reciprocally to each other. That means a person with positive feelings about his/her family and personal life will be likely to develop positive attitudes toward his/her job and vice versa (Schultz and Schultz, 1998). In addition, several studies, for instance Vroom (1964), have shown that a negative relation between job satisfaction and labour turnover exists. The more satisfied an individual is with his/her work, the less likely he/she will change the employer. However, there are a lot of other factors such as the organisational commitment of an employee, and the state of the labour market, which have an influence on the turnover behaviour as well (Molander, 1996). The relation between job satisfaction and absenteeism inclines to be negative and less consistent (Vroom, 1964). However, Verhaegen (1979) argued that turnover and absenteeism are related to satisfaction in some way, but since many other factors influence these variables as well, an explicit relationship can only be identified in some concrete situations. Finally, the more a person identifies himself/herself psychologically with the job, the higher the job satisfaction seems to be. Thereby, according to Schultz and Schultz (1998), job involvement depends on personal factors such as age and growth needs, job characteristics like autonomy, variety, stimulation, and feedback, and social factors such as group work.
3.4 Work motivation theories

Since motivation deals with factors that energise, direct and sustain behaviour (see 3.1), there are a lot of important variables, which may influence an individual’s motivation at work. These variables can be distinguished in three groups: characteristics of the individual, job characteristics, and work environment characteristics (Steers and Porter, 1983). These sets of variables were considered in the Steers study as well. Steers developed a model (see figure 3:2), which shows the antecedents and consequences of organisational commitment.

![Diagram showing the antecedents and outcomes of organisational commitment](image)

Organisational commitment can be described as the extent to which an individual identifies himself/herself with and is involved in the company (Mak and Sockel, 2001). Schultz and Schultz (1998) mentioned that organisational commitment includes the fact that a person has to accept the
goals and values of the company, has to be willing to expend efforts for the enterprise, and has the desire to remain in the company. According to Steers and Porter (1983), two types of commitment can be found in the literature - the attitudinal and behavioural commitment. The attitudinal commitment contains an individual's identification with the company and his/her wish to remain in the organisation. The behavioural commitment, on the other hand, deals with the aspect that a person feels bound to the company, but there is no personal identification with the company goals and values (Schultz and Schultz, 1998). Payment and benefits are, according to Torrington and Hall (1995), means to commit people to the company, but will not necessarily lead to high levels of performance.

According to Steers (1977), mentioned in Dessler (1986), the antecedents of organisational commitment are personal characteristics (need for achievement, age and education), job characteristics (feedback, interesting and meaningful work), and work attitudes (for instance group attitudes). All antecedents together determine a person's organisational commitment, which in turn influences, among others, a person's job performance and the desire to stay in membership with the company.

Moreover, Steers and Porter (1983) pointed out that

"individuals enter organizations with certain needs, desires, skills, and so forth and expect to find a work environment where they can utilize their abilities and satisfy many of their basic needs. Where the organization provides such opportunities (e.g., where it makes effective use of its employees, is dependable, etc.), the likelihood of increasing commitment is apparently enhanced. However, where the organization is not dependable, or where it fails to provide employees with challenging and meaningful tasks, commitment levels tend to diminish.” (p. 444)

Each of the theories and studies considered in the following deals with at least one of these sets of variables - personal characteristics, job characteristics, and work attitudes.
3.4.1 Hawthorne studies

The importance of studying the attitudes, feelings, and perceptions that individuals hold toward their work was emphasised by the Western Electric studies. Roethlisberger and Dickson (1939), mentioned by Reis and Peña (2001), published their book *Management and the worker* about the first important practical study conducted at the Hawthorne plant of the Western Electric Company in 1939. This study dealt with informal groups, work restriction norms, productivity and social relations, and stressed the issue of humane leadership (Reis and Peña, 2001). Between 1924-1932, a huge amount of experiments were performed under the leading of Elton Mayo at the Western Electric Company plant in Hawthorne. The main conclusions drawn from these experiments are presented in brief below.

A better performance was noticed whenever management introduced an environmental change such as changes in lighting, rest breaks, hours of work, system of payment, and so on. An increased productivity was recognisable even if one of the changes was a return to a previous way of doing (Statt, 1994). Therefore, the researchers concluded that factors other than working conditions influenced the work performance (Mullins, 1999). The experiments identified social relations at work as the source of motivation. Social incentives such as belonging to a work group seemed to be stronger than monetary incentives (Steers and Porter, 1991; Mullins, 1999). In addition, increased productivity was due to the fact that management showed interest in the employees and paid extra attention to them (Mullins, 1999). Another result was that employees brought their problems with them to their work (Steers and Porter, 1991), and therefore management was demanded to listen to their feelings and problems (Mullins, 1999).
3.4.2 Needs Hierarchy Theory

The following chapter is based on Maslow (1943, 1954), unless otherwise stated. Maslow (1943, 1954) pointed out that human motivation has a hierarchical structure, which he called a hierarchy of needs. There are at least five basic needs, which all individuals uphold. These are physiological, safety, love, esteem, and self-actualising.

Physiological needs are for instance food, drink, oxygen, sex, and sleep. In short, all needs, which present the basis for life. Safety needs include security, the need for a safe, predictable and organised world, and the avoidance of pain and physical attacks. Love needs refer to affection and belongingness needs. That means a person will strive for good relations with people and a place in his/her group. Thereby, special attention is given to friends, sweetheart, wife, and children. In addition, all individuals hold the need for a stable and high evaluation of themselves, self-esteem, and respect given to them by other persons. Esteem needs may be categorised into (1) the desire for strength, for achievement, for independence and freedom, and (2) the desire for prestige and respect from other persons, recognition, attention, importance and appreciation. The fifth needs level, the self-actualising needs, represents the desire for personal development and accomplishment. The form of these needs differs from person to person. As an example, some persons experience these needs in the desire to be a perfect mother, whereas other people express self-actualisation in form of painting pictures.

All five basic needs are arranged in a hierarchy of importance. Thereby, physiological needs represent the starting point for the motivation theory at the lowest level. In a situation when all needs are unsatisfied and the human being is dominated by the physiological needs, the other needs do not seem to exist or are pressed in the background. When physiological needs are satisfied, new and higher needs such as safety needs will emerge and dominate the individual. When these new needs in turn are gratified, again new and higher needs such as love needs will appear, and so on. The hierarchy of the basic needs ranges from physiological needs through safety needs, love needs, and esteem needs, to the needs of self-actualising at the highest level. A need that is satisfied is no longer perceived as a need by a person. The individual is dominated and his/her behaviour is influenced only by needs that are not satisfied. However, if once satisfied needs are thwarted they will emerge again in order to drive a person's
behaviour. Maslow (1943, 1954) argued that lower level needs have to be gratified before next higher level needs will arise and determine a person's behaviour. However, it is not necessary that a need is gratified fully before a subsequent need emerges.

Maslow's theory about human motivation can be applied to work situations as well. It provides useful information for motivation at work. As already mentioned, every person strives for the fulfilment of certain needs. Thereby, an individual’s actual state in certain overall need classifications determines his/her behaviour at work (Wiley, 1997). In other words, the state where an employee is in the ladder on hierarchy of needs influences the work performance of that employee. Individual needs have to be identified in order to motivate people's work behaviour. The knowledge of an employee's unfulfilled needs may enable companies to influence the work performance. Figure 3:3 shows examples of how companies can motivate employees at all levels of the need hierarchy.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maslow's Hierarchy Level</th>
<th>Examples of How Organisations Can Satisfy Needs</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Self-actualising</strong></td>
<td>- Encouragement of complete employee commitment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Job a major expressive dimension of employee's life</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Creation of jobs with scope for achievement, autonomy, responsibility, and personal control</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Work enhancing personal identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Feedback and recognition for good performance (e.g., promotions, &quot;employee of the month&quot; awards)</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Ego</strong></td>
<td>- Work organisation that permits interaction with colleagues</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Social and sport facilities</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Office and factory parties and outings</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Social</strong></td>
<td>- Pension and health care plans</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Job tenure</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Emphasis on career paths within the organisation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Security</strong></td>
<td>- Salaries and wages</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>- Safe and pleasant working conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Figure 3.3 Examples of how organisations can satisfy needs at different levels of Maslow's hierarchy (Morgan, 1997, p. 37)
3.4.3 Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory

The following chapter is based on Herzberg (1966) and Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1999). In the late 50's, Herzberg interviewed two hundred engineers and accountants of Pittsburgh industry in order to investigate what causes their satisfaction and dissatisfaction on the job. The employees were asked to describe a situation at work when they felt good, and a situation when they felt bad. Moreover, they were asked why they felt that way. In other words, the employees were asked if their feelings about their job had influenced their work performance, well-being or personal relationships. The results of this study revealed that a bad environment caused dissatisfaction. However, a good environment led to an individual's satisfaction very seldom. According to this study, employees perceived satisfaction by the intrinsics of their work.

Herzberg's work categorised motivation into two sets of factors: motivators and hygienes.

(1) Hygiene factors do not motivate employees, however, they may reduce the extent of dissatisfaction experienced by the individuals. That means if these factors are not present, or are mismanaged, they may cause dissatisfaction on the job. In an optimal situation, regarding the presence of hygiene factors, the employee will not experience dissatisfaction, but neither will he/she develop positive attitudes toward the work. Hygiene factors are related to the job context. They are the major environmental aspects of the work, in other words, they are extrinsic factors of the job. Herzberg (1966) and Herzberg et al. (1999) identified company policy and administration, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary as hygiene factors.

(2) The other set of factors, called motivators, satisfies a person's need for self-actualisation in his/her job and, therefore, leads to positive feelings towards the work. The motivators are related to the job content, in other words, they are intrinsic. Job related factors that promote job satisfaction are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement.

They argued that hygiene factors led to job dissatisfaction due to an individual's need to avoid unpleasantness, whereas the satisfaction generated by motivators was caused by a need for growth and self-actualisation. Moreover, the factors providing job satisfaction were separate and distinct from the factors that led to work dissatisfaction.
Herzberg (1966) and Herzberg et al. (1999) argued that positive and negative attitudes toward the job are not the opposite of each other, since they are influenced by different factors. Therefore, they suggested that the opposite of job satisfaction is no job satisfaction, and the opposite of job dissatisfaction is no job dissatisfaction.

To sum up, the hygiene factors are extrinsic, aim to prevent job dissatisfaction, and contribute only to a minor extent to positive feelings toward the job. Motivators, on the other hand, are intrinsic elements of the job, encourage personal growth and development, and contribute very little to job dissatisfaction. Both the hygiene factors and the motivators serve an employee's needs. However, mainly the motivators cause the satisfaction on the job and the enhancement in the work performance.

Herzberg et al. (1999) discussed the effects of job attitudes in terms of performance, attitudes toward the job, attitudes toward the company, mental health, and interpersonal relations. An employee's feelings toward his/her job had a significant impact on the performance of the tasks. Improved attitudes toward the job led to an enhanced performance, whereas negative changes in the job attitudes caused a reduction in the work performance. Moreover, favourable attitudes toward the job had an influence on performance rather than unfavourable ones. Conclusions about the impact of positive job attitudes on the psychological commitment of an individual to his/her work could not be drawn. In addition, improvements in job attitudes led to an increase in the attitude toward the company. Furthermore, there seems to be a tendency that job attitudes are related in a positive way to mental health. However, this fact could not be assessed fully due to the subjective nature of the data. Moreover, a relation between the effects of job attitudes and interpersonal relationships tends to exist. The respondents, however, mentioned that they did not let negative feelings of their job influence their family life.

