

INDUSTRIAL EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION: CONFLICTS BETWEEN SUBJECTS AND SUPERVISORS

KENNETH A. KOVACH
George Mason University
Fairfax, Virginia

ABSTRACT

One thousand employees in industrial jobs were asked to rank order ten rewards in terms of motivational value. Immediately thereafter the subjects' supervisors were asked to do the same, ranking the rewards as they thought the employees would. Results are compared between the two groups as well as between subgroups of employees differentiated by sex, age, income level, organization level, and job type. Cases where statistically significant differences were and were not found are discussed, possible explanations are offered, and implications for manipulation of reward systems are proposed.

This study asked 1000 industrial employees to rank order ten possible rewards and found that "interesting work" was preferred in the majority of cases. If this is the answer, then all that is necessary is to make all of the work in industry interesting and we will have happy, productive employees that come to work on time and don't quit. Unfortunately, not all jobs can be made interesting and more importantly, what is interesting to one person might not be interesting to another person.

The direct supervisors of the employees might be able to recognize the differences between their employees and they could make sure that all employees were in jobs that was interesting to them. However, when these supervisors were asked their opinions on what their employees wanted from their jobs, the supervisors claimed their workers' highest preference was not for interesting work but for good wages. If the immediate supervisors are to be believed, all a company has to do is make sure it pays good wages to all of its employees.

The second solution, i.e., good wages, are probably easier to implement than interesting work, but the employees say this is not extremely high on their list of

preferences. Thus, there appear to be some differences in managers' and employees' perceptions.

This article compares results of three surveys concerning employee and supervisory rankings of ten motivational items, discusses individual differences between groups of employees and supervisors, and looks at the manipulation of reward systems. It is hoped the information presented will shed some light on the question of why workers work and what an employer can do to attain full productivity.

SURVEY RESULTS

In 1946, industrial employees were asked to rank ten "job reward" factors in terms of personal preference. The results were [1]:

1. Full appreciation of work done
2. Feeling of being in on things
3. Sympathetic help with personal problems
4. Job security
5. Good wages
6. Interesting work
7. Promotion and growth in the organization
8. Personal loyalty to employees
9. Good working conditions
10. Tactful discipline

A similar questionnaire was given to industrial employees in 1981 and again in 1991. By 1981 there were changes in what workers wanted compared to 1946. Interesting work was positioned in the number one slot and sympathetic help with personal problems was moved to the number nine slot. By 1991, the list looked like this:

1. Interesting work
2. Full appreciation of work done
3. Feeling of being in on things
4. Job security
5. Good wages
6. Promotion and growth in the organization
7. Good working conditions
8. Personal loyalty to employees
9. Tactful discipline
10. Sympathetic help with personal problems.

The workers surveyed in 1946 came from a different environment than the workers in our factories today. America had just come out of a depression and gone through a war. In 1991, after almost thirty-five years of relative prosperity

and a rise in the standard of living beyond the imagination of the workers in 1946, it is not surprising that the list of what workers wanted from their work had changed. (The Wilcoxon Matched Pairs Test shows a significant difference at the .05 level.)

If we consider the list of employee ratings as relating to Maslow's hierarchy of needs [2] or to Herzberg's hygiene theory [3], it becomes fairly obvious that in the United States' industrial sector, organizations have done a better job of satisfying the basic or "deficit" needs of the worker than they have in satisfying the ego or self-fulfillment needs [4].

In each of the 1946, 1981, and 1991 studies, supervisors were asked to rank the list of job rewards as they believed the employees had ranked it. Their rankings remained almost the same for each year:

1. Good wages
2. Job security
3. Promotion and growth in the organization
4. Good working conditions
5. Interesting work
6. Personal loyalty to employees
7. Tactful discipline
8. Full appreciation of work done
9. Sympathetic help with personal problems
10. Feeling of being in on things

The above rankings by the supervisors show that not only has their collective perception of factors that motivate employees not changed over the last forty years, but also that they have little realization of the importance of Maslow's hierarchy of needs or Herzberg's extrinsic and intrinsic factors in motivation. Most importantly, a comparison of employee and supervisor rankings shows that the latter group has a very inaccurate perception of what motivates the former.