Herzberg's two-factor theory represents an extension of Maslow's need hierarchy (see figure 3:4). Thereby, the hygiene factors can be considered as lower level needs, whereas the motivators can be seen as higher level needs. Herzberg's theory emphasises that attention has to be given to hygiene factors as well as to motivators in order to motivate employees. Furthermore, the major role of the work itself as a factor of motivation and job satisfaction is stressed.
3.4.4 The Job Characteristics Model

All motivation theories mentioned before contributed, to a certain extent, to the job characteristics model developed by Hackman and Oldham (1980), which deals with the structure of work in order to achieve a high internal motivation, high job satisfaction and high work effectiveness. This model considers the intrinsic motivation that causes a person to perform the job well due to interests on the work and challenges in the job. This model will be explained in detail in this chapter that is based on Hackman and Oldham (1980).

3.4.4.1 Conditions for internal motivation

The occurrence of internal motivation is caused by three basic conditions. These conditions influence not only an employee's motivation to work, but also his/her satisfaction on the job. First, the individual must have knowledge of the results of his/her work performance. In other words, if the individual has no idea about how well or poorly he/she is performing the job, he/she will not develop any feelings such as happiness or sadness about his/her job performance. Secondly, the person must feel responsible and accountable for the results of his/her work. That means when a person
thinks that his/her own efforts contribute only to a minor extent to the quality of his/her work outcome, the individual will not generate any feelings such as pride or sadness towards the quality of work done. Third, the person must experience work as meaningful. In other words, if the individual does not perceive his/her work as generally important, valuable and worthwhile, he/she will not develop any internal motivation. Even when a person feels responsible for the work done and receives information about his/her performance, but lacks the feeling for doing a meaningful job, the internal motivation will unlikely to develop. In other words, if one of these conditions is missing the internal motivation will not occur. All three factors - knowledge of results, experienced responsibility and experienced meaningfulness - are necessary to develop and sustain a strong internal work motivation. Moreover, the stronger these factors are present, the higher the internal motivation.

3.4.4.2 Job dimensions

The above-mentioned conditions for internal motivation are facilitated by five job characteristics. Three of these characteristics contribute to the experienced meaningfulness of the work, one influences the experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work, and one has an effect on the knowledge of results.

The three characteristics that have an influence on the meaningfulness of the work are skill variety, task identity, and task significance. First, skill variety is the extent to which a job requires different activities in order to perform the work. These activities entail the use of various skills and abilities. Hackman and Oldham (1980) point out that a challenge and stretch of an employee's abilities and skills by his/her tasks will lead to the fact that the employee will perceive the work as meaningful. In addition, the more skills can be used, the more meaningful the task appears to be. Second, task identity refers to the degree to which a job involves doing a whole unit of work from beginning to end with a visible outcome instead of performing only a tiny part of the overall piece of work. When people are doing a whole job (providing a complete unit or putting together an entire product) they care more about their work and perceive their job as more meaningful. A worker who is responsible for assembling a complete coffee machine will find his/her work more meaningful than another worker who solders electrical connections on coffee machine after coffee machine, even though similar skill levels are necessary to perform the jobs. Third, task significance is the degree to which the job has a meaningful impact on
other people lives and well being, either inside or outside the company. When people understand that their work outcome will have an impact on someone's well being (e.g. happiness, safety, or health) they will care more and experience meaningfulness in their work. If all three characteristics are present in a job, an employee is more likely to perceive his/her job as meaningful. Even if one or two characteristics are quite low, a person can experience his/her job as meaningful.

The characteristic of the job that influences the experienced responsibility for the work outcome is autonomy. Hackman and Oldham (1980) refer to autonomy as the degree of freedom and independence that an individual has in scheduling and organising his/her work provided by the job. A person will feel that the work outcome depends on his/her own efforts, initiatives and decisions when the degree of autonomy provided by the job is high. That person will feel more personally responsible for the success or failure of his/her work outcome in comparison to a person who follows the instructions of his/her boss, or acts according to a manual of job procedures. Finally, the job characteristic that influences the knowledge of results is the feedback, which a person receives directly from the work activities themselves. Feedback is the extent to which the job itself provides an individual with information about the effectiveness of his/her work performance.

A job may provide one or more of these five characteristics to a high extent, but at the same time the others may be quite low. Therefore, it is advisable to consider a job in terms of each characteristic. Furthermore, it may be of value to combine the scores of a job on the five dimensions into a single index in order to understand the overall potential of a job to facilitate internal work motivation. A job has a high motivating potential if at least one of the three factors that foster the experienced meaningfulness of a job is provided to a high extent, and the degree of both autonomy and feedback is high as well (see figure 3:5). The presence of these characteristics is necessary to create the conditions for the internal motivation - the experienced meaningfulness of the work, the experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work, and the knowledge of the actual results of the work activities.
3.4.4.3 Moderators

Since job characteristics only set the stage for internal motivation, the role of differences among people has to be considered as well. Several attributes of people influence their response to highly motivating potential jobs. Three of them are considered in more detail below.

The first attribute is "knowledge and skill". If a job is low in motivating potential, a person's feelings will not be greatly affected by how well he/she performs, irrespective of that person's job-related knowledge and skills. If a job is high in motivating potential, then, a person who has sufficient knowledge and skills to perform the job well will receive satisfaction from doing well. However, a person who has insufficient knowledge and skills will receive negative feelings from doing poorly.

"Individual growth need strength" is the second attribute. Jobs with a high motivating potential often offer the opportunities for learning and personal accomplishments at work. However, complex, challenging work is not appreciated by all persons. Individuals with "strong growth needs" such as need for personal accomplishment, for learning and developing themselves, experience a high internal motivation from performing a complex and challenging work. They react in a positive way to opportunities provided by enriched work. On the other hand, persons with "low growth needs" do not strive to exploit opportunities for personal growth that are provided by such a job. Furthermore, it seems that they do not recognise that such opportunities exist, or may perceive such opportunities as a threat. The affects of "growth need strength" on people’s reaction to their work can be recognised at two points in the model (see figure 3:5). First, the link between the job dimensions and the conditions for internal motivation means that the conditions for internal motivation are more strongly experienced by an individual with "high growth needs", when he/she performs an enriched work, than by a "low growth need person". Second, the link between the conditions for internal motivation and the internal motivation means that a "high growth need person" will show more positive responses to the conditions for internal motivation, when they are present, compared to a person with a "low growth need strength".

Finally, the satisfaction with the work context is the third variable influencing a person's response to work. The degree of satisfaction with the work context may be of importance for an individual in order to use
opportunities of personal accomplishments provided by the job. That means a person satisfied with pay, job security, co-workers and supervision would react more positively to challenges and enrichment of his/her work compared to a person who is dissatisfied with the work context. Persons who have a "high growth need strength" and are satisfied with the work context have a very high level of internal motivation. The motivating potential score is positively related to a person's motivation and performance of the job. Individuals who have a "low growth need strength" and are dissatisfied with the work context can be rarely motivated by motivational characteristics of the job they do.

The three attributes mentioned above - job relevant knowledge and skill, "growth need strength", and level of satisfaction with aspects of the work context - affect the responses of a person to a job with high motivating potential. A combination of these factors has a more significant impact on the responses than just a single factor. A person with (1) insufficient knowledge and skills to perform the job well, (2) low needs for personal growth at work, and (3) a high degree of dissatisfaction with the work context, would not fit a job high in motivating potential score. The work would be too much for that person and negative personal outcomes, as well as negative work outcomes have to be expected. Therefore, a more simple and routine job would be more appropriate for that person. On the other hand, an individual with (1) knowledge and skills to perform a complex and challenging work, (2) a high need for personal growth, and (3) satisfied with the aspects of work context, would be expected to experience a high degree of personal satisfaction and work motivation, and to perform best his/her tasks. A work high in motivating potential would fit best with the talents and the needs of that person.

3.4.4.4 Outcomes of enriched work

Internal work motivation is only one outcome of enriched work. Hackman and Oldham (1980) divide the outcomes of enriched work into personal outcomes and work effectiveness. The personal outcomes are internal motivation, growth satisfaction and general satisfaction. People, who perform a job that is high in the motivating potential, may experience opportunities for personal growth and learning in their job as personally satisfying. General satisfaction and work effectiveness (quantity and quality of produced goods and services) may be increased by job enrichment as well. Employee satisfaction in terms of work context is not
only unlikely but also may be declining with increasing job enrichment. The redesign of work may effect absenteeism and voluntary turnover in the way that more capable persons may feel more committed to the job and to the company, whereas the commitment of less talented individuals may decrease.
Figure 3:5 The job characteristics model (Source: Hackman and Oldham, 1980, p. 90)

Core job characteristics
- Skill variety
- Task identity
- Task significance
- Autonomy
- Feedback from job

Critical psychological states
- Experienced meaningfulness of the work
- Experienced responsibility for outcomes of the work
- Knowledge of the actual results of the work activities

Outcomes
- High internal work motivation
- High "growth" satisfaction
- High general job satisfaction
- High work effectiveness

Moderators
1. Knowledge and skill
2. Growth need strength
3. "Context" satisfactions
4.4.5 Closing remarks on the Hawthorne studies, Maslow's, Herzberg's, Hackman and Oldham's motivation theories

The Hawthorne studies focused on the context in which work is carried out. It was found that the group culture among the employees has a great impact on the employees' attitudes and reactions toward their work. It was implicated that improving aspects of the work context can lead to enhancements in the productivity and satisfaction of the employees and can let even the most boring job appear meaningful to the employees. The Hawthorne studies caused attempts to improve the work context, in particular interpersonal relationships, which can lead to a higher quality of work life and a higher commitment of the employees to the company. However, according to Hackman and Oldham (1980), the Hawthorne studies does not provide any evidence, which proves that improvements in interpersonal relationships and the work context will lead to long term enhancements in productivity or work efficiency. The Hawthorne studies did not offer a well-developed concept for motivation, and further research in the field of employee motivation followed.

Maslow identified 5 basic needs, which all individuals uphold. These needs are arranged in a hierarchy of importance with the physiological needs at the base and the self-actualisation needs on the top. Moreover, he argued that lower level needs have to be satisfied before the next higher level needs occur and the behaviour of the individual determine (Maslow, 1954). Mullins (1999) argued that this theory is often applied to the work situation although, this is not what Maslow originally intended. It provides useful indications on the motivation of employees such as various needs of people, the state where people are in the ladder on hierarchy, and the various motivators that might be applied to individuals at different levels. In addition, according to Mullins (1999), this theory influenced management approaches and the design of organisations, despite existing criticism, and generated attention toward various motivators. It also inspired studies and research in the field of individual motivation.

Herzberg's model represents a further development of Maslow's thoughts regarding the recognition of higher needs of employees (Gee and Burke, 2001). He identified two types of factors - hygiene factors and motivators. As already mentioned, the former set of factors, which are not directly related to the work itself, but to the work context, may reduce the extent of dissatisfaction experienced by the employees, but do not lead to
motivation. The latter type of factors, directly related to the task itself, leads to satisfaction (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1999) and can be compared to Maslow's higher needs. The separation of satisfying factors from dissatisfying factors led to the identification of the employees' higher needs (Gee and Burke, 2001). The satisfaction of the need for growth and self-actualisation (the highest need in Maslow's hierarchy of needs) is the reason for the satisfaction generated by the motivators, according to Herzberg (1966) and Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1999).

Herzberg attributed importance to the employees' work lives (Mullins, 1999) and the work itself as the source of satisfaction (Tietjen and Myers, 1998). Through Herzberg's work, emphasis was put on the design of work, in particular on the enrichment of jobs (Mullins, 1999). According to Hackman and Oldham (1980), Herzberg's theory offers a clear and direct mindset about the motivation of employees, and influences of planned changes on the motivation can be predicted explicitly. Moreover, with the help of this theory, companies will focus in designing of jobs on issues central to the motivation and satisfaction of their employees.

Hackman and Oldham (1980) pointed out that their work focuses on jobs that are carried out independently by employees who operate more or less alone. The objective characteristics of the job represent thereby the central point in their research. They are of the opinion that restructuring the jobs can often solve problems, which have their roots in the unsatisfactory relationship between employees and their work. Measures to fit employees better to their jobs are not seen as a way to solve the problems. Hackman and Oldham (1980) consider the job itself as well as the work context in their work. The integration of features that generate the conditions for high work motivation, satisfaction and performance is the fundamental idea of the model. Furthermore, it is assumed that individuals react in different ways to the same job. Thus, the design of work requires the consideration of personal as well as of job characteristics. The job characteristics represent a basis for decision-making on changes in the job, which probably will lead to enhancements in the motivation of employees. Due to the easy measurability of those characteristics changes may be adjusted more precisely and predictions about the effects of changes may be more credible. Hackman and Oldham, as well as Herzberg, focus on changeable aspects of the job in order to increase the motivation of employees. Both theories concentrate on individual motivation.

Figure 3:6 shows a linking of the Hawthorn studies and the previously explained theories.
Figure 3:6 Linking Hawthorne studies, Maslow's, Herzberg's, Hackman and Oldham's theories (own creation)
4. Empirical Analysing

This part of the thesis deals with the results of the questionnaire - the evaluation of the job situation and the satisfaction with certain job features, how much importance employees attach toward certain job features, and the evaluation of the benefits offered by the company. Moreover, the results of the interviews are presented in order to provide a better understanding of the questionnaire findings. Additionally, the empirical findings are analysed in connection to the theoretical background.

First, the examined factors are explained in order to make it easier for the reader to understand the meaning of those terms.

- **The factor skills** contains to do many different things, to use a number of skills and talents to perform the work, and to have challenges in the work.
- **Task identity** means that a person does an entire piece of work from beginning to end.
- **Task significance** deals with the importance and meaningfulness of the work and its effects on other people's life.
- **Autonomy** refers to an individual's freedom and independence to schedule and organise his/her work.
- **Feedback** can be received directly from the work itself as well as from superiors, co-workers, and customers.
- The factor **environment** includes the relationship to co-workers, the co-operation with other persons, and the work condition.
- **Job security** deals with the fear to lose the job.
- The last factor **compensation** considers the salary and wages, as well as the benefits offered by the company. These benefits are the profit-sharing (referred in the tables and figures as benefit), subsidised lunch price and free coffee (food), sport activities paid by the company (sport), and free work clothes including the washing (work).

Skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy and feedback are job characteristics according to the model by Hackman and Oldham. They represent intrinsic motivation factors and can be related to the motivators in Herzberg's theory and the higher level needs in Maslow's hierarchy of needs. These motivators influence an employee's internal motivation and satisfaction with the job. Environment, job security, and compensation are
factors, which concern the work context according to Hackman and Oldham (1980). Moreover, they are related to the hygiene factors in Herzberg's theory and the lower level needs in Maslow's hierarchy of needs. These needs have, according to the before mentioned theories, to be fulfilled to a certain degree before higher level needs may occur to a higher extent. Furthermore, they do not lead to satisfaction with the work, but decrease the level of dissatisfaction of an employee and influence a person's willingness to take advantage of challenges in the work. Likewise, the importance of the environment was emphasised by the Hawthorne studies, which identified social relations as the source of motivation. The link among the Hawthorne studies, Maslow's, Herzberg's, and Hackman and Oldham's theories is shown in figure 3:6.

The factors examined in this study are analysed according to individual characteristics of the sample - age, gender, marital status, blue-collar/white-collar worker, leading/non-leading position, and the years in the company. In the following analysis some comparisons are presented. Thereby, differences $x \geq 2$ are considered as "strong differences", differences $1 \leq x < 2$ are seen as "weak", and differences $x < 1$ are considered as "no differences". However, the word "difference" is not used in the statistical meaning of "significance". It is employed to compare the answers of certain subgroups in order to figure out similarities and differences among those groups.

### 4.1 Age

When the responses in terms of the work situation and satisfaction were analysed according to three age groups ($\leq 30$, $31 - 45$, and $46 and over$), weak differences were found (Figure: 4:1). In terms of skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, and environment a tendency of increasing satisfaction with the job with increasing age of the employees can be noticed. Thereby, the differences regarding skills, task significance, and autonomy are weak (difference $1 \leq x < 2$ among the groups). These factors are of an intrinsic nature, inherent in the work itself (see 3.2.1 and 3.4.4). In other words, older people seem to receive more job satisfaction out of the intrinsic motivation factors than younger people who lack those internal motivators to a higher extent. These intrinsic factors are, according to Hackman and Oldham (1980) as well as to Herzberg (1966) and Herzberg et al. (1999), the reason for the motivation of employees. That
means the more a person experiences those factors the more satisfied and motivated that person is at work. In contrast, job security and compensation - the extrinsic factors of the job - are evaluated as similar by the respondents irrespective of their age. These factors are identified as hygiene factors by Herzberg (1966) who pointed out that they do not serve as motivators, but reduce the extent of dissatisfaction experienced by an individual.

My interview partners argued that the weak differences might be due to the following. "Maybe older people have got a promotion within the company. They have more experiences and do more advanced things. For instance, in the factory young people start in the assembling with easy things and get more advanced things to do later on." "People get more responsibility and difficult tasks with the age. The performance of more advanced things leads to more autonomy; more decisions have to be made". Another interviewee linked the age to the years in the company and pointed out, "when you are a couple of years in the company maybe you have been promoted, your skills are better used, and you feel more comfortable with what you are doing." Moreover, it was mentioned, "superiors rather talk to older people"
who have been longer here. The younger persons do not always get so much feedback than the older ones."

Applying the job characteristics model by Hackman and Oldham (1980) to the actual situation at work (Appendix: table 4:1), it can be stated that people experience their work as more meaningful (skill variety, task identity, and task significance), experience more responsibility for the outcomes of the work (autonomy), and have a higher knowledge of the actual results of the work activities (feedback) with increasing age. That leads in turn to a higher internal work motivation and satisfaction with the work, which increases in the age.

In terms of the importance attached to the job features examined in the questionnaire - skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, environment, job security, and compensation - no strong or weak differences among the age groups could be noticed (Appendix: table 4:2, figure 4:2). In other words, younger and older people evaluated the job features similar. However, there seems to be a tendency that the older people get the less importance do they attach to feedback. With regard to the feedback, the following remarks were given during the interviews. It was pointed out, "when you get older you know if you do a good job since you got more experiences. You know if your performance is good or not by yourself. Older persons do not need so much feedback than younger people; they rely more on themselves." Another interviewee argued, "older people are used to get feedback and therefore do not attach so much importance to it, whereas younger people do not receive so much feedback."

The evaluation of the importance of the benefits offered by the company showed no differences among the age groups (Appendix: table 4:3, figure 4:3). All groups evaluated the benefits according to the following order: (1) profit-sharing, (2) work, (3) sport, and (4) food. Thereby, the profit-sharing and the work benefits are evaluated as very important.

Considering the whole, younger as well as older people evaluate certain job factors in the same way, but differ in their satisfaction with those job characteristics, in particular with the intrinsic factors, due to the extent that these features are present in their job.

An individual’s motivation, job satisfaction, and job performance is determined by the comparative strength of economic rewards, intrinsic
satisfaction and social relationships, as well as their satisfaction (see 3.2.2). The data presented in table 4:1 and 4:2, as well as the comparison between the situation at work and the importance of the job factors (Appendix: table 4:4), shows that older people seem to be more motivated and perceive job satisfaction to a higher extent than younger people.

Moreover, the comparison between the actual situation and what employees find important at work (Appendix: table 4:4) suggests differences in all age segments. The current situation and satisfaction with certain job factors was mostly rated lower than the importance of that job features. That finding may serve as a starting point to think about what the reasons are and how to increase the job satisfaction. Therefore, more detailed information are given regarding the single age groups.

< = 30: The factors skills, task significance, and feedback show strong differences (x >= 2); environment and compensation show weak differences (1<= x < 2), whereas the differences regarding task identity, autonomy, and job security are less than 1.

31 - 45: Feedback is the only factor with a strong difference. However, skills, task significance, environment, and compensation still represent factors with weak differences. No differences (x < 1) are recognisable regarding task identity, autonomy, and job security, similar to the age group <= 30.

> = 46: There are no strong differences in the job factors anymore, however the feedback and the environmental aspect show weak differences. The differences regarding the other factors are less than 1, and job security and autonomy are even higher perceived as importance is attached to them.

Out of the comparison I can conclude that skills, task significance, feedback, environment, and compensation are the factors with the most conflicting potential for people in the age under 46. Job satisfaction is caused, according to Hackman and Oldham (1980), by the intrinsic motivators - skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback. In addition, they pointed out that a job has a high motivating potential if the degree of autonomy and feedback is high and when at least one of the following three factors - skills, task identity, and task significance- is provided to a high extent. A look at table 4:1 shows that these factors, except for task significance and autonomy, are only to a moderate extent present at work. Furthermore, the differences between the
situation and the importance regarding skills, task significance and feedback are weak or strong, whereas no differences regarding task identity and autonomy can be noticed. The jobs for people under 46 seem to not offer a high potential for motivation. Hence, special focus should be given to the aspect of feedback (feedback from persons as well as from the work itself) in order to provide the employee with more knowledge of the actual results of his/her work tasks, and to the use of skills and/or the task significance to increase the experienced meaningfulness of the work. That would lead, according to Hackman and Oldham (1980), to a higher job satisfaction, work effectiveness, and internal motivation of the employees. The aspects of the environment and compensation are extrinsic factors that influence a person’s dissatisfaction (Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg et al., 1999) and influence a person’s willingness to take advantage of challenges in the job (Hackman and Oldham, 1980). Moreover, those needs are lower level needs according to Maslow (1943, 1954), which have to be fulfilled to a certain degree before the individual strives for the satisfaction of higher needs. In consideration of the comparison mentioned before, special attention should be given to those aspects in order to provide the basis for job satisfaction.