Why have managers, assuming they are aware of the almost four decades of research, chosen to ignore the theories of motivation? Specifically, why do managers continually place wages at the top of their hierarchy and put the other motivators that both Maslow and Herzberg consider essential for job satisfaction at the bottom of their list? Several reasons are possible for the supervisors' apparent neglect of the conclusions drawn from behavioral scientists' research.

One reason could be that supervisors feel employees do not believe it is socially desirable to be interested in money and other basic needs and pay lip service to more socially acceptable factors such as interesting work. Or, on the other hand, it might just be possible that employees are better witnesses to their own feelings than their supervisors. Another reason for this disparity might be that managers chose the rewards they have less responsibility for, such as pay raises, which are usually determined by formalized organizational policies, as opposed to values that stem from the personal relationships between supervisors and employees,

thus “passing the buck” when it comes time to fix the blame for poor levels of employee motivation.

These explanations are largely intuitive and untested; however, one theory the author believes may explain this phenomenon is what he calls “self-reference”; i.e., managers offer workers rewards that would motivate managers (that is, themselves), but this may not necessarily be what will motivate their employees. David McClelland, in his studies, found that supervisors are usually high achievers who are interested in concrete measures that reflect how well they have done: namely, money [5]. For them it is a quantifiable way to keep score. There is a significant difference between the supervisors’ rankings of employee rewards in 1946 and employee rankings in 1946, and a significant difference between the two in 1981 and 1991. Thus managers appear to remain out of tune with the wants of their employees. Despite a tremendous volume of behavioral research into what motivates employees, supervisors’ self-reference is still as much of a problem today as it was after the Second World War: a sad commentary on the implementation of research results in the workplace.

DIFFERENCES BETWEEN SUBGROUPS

The survey taken in 1991 also divided employees into various categories, something the earlier surveys did not do. Just as there are differences between what employees want over time, there may also be differences between categories of employees based on sex, age, income level, job type, and organization level. (See Table 1 for the subgroups studied in the 1991 survey.)

When the subset data is analyzed against the total employee response, only two groups do not meet the null hypothesis, which specifies that the distribution of the total response is equal to the distribution of each subset. One of these groups is the under-thirty age group, and the other is the group with income under \$12,000. (See Table 2 for a comparison of total employee response to each subset response and Table 3 for a Chi Square analysis of total employee response to each subset response.)

When the subset data is analyzed against the supervisor rankings, all but three groups do not meet the null hypothesis, which specifies that the distribution of the supervisors is equal to the distribution of each subset. These groups are the under-thirty age group, the under-\$12,000 income group and the lower organizational level. (See Table 3 for a Chi Square analysis of supervisor response to each subset response and Table 4 for supervisor/subgroup agreement by factor.)

Males Versus Females

When one analyzes male versus female responses by the Chi Square technique, no significant statistical difference in the distribution of rewards is found between the two; however, when one looks at the ranking of values, it is found that females

Table 1. Survey Statistics

1,000 Employees (Industrial Sector)	100 Supervisors ^a (1st and 2nd Level)
Sex	Sex
(S1) M = 622	(S1) M = 76
(S2) F = 378	(S2) F = 24
Age	Age
(A1) Under 30 = 202	(A1) Under 30 = 16
(A2) 31-40 = 348	(A2) 31-40 = 29
(A3) 41-50 = 325	(A3) 41-50 = 40
(A4) Over 50 = 125	(A4) Over 50 = 15
Income Level	Income Level
(I1) Under 12000 = 135	(I1) Under 16000 = 6
(I2) 12001-18000 = 360	(I2) 16001-22000 = 34
(I3) 18001-25000 = 334	(I3) 22001-30000 = 39
(I4) Over 25000 = 171	(I4) Over 30000 = 21
Job Type	Job Type Supervised
(J1) Blue-collar unskilled = 350	(J1) Blue-collar unskilled = 31
(J2) Blue-collar skilled = 291	(J2) Blue-collar skilled = 27
(J3) White-collar unskilled = 206	(J3) White-collar unskilled = 23
(J4) White-collar skilled = 113	(J4) White-collar skilled = 19
Organization Level	Organization Level Supervised
(O1) Lower Non-supervisory = 418	(O1) Lower Non-supervisory = 34
(O2) Middle Non-supervisory = 359	(O2) Middle Non-supervisory = 37
(O3) Higher Non-supervisory = 139	(O3) Higher Non-supervisory = 29

^aSupervisors surveyed are directly connected with employees surveyed.

rank "full appreciation of work" in first place while males rank it in second place. "Sympathetic help with personal problems" is ranked seventh by females as opposed to tenth by the males. This indicates that perhaps female employees place greater importance on interpersonal relationships and communication than male employees, a difference that should be noted by managers. Women in the work place today do have different problems than men because many are still trying to cope with their traditional role of housewife along with that of a worker. This could cause them to seek more appreciation of work and more help with personal problems.