The persons over 46 do not lack the intrinsic motivation factors to a noticeable extent except for the feedback. Considering Hackman and Oldham's model, those employees should be provided with more feedback (from the work itself or other persons) in order to increase their knowledge of the work results, which in turn will lead to a higher job satisfaction. The comparison of the environment in terms of the work situation and its importance for the employees showed a weak difference within the age group 46 and older and a strong difference in the age groups ≤ 30 and 31 - 45. In the face of that fact, and that all age groups ranked the environment as very important, special attention should be given to it. The importance of the environment was not only emphasised by Herzberg (1966), Maslow (1943, 1954), and Hackman and Oldham (1980), but also by the Hawthorne studies, which identified social relations at work as the source of motivation.
4.2 Gender

Women evaluated the job factors higher than men, except for task identity and feedback, which are evaluated higher by men (Appendix: table 4:5, figure 4:4). However, except for the environment which shows a weak difference, strong or weak differences cannot be stated. Generally speaking, except for the environmental aspect, there seem to be no differences among men and women in terms of job satisfaction.

The difference regarding the environment (co-operation with other persons, good relationship to co-workers, and a good work environment) can, according to the interviewees, be due to the fact that the majority of women are working in offices, whereas most of the male persons are working in the production. Furthermore, it was pointed out that women are more satisfied with what they have and do not complain so much.

Considering the actual situation (Appendix: table 4:5) and the job characteristics model by Hackman and Oldham (1980), there are no differences in terms of skill variety, task identity, and task significance. Therefore, it can be stated that men and women perceive their work as meaningful to the same extent. In addition, in view of autonomy and feedback it can be said that men and women feel to the same extent that the work outcome depends on their own efforts and there is no difference regarding the knowledge of the work results. Hence, there seem to be no differences in the motivation and satisfaction with the work regarding the gender.

Women always attached more importance to the respective job features than men did (Appendix: table 4:6, figure 4:5). However, strong or weak differences cannot be stated. During the interviews it was argued that women like more freedom in their job than men do and are not used to deciding, whereas men are used to deciding. That may be an explanation for the difference in terms of the autonomy in the performance of the job, which however, is very small (less than 1) and therefore is considered as no difference. Moreover, it was argued that a woman’s desire for autonomy increases with age. Regarding the benefits offered by the company, no differences can be noticed (Appendix: table 4:7, figure 4:6).
Taking into consideration the comparative strength of the economic rewards, intrinsic satisfaction, and social relationships, and the extent to which they are fulfilled, no differences in the work motivation and satisfaction can be noticed in reference to the gender (Appendix: table 4:8). Furthermore, the comparison of the situation and job satisfaction with the importance attached to the job factors (Appendix: table 4:8) shows the following results:

**Men:** Weak difference can be noticed in terms of skills, task significance, feedback, environment, and compensation. The other factors show no differences.

**Women:** A strong difference ($x \geq 2$) can be noticed with regard to feedback. In addition, weak differences are obvious in terms of the task significance, environment, and compensation. The differences regarding the other factors are less than 1, and in terms of job security $= 0$.

That comparison shows that both men and women lack feedback (women even more than men do), and experience some differences regarding the satisfaction and importance attributed to task significance, compensation, and the environment. Moreover, men experience a weak difference in terms of skills. In order to ensure a higher job satisfaction, work effectiveness, and internal motivation of the employees, special attention should be given to the intrinsic job motivators; particularly to the feedback (men and women), in order to increase the knowledge of the work results, but also to skills (men), and the task significance (men and women) to enhance the experienced meaningfulness of the work. Compensation and the environment, according to Herzberg (1966), do not influence work motivation and job satisfaction, but decrease the dissatisfaction with the job, and therefore should also be taken into consideration to a certain extent.

### 4.3 Marital status

The responses in terms of the situation at work and the satisfaction with work, analysed regarding the marital status, showed that married people evaluated the job factors, even if only to a minor extent, higher than unmarried (Appendix: table 4:9, figure 4:7). However, strong and weak
differences between married and unmarried persons regarding the work situation and the satisfaction with the work cannot be stated.

However, the interviewees gave some explanations for the higher evaluation of the job factors by married persons. "Married persons have a high responsibility for wife or husband and children. They have to be secure about their work and perceive a need to climb in the career, and feel more satisfied." Furthermore, it was pointed out, "married people feel that they have to find the work interesting because they know that they cannot afford to be unemployed since they will not have so much money anymore." Additionally, "they cannot quite their job and move somewhere, because they have maybe children and their wives or husbands work in that area as well." In contrast, "single persons have to think only about themselves, they are free to go and to do whatever they want."

Moreover, it was argued, "if you are married, have a family, a house of your own, have reached everything what you wanted to reach for the life you live outside the work you can take all the time you need to make your work more interesting". In contrast, "young, unmarried persons often see their job just as a way to earn money, but not as the interesting part of the life. They always plan to do something, even if it is only to go out on the evening or what to do next week. They take their jobs not so serious than older persons."

With regard to the environment some interviewees argued, "married persons might have another view about how to work together in a group than unmarried persons." "When a person is married, has a family, lives together with someone that person has to deal all the time - give and take. Single person do not have to do that; they do not have to co-operate with anyone at home, and are maybe more selfish."

Referring to Hackman and Oldham's model, it is interesting to note that married people perceive the use of a variety of skills, task identity, and the significance of the tasks in their job to a higher extent than married people (Appendix: table 4:9). Nevertheless, these differences are less than 1, and therefore it may be noted here that unmarried persons experience all three factors similar to married people. Furthermore, married and unmarried persons evaluated the extent to which autonomy and feedback are present at work as similar. Thus, no differences can be recognised in terms of the experienced meaningfulness of the work, the experienced responsibility for the work outcome, and the knowledge of the actual work results. That in
turn leads to the conclusion that no differences in the work motivation and job satisfaction in respect to the marital status can be pointed out.

In terms of the importance attributed to the factors, no differences can be noticed (Appendix: table 4:10, figure 4:8). However, the interviewees pointed out that job security is of great importance for married people because "they are responsible for and take care of their families". In contrast, "unmarried people do not have to take care of someone and can move easier to another city". In addition, it was mentioned, "as a married person one is living in a family and sees not so many other people/friends. Thus, it is very important to have friends at work". "Younger people, [on the other hand], have a lot of friends." "The older you get the more important it is for you to have good relations." Regarding the evaluation of the importance attached to the benefits that are offered by the company, no differences can be noticed (Appendix: table 4:11, figure 4:9).

Given the comparative strength of economic rewards, intrinsic satisfaction, and social relationships, as well as the satisfaction of those needs, no differences in the work motivation and satisfaction regarding the marital status can be identified (Appendix: table 4:12). Moreover, the comparison between the actual situation and what employees find important at work (Appendix: table 4:12) suggests the following facts:

**Married:** A strong difference (\(x \geq 2\)) is noticeable with regard to feedback. Skills, task significance, environment, and compensation show weak differences (\(1 \leq x < 2\)), whereas the other factors have no differences.

**Unmarried:** The difference regarding feedback is strong. Skills, task significance, environment, and compensation represent factors with weak differences. The other factors show no differences, and job security is even higher perceived at work than importance is attached to it.

In respect to the comparison, no differences among the groups can be identified. In other words, married and unmarried persons lack the same factors. Both groups experience a strong difference regarding the feedback. Thus, special attention should be given to the aspect of feedback. More feedback would provide the employees (married and unmarried persons) with more knowledge of the outcome of their work. That in turn will lead to an increase in the internal motivation, work effectiveness, and job satisfaction. Additionally, skills and task significance represent a potential
to increase the motivation and satisfaction of married and unmarried persons likewise, due to the fact that they may contribute to an increased experienced meaningfulness of the work. Furthermore, the environment and the compensation play an important role in the motivation and satisfaction at work because they reduce a person's dissatisfaction. Likewise, they represent lower needs, which have to be fulfilled to a certain extent before higher needs such as challenges in the work are pursued by individuals. For this reason, some attention should be given to these factors in order to provide the basis for the use of challenges in the work by employees.

4.4 White-collar/blue-collar worker

The received data showed a clear tendency that white-collar workers are more satisfied and perceive all investigated job factors to a higher extent than blue-collar workers did (Figure: 4:10). In particular, weak differences can be noticed in skills, task identity, task significance and autonomy. These weak differences can be explained by the work itself.

Figure 4:10 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding white-collar/blue-collar worker (Mean) (Appendix: table 4:13)
"There is a big difference with what you work with as a blue-collar person or white-collar person and there is no one who performs a whole piece of work from beginning to end in the production," was pointed out during the interviews. Blue-collar workers often produce only a single part of a piece of work and thereby they can use only a limited number of their skills and talents. Moreover, they have a limited amount of autonomy in order to decide how and when to perform the task since their performance is often influenced or influences directly the performance of co-workers. Furthermore, performing of only a small part of the overall piece of work instead of the whole work from beginning to end might be perceived as not very interesting and meaningful. Some of the interviewees pointed out, "blue-collar workers do certain tasks again and again and most of the jobs are from A to B and offer not much challenges and much responsibility". However, it was also said, "blue collar worker have their responsibility, but maybe do not feel like having that". In addition, it was mentioned that blue-collar workers have many unused skills and unused knowledge, are overqualified for the job, and feel that they do not get so much feedback.

The following statements given in the questionnaire about the work may give an insight into the work: "I work in a machine group and have nobody to ask about possible mistakes. My competence within that area stopped." "In the short view my workplace is perfect. It could be that one will get tired of the job with the years." "Lonely and boring work" (Translation).

White-collar workers, on the other hand, have, according to the interviewees, a higher education, can use more skills in their jobs, do many different things, have to do a whole work on their own, and have more interesting and often more challenging jobs. Moreover, they have more freedom, work more on their own, and have more responsibility. They can decide by themselves quite a lot due to the less hierarchical organisational structure typical for Swedish companies. Furthermore, white-collar workers are higher paid due to their higher education and the use of more skills.

Comparing the intrinsic job factors according to the actual work situation, the following can be stated. Skill variety, task identity, and task significance, which contribute to the feeling of doing a meaningful job, are to a weak extent, perceived as lower by blue-collar workers than by white-collar workers. In addition, first floor workers evaluated the extent to which they can decide how and when to perform the work as lower. That means the responsibility for work outcomes is experienced to a lower degree as well. There are no differences between blue-collar workers and white-
collar workers regarding the feedback, which influences a person's knowledge of the actual work results. Since the experienced meaningfulness, the experienced responsibility for the work outcome, and the knowledge of results determine a person's internal motivation and satisfaction with the job, it can be argued that the jobs performed by white-collar workers seem to offer a higher potential of internal motivation and job satisfaction than blue-collar jobs.

In terms of the importance attached to the job features examined in the questionnaire, no differences between blue-collar workers and white-collar workers could be noticed (Appendix: table 4:14, figure 4:11). In other words, blue-collar workers attached almost the same importance to the respective factors than white-collar workers did. Moreover, there are no differences in the importance attached to the benefits (Appendix: table 4:15, figure 4:12).

Taking into consideration the comparative strength of all factors - economic rewards, intrinsic satisfaction factors, and social relationships - and their degree of fulfilment (Appendix: table 4:16), it may be noted here that white-collar jobs seem to offer more job satisfaction and motivation. Furthermore, a comparison of the data concerning the job situation and the job satisfaction with the importance attributed to the job factors (Appendix: table 4:16) suggests remarkable differences.

**Blue-collar worker:** A strong difference is noticeable in terms of feedback, whereas the differences regarding skills, task significance, environment, and compensation are of a weak nature. The other factors show no differences.

**White-collar worker:** Strong differences cannot be noticed. Only the factors feedback and environment suggest weak differences. The other factors show no differences; job security is even perceived as higher than the importance attached to it.

The feedback represents a high motivating potential for blue-collar workers as well as for white-collar workers since the difference is of a strong respectively weak nature. An increase in feedback would improve the knowledge of the actual work results and would lead to a higher internal motivation and job satisfaction. Moreover, regarding blue-collar workers, increases in the use of a variety of skills as well as in the task significance, would contribute to a higher experienced meaningfulness of the work,
which would consequently lead to higher satisfaction with the job, work effectiveness, and to a higher internal motivation. In addition, differences between the situation and the importance can be noticed with respect to compensation and environment. Even though these factors do not influence the job satisfaction and work motivation, they are important to reduce the dissatisfaction with the work and represent the basis for the use of challenges in the work. Furthermore, according to the results of the Hawthorne studies and Maslow's hierarchy of needs (see 3.4.2), the environmental aspect is of relevance and should be taken into consideration. Likewise, white-collar workers evaluated the importance of the environmental factor to a weak extent higher than it is perceived by them in their actual job situation.

A way to increase the motivating potential of blue-collar jobs represents a rotation system. According to the questionnaire respondents and the interviewees, the company should let the employees rotate to a greater extent to different work tasks/work places. It was pointed out, "more rotation offers more stimulation for the individual and gives more flexibility". Moreover, "a rotation system may be more interesting and more meaningful to the employees, and would lead to less industrial injuries since people have to think more and to be more careful." In addition, "people standing always in the same position and after several years they have problems with their arms, legs, and so on. A rotation would reduce that standing in the same position all the time and consequently also the resulting health problems."
4.5 Leading/non-leading position

Leading persons evaluated all factors of the job higher than non-leading persons did (Figure: 4:13). A comparison of the data revealed weak differences regarding all factors examined in this study.

![Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding leading/non-leading position (Mean)](image)

Figure 4:13 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding leading/ non-leading position (Mean) (Appendix: table 4:17)

The differences between leading persons and non-leading persons may be due to a broader work area and a higher responsibility of leading persons, which in turn lead to the necessity to use a variety of skills, and to perform a work from beginning to end. Furthermore, the work is experienced as interesting and meaningful, as important for other people, and offers a very high degree of autonomy. According to my interviewees, leading persons have a larger work field, more responsibility, more freedom and independence, more variety in their job, use more skills, do things from beginning to end, have been working a long time in the company, and are paid better than non-leading persons.
Taking into consideration the presence of intrinsic job factors in the actual work situation (Appendix: table 4:17), it may be noted here that leading persons always perceive skill variety, task identity, and task significance, in short, all the factors influencing the experienced meaningfulness of work, to a higher extent than non-leading persons. Moreover, they experience more responsibility for the work results (autonomy) and have more knowledge of the actual work results (feedback). Since all three critical psychological states are experienced to a higher extent, it can be concluded that the overall potential of leading jobs to facilitate internal work motivation and job satisfaction is higher than the overall potential of non-leading jobs.

In respect to the importance attributed to the examined job factors, no differences can be stated (Appendix: table 4:18, figure 4:14). That means leading persons and non-leading persons evaluated the respective job features similarly. In addition, strong and/or weak differences in the importance of the benefits to leading and non-leading persons cannot be figured out (Appendix: table 4:19, figure 4:15).

When the comparative strength of economic rewards, social relations and intrinsic satisfaction factors, as well as their satisfaction is taken into consideration (Appendix: table 4:20), it can be noticed that leading persons experience a higher satisfaction with the job and maybe a higher motivation than non-leading persons do. Furthermore, a comparison between the actual situation and what employees find important at work (Appendix: table 4:20) suggests the following results:

**Leading position:** The only factor with weak differences is the feedback. The differences regarding the other factors are less than 1. Autonomy, job security and compensation are even higher perceived regarding the actual work situation and satisfaction with the work than importance is attached to them. Particularly autonomy is perceived as much higher by leading persons than it is of importance to them.

**Non-leading position:** Feedback shows a strong difference (x >= 2), skills, task significance, environment, and compensation show weak differences (1 <= x < 2), whereas the difference regarding task identity, autonomy, and job security are less than 1. Moreover, job security is perceived to the same extent than importance is attached to it, and autonomy is even higher perceived by non-leading persons than importance is attributed to it by them.
The jobs of leading persons seem to offer a higher motivating potential than non-leading positions. However, the factor feedback still shows weak differences. Therefore, some attention should be given to that aspect in order to increase the knowledge of the actual outcomes of the work. That in turn will lead to higher personal outcomes and work outcomes such as job satisfaction and work effectiveness. The same is true for the jobs of non-leading positions. Furthermore, in terms of non-leading positions, increases in the variety of skills and task significance would contribute to a higher experienced meaningfulness and therefore increase the internal motivation and satisfaction with the work. In addition, the consideration of the data given by non-leading persons reveals weak differences regarding the environmental aspect and compensation. According to Herzberg (1966), an improvement of these extrinsic factors will reduce dissatisfaction, but leads not to a higher motivation and job satisfaction. However, they are basic human needs and have to be fulfilled to a certain extent. Moreover, they represent the basis for the use of challenges in work, and the environmental aspect is of particular importance for employees, according to the Hawthorne studies.
4.6 Years in the company

When the responses were analysed with regard to the years people have been working in the company, some interesting findings can be seen (Figure: 4:16).

After more than 10 years a sharp increase in the satisfaction of employees can be recognised in terms of using a variety of skills, task identity, and the meaningfulness and interest of the job. This can be explained according to the interviewees by the fact that "when a person is longer in the company his/her skills are more used. This is true all over the company including the factory. Usually the employees do not stay at the same job over 20 years, at least most of them. For instance some of the employees from the factory have a job in the office now." "With increasing years in the company the persons get more tasks, are able to do more things by themselves, and may perceive his/her job as more meaningful and interesting." Furthermore, "the company normally selects people inside the organisation when a person is needed for a new job." Moreover, "employees often listen to a
person who is working a long time in the company since that person has more experience." Additionally, "employees gain more knowledge about the company with the years working here, and see the company and the work in another way." Moreover, it was mentioned that the longer a person is in the company the higher up that person is in the organisation and therefore has more challenges and responsibility in the work performance.

Another interesting fact is the high increase in job security after 5 years and its persistence. This can be due to the fact that during the last years a lot of persons were employed, and to the Swedish law, which states that the person last employed has to be fired first in the case that reductions in the personnel have to be made. Furthermore, the development of the company and its steadily increasing success might have contributed to the high level of job security perceived by the employees as well.

The other variables of the job examined in the survey show no differences among the groups. However, during the interviews it was mentioned, "the company has grown to a high extent in the last years, and people who have been employed longer in this company may have a more positive look at the company; may still see the company as it was before 5-10 years." In addition, "people who stayed longer in the company know the bosses much better and are more friend with everyone than new employed persons."

Considering only the intrinsic job factors, the following statements can be given. Comparing the variety of skills, task identity, and task significance regarding the years in the company, it may be noticed that these three dimensions show no differences in the range from up to 2 years to 10 years. Those employees experienced the meaningfulness of the work, which in turn contributes to the extent of the internal motivation and job satisfaction, similarly. Persons who have been working in the company more than 10 years experienced these three dimensions, to a weak extent, higher than the other employees did. In other words, they experienced their jobs as more meaningful. Considering the aspect of autonomy in the range from up to 2 years to 10 years and more, no differences can be recognised. That means they experienced the responsibility for the work results to nearly the same extent. The feedback suggests no differences from up to 2 years to 10 years and more as well. Thus, the knowledge of the actual work outcomes of the work activities seems to be quite the same in the before mentioned range of years. In consideration of all three critical psychological states, which together determine the job satisfaction and internal motivation experienced by an employee, it may be noted that there seem to be no different
motivating potentials of the jobs regarding the years in the company from up to 2 years to 10 years. However, regarding 10 years and more, those jobs seem to be of a more motivating nature. That means those jobs offer a higher internal work motivation and satisfaction with the work.

In terms of the importance attributed to the job factors that are examined in that study, no differences except for skills and the environment can be noticed (Appendix: table 4:22, figure 4:17). The variety in the use of skills and the environmental aspect suggest an increasing tendency with the years, but after more than 10 years a sharp decrease is noticeable. The following explanations were given by the interviewees.

With regard to skills it was pointed out that those "persons have been working a long time and will maybe get retired in a couple of years. They know their work very well, and maybe do not like to learn new things or to get more tasks to perform." Furthermore, it was mentioned that persons who have been working longer than 10 years in the company, have more challenging jobs and therefore maybe do not attach so much importance to the use of a variety of skills than persons who have been working there a shorter time. "Maybe during the 5 to10 years people want to move on in their career and in the company. Later on maybe they reach maturity in the job and do not strive to move on in the job anymore." One interviewee compared the years in the company with a person's entire life. It was argued that the range from 5 to10 years represents the top of an individual’s life at work as well as of the personal life, "when a person perceives everything as very interesting, wants to learn so much, and likes to do everything."

In terms of the environment it was argued that a person working a long time in the company, for instance more than 10 years, is working hard and has maybe little time to talk to his/her co-workers about other things than work. Moreover, it was mentioned that persons who have been in the company for more than 10 years maybe leave soon and therefore consider the environmental aspects as not so important anymore. In addition, it was pointed out that people who are a long time in the company know most of the people, and feel comfortable with their environment and therefore do not attribute as much importance to it as persons who have not been there such a long time. Furthermore, it was argued that people at middle age and over have more experiences and work on their own to a high extent. Therefore, they do not need feedback from other persons all the time, and do not need to discuss things (depends on the kind of work).
The evaluation of the benefits shows no differences except for the food. Persons have been working in the company from 2 to 5 years evaluated the food benefit, to a weak extent, higher than persons working in the company less than 2 and from more than 5 to 10 years (Appendix: table 4:23, figure 4:18).

Looking at the comparative strength and the degree of the satisfaction of the intrinsic factors, economic rewards, and the social relation, it can be stated that persons who have been working longer than 10 years in the company seem to be more motivated and satisfied with the work than people who have been working there less than 10 years (Appendix: table 4:24). Moreover, the comparison between the actual situation and what employees find important at work (Appendix: table 4:24) suggests remarkable differences in all segments.

**< 2 years:** The aspect of feedback represents a factor with a strong difference; skills, task significance, environment, and compensation show differences of a weak nature, whereas the differences regarding the other factors are less than 1.

**2 - 5 years:** Strong differences can be recognised in terms of task significance and feedback. Skills, environment, and compensation represent weak differences, and task identity, autonomy, and job security are less than 1. The aspect of autonomy is even higher perceived at work than it is of importance for people who have been working between 2 to 5 years in the company.

**> 5 - 10 years:** In consideration of this group, strong differences in terms of skills and feedback can be noticed. In addition, task identity, task significance, environment, and compensation represent weak differences. There is no difference regarding autonomy; job security is even more perceived at work than importance is attached to it.