Age Groups

The age groups analyzed consisted of under thirty, thirty-one to forty, forty-one to fifty, and over fifty. As mentioned above, the under-thirty group showed the

Table 2. Response Distribution

	S	E	S1	S2	A1	A2	A3	A4	I1	I2	I3	I4	J1	J2	J3	J4	O1	O2	O3
Interesting Work	5	1	1	2	4	2	3	1	5	2	1	1	2	1	1	2	3	1	1
Full Appreciation of Work Done	8	2	2	1	5	3	2	2	4	3	3	2	1	6	3	1	4	2	2
Feeling of Being In on Things	10	3	3	3	6	4	1	3	6	1	2	4	5	2	5	4	5	3	3
Job Security	2	4	5	4	2	1	4	7	2	4	4	3	4	3	7	5	2	4	6
Good Wages	1	5	4	5	1	5	5	8	1	5	6	8	3	4	6	6	1	6	8
Promotion and Growth in Organization	3	6	6	6	3	6	8	9	3	6	5	7	6	5	4	3	6	5	5
Good Working Conditions	4	7	7	7	7	7	7	4	8	7	7	6	9	7	2	7	7	7	4
Personal Loyalty to Employees	7	8	8	8	9	9	6	5	7	8	8	5	8	9	9	8	8	8	7
Tactful Discipline	9	9	9	9	9	10	9	10	10	9	9	10	7	10	10	9	9	9	10
Sympathetic Help with Personal Problems	6	10	10	10	10	8	10	6	9	10	10	9	10	8	8	10	10	10	9

Note: S = Total Supervisor Response, 1991; E = Total Employee Response, 1991.

Table 3. Employee vs. Supervisory Responses

Subgroup	E 1991 vs.		Subgroup	S 1991 vs.	
	Chi-Square	Sig. Level		Chi-Square	Sig. Level
S1	1.28	N.S.	S1	34.28	.01
S2	3.71	N.S.	S2	41.61	.01
A1	22.44	.05	A1	8.52	N.S.
A2	4.72	N.S.	A2	31.62	.01
A3	6.50	N.S.	A3	44.79	.01
A4	9.67	N.S.	A4	86.78	.01
I1	27.18	.05	I1	9.21	N.S.
I2	2.83	N.S.	I2	39.08	.01
I3	1.20	N.S.	I3	46.12	.01
I4	4.03	N.S.	I4	69.32	.01
J1	4.65	N.S.	J1	28.92	.05
J2	9.59	N.S.	J2	24.53	.05
J3	9.13	N.S.	J3	49.01	.01
J4	3.78	N.S.	J4	46.08	.01
O1	11.53	N.S.	O1	13.36	N.S.
O2	.36	N.S.	O2	45.99	.01
O3	4.49	N.S.	O3	72.54	.01

Note: S = Total Supervisor Response, E = Total Employee Response.

greatest disparity in its distribution from the total responses of all groups, but showed the greatest similarity to the supervisors' estimate of how employees would respond. The difference between how the under-thirty group responded when compared with each of the other age groups is statistically significant. The under-thirty group chose good wages, job security, and promotion and growth as its first three choices. This could indicate that because they are new workers, they have not yet fulfilled their basic needs according to Maslow. When comparing the under-thirty group to the thirty to forty-one group, it is noteworthy that the thirty-one to forty group still places job security high on its hierarchy of values but as one moves up through the age groups, the basic needs become less important to the respondents. Thus, industry seems to do well in taking care of the basic needs of their employees, at least for those who stay past their fortieth birthday.

The over-fifty workers have some anomalies in their ranking of rewards. They place "sympathetic help with personal problems," "good working conditions," and "personal loyalty to employees" as moderately high on their list of preferences. Again as one ages, personal problems become more of a factor. (See Table 5 for the Chi Square analysis of the age groups.)

Table 4. Supervisor/Subgroup Agreement by Factor — 1991

Supv. Rank	Tactic	Subgroups Agreeing	Pop.	Percent of Total	
1	Good Wages	A-1 Age under 30	202	20.2	
		I-1 Income under \$12,000	135	13.5	
		O-1 Lower Non-Supervisory	418	41.8	
2	Job Security	A-1 Age under 30	202	20.2	
		I-1 Income under \$12,000	135	13.5	
		O-1 Lower Non-Supervisory	418	41.8	
3	Promotion and Growth in the Organization	A-1 Age under 30	202	20.2	
		I-1 Income under \$12,000	135	20.2	
		J-4 White Collar Skilled	113	11.3	
4	Good Working Conditions	A-4 Age over 50	125	12.5	
		O-3 Higher Non-Supervisory	193	19.3	
5	Interesting Work	I-1 Income under \$12,000	202	20.2	
6	Sympathetic Help with Personal Problems	A-4 Age over 50	125	12.5	
7	Personal Loyalty to Employees	I-1 Income under \$12,000	135	13.5	
		O-3 Higher Non-Supervisory	193	19.3	
8	Full Appreciation of Work Done	None			
9	Tactful Discipline	I Aggregate	1000	100	
		S-1 Males	622	62.2	
		S-2 Females	378	37.8	
		A-3 Ages 41-50	325	32.5	
		I-2 Incomes \$12,001-18,000	360	36.0	
		I-3 Incomes \$18,001-25,000	334	33.4	
		J-4 White Collar Skilled	113	11.3	
		O-1 Lower Non-Supervisory	418	41.8	
10	Feeling of Being in on Things	O-2 Middle Non-supervisory	389	38.9	
		None			
Subgroups Finding No Common Ranking with Supervisors					
A-2	Ages 31-40	A-4	Age over 50	I-4	Incomes over \$25,000
J-1	Blue Collar Unskilled	J-2	Blue Collar Skilled	J-3	White Collar Unskilled

Income Group

The low income group (under \$12,000) also showed a response pattern that was quite different from the total employee responses and similar to the supervisors' expectations. The responses were also statistically different from the other income groups. As with the low-age group, the low-income group placed "good wages," "job security," and "promotion and growth in the organization" in the primary positions. The next two income levels (through \$25,000) showed little difference in their responses and differed from the low-income group only in that they placed "good wages," "job security," and "promotion and growth in the organization" in a moderate position in their list of preferences. Interestingly, the over-\$25,000 group placed "job security" as third in importance. Perhaps the increased largesse causes a desire to retain it, thereby increasing the importance of job security. (See Table 6 for Chi Square analyses of income levels.)

Job Types

The comparison of the blue-collar, unskilled responses with those of the white-collar, unskilled workers showed significant differences. The unskilled blue-collar

Table 5. Age Distribution

Subgroups	Chi-Square	Sig. Level
A1 vs A2	22.86	.05
A1 vs A3	33.67	.01
A1 vs A4	84.21	.01
A2 vs A3	14.65	N.S.
A2 vs A4	43.95	.01
A3 vs A4	12.67	N.S.

Table 6. Income Level Distribution

Subgroups	Chi-Square	Sig. Level
I1 vs I2	27.69	.05
I1 vs I3	34.92	.01
I1 vs I4	60.77	.01
I2 vs I3	1.87	N.S.
I2 vs I4	13.53	N.S.
I3 vs I4	5.53	N.S.

group gave top ranking to "full appreciation of work done," "interesting work," and "good wages," whereas the unskilled, white-collar worker showed a greater interest in "interesting work," "good working conditions," and "appreciation of work done." The unskilled, blue-collar worker was slightly more interested in "job security" than the unskilled, white-collar worker, whereas the unskilled, white-collar worker placed more value on "promotion and growth in the organization."

When one compares the skilled, blue-collar with the skilled, white-collar worker, fewer differences are found. The most significant difference is that blue-collar skilled do not seem to place much value on full appreciation of work done. One could posit they were intrinsically content with their work, since in the majority of cases their tasks are well-defined and self-contained, while the tasks of white-collar workers tend to be more open-ended and the worker is more dependent on supervisory feedback for the definition and assessment of the job. "Job security" was of primary importance for the blue-collar skilled, whereas "promotion and growth in the organization" was of primary importance to the white-collar skilled.