**> 10 years:** The factors examined in this study show no strong differences (x >= 2), however weak differences regarding feedback and compensation can be noticed. The differences in terms of the other factors are less than 1; autonomy is even 0, and job security and task identity are even more perceived at work than it is of importance for workers who have been working in the company for more than 10 years.
The comparison shows that all subgroups in the range from up to two years to 10 years lack feedback to a strong extent. The group of employees working for more than 10 years in the company lack feedback as well, but not to such a high extent as the other groups. Considering the whole, providing employees with more feedback would result in an increase in the knowledge of the actual results of the work activities. Furthermore, the group up to two years shows a weak lack of skills and task significance, the group from 2 to 5 years lacks task significance to a strong extent and skills to a weak extent, whereas the group from more than 5 to 10 years lacks skills to a strong extent, and task identity and task significance to a weak extent. An increase of one or more of these factors (task identity only for the group of employees who have been working from more than 5 to 10 years in the company) would lead to an increased experienced meaningfulness of the work. Both the increased knowledge of the actual work results as well as that employees experience their job as more meaningful will result, according to Hackman and Oldham (1980), in a high internal motivation, job satisfaction, and work effectiveness. In addition, the factor compensation shows differences between the satisfaction of the employees and the importance attributed to it in all groups, whereas the environmental aspect is of motivational importance for the groups from up to two to 10 years. As mentioned several times before, these factors are of importance since they represent the basis for an individual to take advantage of challenges in the job and decrease the extent of dissatisfaction.
4.7 Similarities among the groups

In general, the comparison of the data (Mean of the total) in terms of the work situation and the satisfaction with the work permits the following order of the aspects: (1) job security, (2) environment, (3) compensation, (4) autonomy, (5) task significance, (6) skills and task identity, and (7) feedback (Table: 4:25).

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Rank</th>
<th>Work situation and satisfaction with the work</th>
<th>Importance of the job factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>Environment</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Task significance</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>Skills</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5</td>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>Job security</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6</td>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>Task identity</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>7</td>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:25 Ranks of the job factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Situation and satisfaction (Evaluation)</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>5,4</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>5,7</td>
<td>4,5</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>5,8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Importance (Evaluation)</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>7,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Difference</td>
<td>-1,4</td>
<td>-0,5</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>-0,1</td>
<td>-2,1</td>
<td>-1,5</td>
<td>0,2</td>
<td>-1,2</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:26 Differences in the evaluation of the job situation and the importance of job factors (Mean of the total)
According to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (see 3.4.2), job security, environment, and compensation represent lower level needs, which have to be fulfilled to a higher degree before higher needs may emerge. This can be noticed here as well. Those needs are more satisfied and emerge to a higher extent than autonomy, task significance, use of skills, task identity, and feedback, which are, according to Maslow (1943, 1954), higher level needs. Moreover, referring to table 4:25 the lower level needs (environment and compensation), which are still not satisfied, are evaluated as more important or nearly important to the same extent than the intrinsic and higher level needs. That may be explained not only by Maslow (1943, 1954), but also by Herzberg (1966), and Hackman and Oldham (1980). Hackman and Oldham (1980) pointed out that work context factors, extrinsic factors, might influence an individual’s willingness to take advantage of challenges in his/her job. Therefore, I argue that the environmental aspects as well as the compensation have to be satisfied to a certain extent in order to provide the basis for the intrinsic job factors to serve as motivators. According to Herzberg (1966), environment and compensation are hygiene factors that do not lead to job satisfaction, but reduce the degree of dissatisfaction. They are beside the motivators necessary to ensure an individual’s well being at work, which in turn serves as the platform for the motivators.

Maslow (1943, 1954) pointed out that a need would lose its motivating power as soon as it is gratified. That can be noticed when looking at the order of the job factors according to their importance (Table: 4:25) and the differences in the mean of the job satisfaction and importance of the job factors (Table: 4:26). When comparing the orders presented in table 4:25 one can see that job security, a lower level need (safety) that is most satisfied (Rank 1), is not so important for the employees in comparison to the other variables (Rank 5). This may be due to the fact that job security is actually perceived to a higher extent at work than importance is attached to it (Table: 4:26). Furthermore, the factors autonomy and task identity show no differences in the comparison of their presence at work and the attention given to them by the employees. Therefore, they do not seem to serve as motivators anymore (only Rank 6 in terms of the importance at work) (see 3.4.2). Finally, the motivation is influenced by several basic needs at the same time. That is visible in the high importance attached to several factors at work, instead of attributing importance only to one factor (Table: 4:26).
Both orders presented in table 4:25 may differ to a less extent for the respective groups, but all groups experienced feedback as very low and job security as very high in terms of the presence at work and the satisfaction with them (Appendix: table 4:1 and so on, figure 4:1 and so on). All groups evaluated environment as the most important aspect and autonomy and task identity as the aspects with the lowest importance (Appendix: table 4:2 and so on, figure 4:2 and so on). Some explanations for those results are given in this chapter later on. In addition, the comparison of the satisfaction with the job features with the importance attributed to them (Appendix: table 4:4 and so on) suggests that feedback is lacked to a higher extent by the employees, regardless of their respective individual characteristics, than all the other factors. According to Wiley (1997), the things which employees value but lack, are the strongest potential motivators. For that reason, it may be noted here that feedback represents the strongest motivator in order to increase the internal work motivation and the satisfaction with the work.

4.7.1 Feedback

As mentioned before, feedback was evaluated as low in comparison to the other job factors. It was evaluated as 4.5 (moderate) on a scale from 1 to 8. For the purpose of this thesis, the factor feedback includes feedback provided by the work itself as well as the feedback from other persons such as co-workers and superiors. The interviewees as well as the questionnaire respondents emphasised the importance of feedback. For instance, one questionnaire respondent pointed out, "it is important that one can feel that one is doing a good job, irrespective of how varied and difficult one's work tasks are." (Translation). However, feedback seems to be provided only to a less extent in the company. For instance another questionnaire respondent argued, "you do not get praise. You are criticised when something went wrong. Praise is only given to all employees simultaneously, never to a person personally." (Translation) Moreover, "we don't have so much feedback", "some people are missing positive words", "one can also say when I hear nothing negative than it is ok", and the fact that feedback cannot be provided every day was pointed out in the interviews.

In addition, it was mentioned that once a month a meeting takes place in which the factory mainly gives information to the employees, provides their employees with feedback, and receives feedback from the personnel. Furthermore, two times a year each individual has a personal discussion with the manager in their respective department. During those meetings
issues such as feelings about the work, co-operation with other people, education and further training the employee would like to have, and if there is something missing in the environment are discussed. Providing feedback about the work performance, however, is up to each manager.

4.7.2 Job security

Job security was evaluated highest with a mean of 6.5 compared to the other seven factors concerning the work situation and satisfaction. The interviewees pointed out that employees are protected against layoffs by the law. Moreover, in the monthly meetings (mentioned before) the company informs the employees about its actual situation. In other words, information about the sales figures and how the market goes are given. "During the last 10 years the sales gone up all the time." In addition, "a lot of years ago the company had to reduce personnel because of a down. However, the persons were rehired again as soon as the times went better." That might be another reason contributing to the employees' feelings of job security.

4.7.3 Task identity and autonomy

Task identity and autonomy were evaluated as not so important as the other job factors. One interviewee pointed out that the performance of a single part instead of the entire piece of work from beginning to end could be seen as the easiest way. Furthermore, it was argued, "some people like that easiest way to do one thing every day and forget about it when they leave at 4 o'clock." Another interviewee said, "it is not necessary to produce something on your own from beginning to end. It can be an interesting and meaningful work without doing the whole work by yourself."

To the aspect of autonomy it was mentioned that some people want to be told what to do and/ or do not like to tell other people to do something. For instance, "some time ago the company used to have one person responsible for the assembling. That person was not the boss, but the co-ordinator who had some overview about the work. It was intended to rotate that job in order that everybody has that job. However, it turned out to be quite difficult to get one of the assemblers to perform the job. They felt not well to tell their friends and co-workers to do something and therefore did not want that job. Today they work together, but nobody is the boss."
Moreover, it was argued, "a work can be important and very satisfying for a person without having the freedom to decide when to do the work."

One interviewee argued, "autonomy and task identity go hand in hand. If you have less task identity then autonomy is also taken away. However, that depends on what you are doing. If you accept less task identity you also have to accept less autonomy. When you are doing one or two steps and then have to hand over to another person, there is not much freedom to decide on your own how and when to perform the work." A possible explanation for the low rating of autonomy and task identity could be, according to this interviewee that people "have realised that many other tasks are not possible to maintain by one person."

### 4.7.4 Environment

The environmental aspect was rated as very important. The interviewees mentioned that it is important to have a good relationship with co-workers, to be able to talk about something else other than work sometimes, to have fun together and not just to work. In addition, it was argued that the employees depend mostly on their co-workers and spend more time with them at work than with their families, sometimes more than 40 hours a week. Therefore, it is important to feel comfortable with work colleagues - no matter which type of work. Since people spend so many hours a day and so many days of their lives at work, the work conditions are important in order to feel comfortable and to be sure that the health is not at risk in any way. The issue of work conditions is often discussed on television and in papers today, and people are very aware of the fact that nothing should influence their personal health in a negative way. The importance of the environmental aspect is pointed out in the literature as well; for instance Maslow (1943, 1954), Herzberg (1966), and Hackman and Oldman (1980) attributed importance to it. Furthermore, the Hawthorne studies emphasised the environment, in particular the social relations, as very important for the motivation of employees (see 3.4.1).

### 4.7.5 Benefits

The comparison of the benefits offered by the company suggests that profit-sharing (benefit) always was ranked as very important, whereas food (subsidised lunch price and free coffee) seemed to be only moderately
important for the employees. The benefits can be ranked as follows (1) profit-sharing (benefit), (2) work, (3) sport, and (4) food (Appendix: table 4:3 and so on, figure 4:3 and so on). These benefits satisfy the lower level needs according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (see 3.4.2). Thereby, profit-sharing serves the need for belonging to the company, work and food serve the psychological needs, whereas the sport benefit contributes to the gratification of safety needs.

Benefits influence the commitment of employees to the company (see 3.4 organisational commitment) in the way that the employees' desire to stay in the company is strengthened. For instance, the profit-sharing contributing to the sense of belongingness to the company is very appreciated by the employees, as it may be noted here. Moreover, the high importance attributed to the profit-sharing and the work benefits may lead to the conclusion that these benefits are more appropriate to generate commitment than the food benefit.

In addition, the employees suggested some other benefits. These are shown in table 4:27 below, and are categorised according to Maslow's hierarchy of needs (see 3.4.2). This categorisation may be not perfect, but seems to be appropriate.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Self - Actualising</th>
<th>Language lessons</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Esteem</td>
<td>Different education concerning the work</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Opportunity to borrow a lorry for free; discounts at local companies; possibility to rent a holiday accommodation</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Love</td>
<td>Sponsoring of activities with co-workers; more pub evenings, where all employees can meet each other and enjoy themselves</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Safety (health)</td>
<td>Free dental care or subsidised dental care (insurance); free medical care; 90 % sickness benefit; registration fee for several sport events as a part of the health care awareness</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Physiological</td>
<td>Free work clothes and shoes for all employees; work clothes subsidy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>More leave days paid; flexitime; abolition of the &quot;karensdag&quot;</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Free fruits; salads</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 4:27 Suggestions on benefits given by the employees
4.8 External factors influencing the motivation of the employees

During the interviews I received the following information. "Most of the employees are from this area and have lived here all their life. If people are born in this area and start working here, they do not move later on." Another interviewee argued that young people often go to bigger cities, but many of them move back to that town when they have got a family. The reason for that, the interviewee guessed, could be that "they do not want the stress that bigger cities cause when they slow down." Furthermore, it was pointed out that the town where the company is located "is not very small, but not big either." Therefore, "one can get to know the persons one is working with, which in turn gives you a good feeling." "It is a good place to live in," argued some persons during the interviews.

"Persons who have a house here do not move easily. They have their family mostly in the same place. Most people stay in this area when they live here". "There is a bigger risk that people from other cities who are working here change the job, because they are more flexible." "The costs to rent an apartment in that town are not so high than in the next bigger cities. Therefore, it might be attractive to live here," argued another person. "The unemployment rate is quite high today, therefore, it might be not so easy to find a new job. If people work here they rather stay here instead of looking for another job in another town. You know what you have, what your work is, how the persons are you work together with. Maybe it is a little bit tough to change a work when you don't have to," said one interviewee.

Moreover, it was pointed out that the payment is on the same level as in other companies in this area, and even a little bit higher in order to keep the employees and not to lose them to another company. In addition, the company is a very secure one, offers a lot of benefits, and has a quite good reputation particularly for the good environment in the workshop. "It is a small but world-leading company - famous all over the world," argued one interviewee.

"Some other companies are in the same area where the same skills are needed. However, they are not a big threat. Today some of them reduce employees due to the fact that times have gone a bit worse again. In such times people do not look for a new job, because the last employed person is the first to go if there are reductions - according to the law. However, when that person has a special skill the company can keep him/her."
Furthermore, there are two bigger cities (A and B) in the near. A "is not a big threat since the connections are quite bad. However, there are very good connections to [city B], but the company has not had many people moving there."

All these aspects may contribute to the organisational commitment, in particular to the behavioural commitment. That means the facts mentioned above contribute to an individual’s desire to stay in the company instead of looking around for another employer. Thereby, the payment level, benefits, work condition, and job security in comparison to other employers, low mobility, amount of employers, and the economic situation are of importance.
5. Conclusion

In the following the main findings of the investigation and analysis of the motivation of employees under consideration of individual characteristics are presented.

In order to fulfil the purpose of this thesis I studied the existing literature in the field of motivation and job satisfaction and carried out mail questionnaires and personal interviews. According to my literature research, skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, environment, job security, and compensation are the most critical factors for the motivation of employees and their satisfaction with the job. These factors represented the basis for the empirical research. The main results are presented below.

**Evaluation of the actual work situation and the employees' satisfaction with this state**

It may be noted here that there seems to be an increasing tendency in the use of skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, and environment with increasing age of the employees. The differences in skills, task significance, and autonomy are thereby of a weak nature (difference $1 \leq x < 2$ among the age groups). That may be caused by the fact that with increasing age most of the employees do more advanced things and more difficult tasks, and receive more responsibility due to more experiences. Moreover, the age groups show no differences in terms of job security and compensation. Considering the gender, except for the environment, no differences among men and woman can be stated. This weak difference might be due to the fact that most of the women are working in the office, whereas the majority of the men are working in the production. In addition, there are no differences in the evaluation of the work situation and the satisfaction with the work regarding the marital status. Furthermore, the responses showed a clear tendency that white-collar workers perceive all factors to a higher extent and are more satisfied with them than blue-collar workers. Thereby, skills, task identity, task significance, and autonomy suggest weak differences between both groups. These differences are due to the work itself. The work of white-collar workers often offers more challenges, more responsibility, more variety in the use of skills, and doing a whole work from beginning to end compared
to blue-collar jobs. Leading persons perceived all job factors to a higher extent at work than non-leading persons did. These differences are of a weak nature and are due to a broader work area and more responsibility of leading persons. Regarding the years in the company, skills, task identity, and task significance show no differences from up to 2 years to 10 years in the company. However, after more than 10 years a sharp increase regarding those factors is noticeable. The fact that the skills of a person are more used and the person receives more tasks, when staying longer in the company may be an explanation for that. Moreover, people who have been working a long time in the company are higher up in the organisation and have more challenges in their work. The consideration of autonomy, feedback, environment, and compensation shows no differences among the groups. In addition, job security suggests a noticeable increase after 5 years, and persists at that high level. The reasons are in the steadily increasing success of the company and in the Swedish law.

Considering all individual characteristics, it may be noted here that each subgroup evaluated the presence of feedback at work as low in comparison to the other factors. However, referring to the analyses, the feedback presents a high motivating potential. Therefore, special attention should be given to that factor. Job security was evaluated as highest, and often higher perceived at work than importance was attached to it. The reasons for that is the Swedish law, the success of the company, and the fact that information about the actual situation of the company are given regularly to the employees.

**Evaluation of the importance of the job factors**

The comparison of the data concerning gender, marital status, blue-collar/white-collar worker, leading/non-leading position revealed no differences. Furthermore, there are no differences among the age groups concerning the importance attributed to the factors examined in that study. However, there seems to be a tendency that older people do not attach as much importance to the feedback as younger people do. That can be explained with the increasing experiences as well. Regarding the years in the company no differences except for the use of a variety of skills and the environmental aspect are evident. Both factors show an increase during the first 10 years in the company and suddenly decrease for a noticeable extent after more than 10 years. The following facts may explain those results. For instance, the employees may have achieved some kind of maturity in their job. They know their work very well and maybe some of them do not like to receive
more tasks, and to learn new things. Another reason could be that those people may have more challenging jobs and thus attach not as much importance to the use of a variety of skills anymore. The differences regarding the environment may be due to the fact that those people have more experiences, and work more on their own, and may have a less need for feedback provided in discussions with other persons all the time. Moreover, the difference may be caused by the fact that people who are a long time in the company know most of the employees, and feel comfortable with their environment and therefore do not attach as much importance to the environmental aspect in comparison to persons who have not been working so long in the company. Another reason could be that some of the employees will retire in a couple of years, and therefore consider the environmental aspect as not as important anymore.

Taking into consideration all individual characteristics, task identity and autonomy were evaluated by each subgroup as not as important as the other job factors, whereas the environmental aspect was rated as very important. The reasons for that may be that people are aware that many tasks are not possible to maintain by one person and that work may also be of interest and meaningfulness without a high degree of task significance. In addition, the environment is highly important since people spend a lot of time at work and like to have good relationships with their colleagues, to speak about something else other than work, to feel comfortable, and to feel that their health is not at risk in any way. The employees, regardless of the respective subgroup, evaluated the importance of the benefits offered by the company as similar.

**Factors, which may cause a higher motivation and job satisfaction in the company**

Since the strongest motivators seem to be things that people value but lack, the following motivators can be identified in order to increase the internal motivation and job satisfaction for the respective subgroups. The motivators are listed according to their motivating strength [the strongest factor first and the less strongest but still weak influencing factor (difference 1 <= x < 2) last].
Age
<= 30: (1) feedback, (2) skills, task significance, (3) environment, and (4) compensation
31 - 45: (1) feedback, (2) skills, (3) task significance, environment, and (4) compensation
>= 46: (1) feedback, and (2) environment.

Gender
Male: (1) feedback, (2) environment, (3) skills, task significance, and (4) compensation
Female: (1) feedback, (2) task significance, (3) environment, and compensation.

Marital status
Married: (1) feedback, (2) task significance, (3) environment, (4) skills, and (5) compensation
Unmarried: (1) feedback, (2) skills, (3) environment, (4) task significance, and (5) compensation

Work area
Blue-collar worker: (1) feedback, (2) skills, (3) task significance, environment, and (4) compensation
White-collar worker: (1) feedback, and (2) environment

Position
Leading position: (1) feedback
Non-leading position: (1) feedback, (2) skills, task significance, environment, and (3) compensation

Years in the company
<= 2 years: (1) feedback, (2) skills, environment, (3) task significance, and (4) compensation
2 - 5 years: (1) feedback, task significance, (2) environment, (3) skills, and (4) compensation
> 5 - 10 years: (1) feedback, (2) skills, (3) task significance, (4) environment, (5) compensation, and (6) task identity
> 10 years: (1) feedback, and (2) compensation

The strongest motivator regarding all subgroups is the feedback. Therefore, special attention should be given to that factor in order to increase the
internal motivation and job satisfaction. Moreover, one should have in mind that the environment and compensation do not actually present motivators. However, their fulfilment to a certain extent provides the basis for taking advantage of challenges in the job and to reduce job dissatisfaction.

Considering the whole, all differences figured out in this research are a starting point to look at the employees' work situation in more detail and to think about how to design the work in order to provide the employees to a higher extent with intrinsic motivators such as feedback, skills, task significance, and task identity. In addition, special attention should be given to the environmental aspect and the compensation, since they make a contribution to the well being of humans and provide the basis for the use of challenges offered by the job. Furthermore, all factors examined in this study contribute to the organisational commitment of employees. The intrinsic factors, on the one hand, may influence a person's willingness to expend considerable efforts toward the goals of the company and to remain in the company (attitudinal commitment). The extrinsic factors, on the other hand, may contribute to the behavioural commitment. Factors external to the work situation such as the economic situation, mobility, and other employers may influence an individual's desire to stay in the company (behavioural commitment) as well.
6. Closing Comments

This chapter contains some reflections regarding the value of the work as well as future research.

6.1 Reflections

The results of this research offer a starting point to think about the actual work conditions and their changes in order to provide a basis for a higher motivation of employees. Not only differences and similarities in the work motivation and satisfaction of employees regarding certain individual characteristics, but also the reasons for that are examined in this study. Moreover, factors that have to be enhanced at work in order to increase the motivation and therefore the commitment toward the company are figured out and presented.

For the purpose of this thesis I feel that I could not have adopted another methodology. The use of quantitative as well as qualitative methods enabled me to investigate the problem under research in more depth and to increase the quality and the value of the research and its results. Thereby, the collection of the quantitative data and their analysis by the use of the mean count for objectivity and reliability of the research.

The results of this thesis are not only of value for the company where the survey was carried out but they also contribute in my opinion to previous research done in the field of motivation and work. Similarities and differences regarding certain individual characteristics are shown and this knowledge can be used to motivate a group of employees, sharing the same individual characteristic, in the same way. However, the investigation was only performed in one production company. A survey carried out in several companies in the same industry might be of higher significance regarding the similarities and differences among the subgroups of the respective individual feature. In addition, the combination of subgroups of several individual characteristics, for instance younger than 30 and blue-collar worker or longer than 10 years in the company and blue-collar worker, may offer additional interesting findings regarding the motivation of employees.
6.2 Future research

Motivation is a continual process and needs to be sustained and developed as individual and organisational factors change over time. It may be of interest to have a continuous view of what motivates the employees and provides them with satisfaction. Furthermore, it may be interesting to compare the received results with similar surveys done in the same industry. Unfortunately, such data is not accessible, therefore, it may be recommended to do a new survey every second year in order to determine the degree of job satisfaction and to figure out the factors, which are valued and lacked by the respective subgroups. A comparison of the surveys may provide the company with useful information about the success/failure of changes regarding the work and the development in the job satisfaction of the employees.
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Motivation and job description questionnaire

Part One

In this part you are asked to describe your job and to evaluate how satisfied or dissatisfied you are with the respective job feature.

Please, circle the number, which is the most accurate description of your job or your level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

1) To what extent requires your job the performance of many different tasks?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Little Moderate Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Dissatisfied Satisfied

2) To what extent do you feel motivated to use your personal qualification?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Little Moderate Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Dissatisfied Satisfied
3) To what extent are your talents utilised by the company?

Little  Moderate  Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

Dissatisfied  Satisfied

4) To what extent do you experience your job as stimulating?

Little  Moderate  Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

Dissatisfied  Satisfied

5) To what extent do you perform an entire piece of work from beginning to end?  
("Little" means that you are doing only a small part of the overall piece of work, which is finished by other people or by automatic machines; "Much" means that you are doing the whole work from beginning to end)

Little  Moderate  Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

Dissatisfied  Satisfied
6) To what extent is your work interesting for you?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Little Moderate Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Dissatisfied Satisfied

7) To what extent do you feel your work is important for other people?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Little Moderate Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Dissatisfied Satisfied

8) To what extent is your job meaningful for you?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Little Moderate Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1--------2--------3--------4--------5--------6--------7--------8
Dissatisfied Satisfied
9) How much freedom and independence do you have in your job? That means to what extent can you decide on your own how and when your work is done?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Little                                  Moderate                                         Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Dissatisfied                                                                             Satisfied

10) To what extent does your work itself provide you with feedback?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Little                                  Moderate                                         Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Dissatisfied                                                                             Satisfied

11) To what extent do you receive feedback about your work performance from other persons (co-workers, superiors)?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Little                                  Moderate                                         Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Dissatisfied                                                                             Satisfied
12) To what extent do you have to work co-operatively with other people?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Little                Moderate                Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Dissatisfied                  Satisfied

13) To what extent do you feel comfortable with your relationship to co-workers?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Little                Moderate                Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Dissatisfied                  Satisfied

14) How comfortable do you feel with your work conditions (equipment, environment)?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Little                Moderate                Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8
Dissatisfied                  Satisfied
15) To what extent do you feel "safe" in the current climate in terms of layoffs?

1---------2---------3---------4---------5---------6---------7---------8
Little                         Moderate                          Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1---------2---------3---------4---------5---------6---------7---------8
Dissatisfied                   Satisfied

16) To what extent do you feel paid fairly?

1---------2---------3---------4---------5---------6---------7---------8
Little                         Moderate                          Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1---------2---------3---------4---------5---------6---------7---------8
Dissatisfied                   Satisfied

17) To what extent do you feel that the benefits, which you receive e.g. free coffee, are sufficient?

1---------2---------3---------4---------5---------6---------7---------8
Little                         Moderate                          Much

How satisfied are you with this situation?

1---------2---------3---------4---------5---------6---------7---------8
Dissatisfied                   Satisfied
**Part Two**

*In this section you are asked to evaluate the importance of the following statements.*

Write a number in the blank beside the statement, based on the following scale:

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8

Less                                   Moderate                                Very important
important

___ 1) It is important to have variety in the job.

___ 2) It is important that my employer supports my talents.

___ 3) It is important to get new tasks.

___ 4) It is important to have stimulating and challenging work.

___ 5) It is important to have opportunities to learn new things from my work.

___ 6) It is important for me to perform an entire piece of work from beginning to end.

___ 7) It is important to have a meaningful and interesting work.

___ 8) It is important to determine oneself how and when to carry out the work.

___ 9) It is important to receive more responsibility (not necessarily more tasks).

___ 10) It is important to receive regular, timely feedback about one's work performance.

___ 11) It is important to receive praise for the work performance.

___ 12) It is important to receive recognition for a good work performance.

___ 13) It is important to have a good relationship to co-workers.

___ 14) It is important to have good work conditions.

___ 15) It is important to experience job security.
16) It is important to change the company (or work place) not too often.

17) It is important to improve the financial compensation.

18) It is important that all employees get fringe benefits.

Part Three

In this section you are asked to evaluate how important these fringe benefits are for you.

Write a number in the blank beside the statement, based on the following scale:

1-------- 2-------- 3-------- 4-------- 5-------- 6-------- 7-------- 8

Less                                     Moderate                                   Very important
important

1) the employees receive a part of the company's profit

2) the company offers free coffee

3) the company stands for a part of the lunch prise

4) the company pays for sport activities

5) the company stands for work clothes and work shoes

6) the company stands for the laundry of the work clothes

7) Which other types of benefits do you like to have?

______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
______________________________________________________________________
Part Four

In this part I would like to gather some general information.

A) Your age:

☐ Under 20
☐ 21-25
☐ 26-30
☐ 31-35
☐ 36-40
☐ 41-45
☐ 46-50
☐ 51-55
☐ 56-65
☐ 66 or over

B) Sex:

☐ Male
☐ Female

C) Marital status:

☐ Married
☐ Unmarried

D) Work area:

☐ Production Workshop
☐ Production Office
☐ Leading position
☐ Finance and Administration
☐ R+D
☐ Sales

D) Your position within the company:

..................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................................
E) How long have you been working in this company?

☐ Up to 2 years   ☐ 2 - 5 years   ☐ > 5 - 10 years   ☐ More than 10 years

In the space below, please write down any additional information about your job that you feel might be helpful for me to understand your work situation.

…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….
…………………………………………………………………………………………….

Thank you for your co-operation.
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Table 4:1 and Figure 4:1 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding the age (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; = 30</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>4.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; = 46</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Table 4:2 and Figure 4:2 Importance of the job factors regarding the age (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; = 30</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>5,6</td>
<td>7,0</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>6,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>6,9</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>7,5</td>
<td>6,7</td>
<td>7,0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; = 46</td>
<td>6,5</td>
<td>6,0</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>6,1</td>
<td>7,2</td>
<td>6,3</td>
<td>6,9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6,8</td>
<td>5,9</td>
<td>7,1</td>
<td>5,8</td>
<td>6,6</td>
<td>7,4</td>
<td>6,4</td>
<td>7,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:3 and Figure 4:3 Importance of the benefits regarding the age (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; = 30</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; = 46</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.4 Comparison of the situation at work and the importance of certain job factors regarding the age

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age Group</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; = 30</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>31 - 45</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.1</td>
<td>1.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; = 46</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.2</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>1.3</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Gender (Mean)

Table 4:5 and Figure 4:4 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding the gender (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signific.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>4.2</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:6 and Figure 4:5 Importance of the job factors regarding the gender (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of the job factors regarding the gender (Mean)
### Table 4:7 and Figure 4:6 Importance of the benefits regarding the gender (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Importance of the benefits regarding the gender (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Evaluation</th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:8 Comparison of the situation at work and the importance of certain job factors regarding the gender

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>1,5</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1,9</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>1,2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>0,9</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,6</td>
<td>2,4</td>
<td>1,0</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1,0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Marital status(Mean)

Table 4:9 and Figure 4:7 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding the marital status (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:10 and Figure 4:8 Importance of the job factors regarding the marital status (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:11 and Figure 4:9 Importance of the benefits regarding the marital status (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:12 Comparison of the situation at work and the importance of certain job factors regarding the marital status

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Married</td>
<td>1,2</td>
<td>0,4</td>
<td>1,4</td>
<td>0,1</td>
<td>2,3</td>
<td>1,3</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>1,1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unmarried</td>
<td>1,8</td>
<td>0,7</td>
<td>1,6</td>
<td>0,3</td>
<td>2,0</td>
<td>1,7</td>
<td>-0,2</td>
<td>1,4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### White-collar/blue-collar worker (Mean)

Table 4:13 and Figure 4:10 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding white-collar/blue-collar worker (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Blue-collar Worker</th>
<th>White-collar Worker</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding white-collar/blue-collar worker (Mean)**

![Bar chart showing the comparison of blue-collar and white-collar workers for different factors such as skills, task identity, task significance, autonomy, feedback, environment, job security, and compensation. Each factor is evaluated on a scale from 1 to 8, with blue and red bars representing blue-collar and white-collar workers, respectively.](attachment:image.png)
### Table 4:14 and Figure 4:11 Importance of the job factors regarding white-collar/blue-collar worker (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Blue-collar</th>
<th>White-collar</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task signif.</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Graph

The graph visualizes the importance of the job factors regarding white-collar/blue-collar worker (Mean) with a bar chart. The factors include Skills, Task identity, Task significance, Autonomy, Feedback, Environment, Job security, and Compensation.

- **Blue-collar worker** is represented in light blue bars.
- **White-collar worker** is represented in dark red bars.
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:16 Comparison of the situation at work and the importance of certain job factors regarding white-collar/blue-collar worker

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Blue-collar</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>White-collar</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.6</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Leading/non-leading position (Mean)

Table 4:17 and Figure 4:13 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding leading/non-leading position (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factor</th>
<th>Leading</th>
<th>Non-leading</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task signif.</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding leading/non-leading position (Mean)
Table 4:18 and Figure 4:14 Importance of the job factors regarding leading/non-leading position (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-leading</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4:19 and Figure 4:15 Importance of the benefits regarding leading/non-leading position (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-leading</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of the benefits regarding leading/non-leading position (Mean)

![Bar chart showing the importance of benefits for leading and non-leading positions]
Table 4:20 Comparison of the situation at work and the importance of certain job factors regarding leading/non-leading position

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Leading</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-1.2</td>
<td>1.0</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.7</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Non-leading</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.2</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
### Years in the company (Mean)

Table 4:21 and Figure 4:16 Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding the years in the company (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>4.7</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 - 10 years</td>
<td>5.1</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>5.2</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>4.6</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>5.6</td>
<td>5.7</td>
<td>4.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

![Work situation and satisfaction with the work regarding the years in the company (Mean)](chart.png)
Table 4:22 and Figure 4:17 Importance of the job factors regarding the years in the company (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>&lt; 2 years</th>
<th>2 - 5 years</th>
<th>&gt; 5 - 10 years</th>
<th>&gt; 10 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Skills</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task identity</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>6.0</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Task significance</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>5.8</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>5.9</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Feedback</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.6</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Environment</td>
<td>7.4</td>
<td>7.5</td>
<td>7.9</td>
<td>6.9</td>
<td>7.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Job security</td>
<td>6.4</td>
<td>6.7</td>
<td>6.5</td>
<td>6.2</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Compensation</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>7.1</td>
<td>6.8</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Importance of the job factors regarding the years in the company (Mean)
Table 4:23 and Figure 4:18 Importance of the benefits regarding the years in the company (Mean)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Benefit</th>
<th>Food</th>
<th>Sport</th>
<th>Work</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>7.2</td>
<td>5.0</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>7.6</td>
<td>6.3</td>
<td>6.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 - 10 years</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>4.9</td>
<td>5.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>7.0</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>7.3</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 4.24 Comparison of the situation at work and the importance of certain job factors regarding the years in the company

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Skills</th>
<th>Task identity</th>
<th>Task signif.</th>
<th>Autonomy</th>
<th>Feedback</th>
<th>Environment</th>
<th>Job security</th>
<th>Compensation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>&lt; 2 years</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.7</td>
<td>1.4</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2.1</td>
<td>1.5</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 - 5 years</td>
<td>1.7</td>
<td>0.3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-0.3</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>1.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 5 - 10 years</td>
<td>2.3</td>
<td>1.1</td>
<td>1.9</td>
<td>0.9</td>
<td>2.5</td>
<td>1.8</td>
<td>-0.6</td>
<td>1.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>&gt; 10 years</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>-0.2</td>
<td>0.4</td>
<td>0</td>
<td>1.6</td>
<td>0.8</td>
<td>-0.9</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>