Comparing the blue-collar unskilled to the blue-collar skilled, one finds the most significant difference between the two to be the placement of "full appreciation of work done." The blue-collar skilled rated this factor sixth out of ten, whereas the blue-collar unskilled placed it as number one in importance. When one compares the white-collar unskilled to the white-collar skilled, a significant difference is found between how the two groups rated "good working conditions." The unskilled, white-collar worker placed working conditions as number two in importance, whereas the skilled worker placed it as number seven. (See Table 7 for a Chi Square analysis of the job levels.)

Organization Level

The organization levels were divided into lower, middle, and higher nonsupervisory categories. The comparison of the lower with both the middle and the higher levels produced statistically significant differences. The largest difference between the lower organization level and both higher groups was that the lower organization level employee rated "good wages" as number one and "job security" as number two, whereas both the middle and higher levels rated "job security" and "full appreciation of work done" as numbers one and two. Again one must return

Table 7. Job Type Distribution

Subgroups	Chi-Square	Sig. Level
J1 vs J2	30.31	.01
J1 vs J3	17.67	.05
J2 vs J4	11.01	N.S.
J3 vs J4	16.56	N.S.

Table 8. Organizational Level Distribution

Subgroups	Chi-Square	Sig. Level
O1 vs. O2	30.30	.01
O1 vs. O3	61.92	.01
O2 vs. O3	7.29	N.S.

to the satisfaction of the basic needs before the higher needs are expressed as an important and relevant concept when evaluating employee satisfaction. (See Table 8 for the Chi Square analyses by organization level.)

REWARD SYSTEM MANIPULATION

All three surveys showed supervisors feel that money, i.e., high wages, is the major motivator of their employees, whereas only three of the employee subgroups rated money as the most important reward. These subgroups were the under-thirty group representing 20.2 percent of the total survey, the under-\$12,000 income level representing 13.5 percent of the total, and the lower organization level employee representing 41.8 percent of the total survey.

Why do managers choose to ignore the reward responses made by the majority of the workers under their supervision? This question was addressed earlier in the article, and it was suggested that managers operate under a self-reference system; i.e., they rank rewards as they would want them for themselves and assume their employees would subscribe to the same rewards. If this is true, and the author would point to the survey results to show that it is, then how can management be encouraged to base its employee policies on more objective interpretations of employee motivations?

One way to encourage more objectivity in structuring reward systems is to do attitude surveys such as this one. This survey revealed that supervisors do not know what their employees want and also revealed differences between employee subgroups that management should take into consideration when structuring reward systems. Managers need to be aware that reward practices should be designed to fit the needs of particular persons working under particular conditions. Using the present survey as an example, reward systems could be manipulated as follows for the various groupings:

Males Versus Females

Males were more inclined to prefer interesting work, whereas females seemed to need more appreciation of work well done. Efforts should be made to design the job format to provide more interest to both groups, since both marked interesting

work as one of the three primary rewards, but managers should take into account the fact that female workers have more need of appreciation and should, therefore, engage in more verbal communication intended to foster such a feeling. Also, managers should be more aware of the needs of women for sympathetic help with their personal problems and thus be willing to spend more time with them vis-a-vis this concern than with males.

Age Groups

Flexible pay incentives might be used effectively with the under-thirty workers since they seem to be concerned about their basic needs, while the higher age groups could be expected to respond more positively to job enrichment and job enlargement programs. One group, the forty-one to fifty group placed as number one "the feeling of being in on things." Systems of "top-down" vertical communication within the organization would appear to be particularly effective with this group. Perhaps supervisors dealing with the forty-one- to fifty-year-old group could make an effort to include this group in discussions of policy, even if their input and ideas are not always implemented. The over-fifty group places as moderately important, "good working conditions," "personal loyalty to employees," and "sympathetic help with personal problems." An awareness of these needs by the manager could make these employees more productive.

Income Groups

The lower income group is primarily concerned with "good wages" and would respond to pay incentive programs. They are moderately concerned with "interesting work," "full appreciation of work done," and "the feeling of being in on things." All of the other income groups are primarily concerned with "interesting work" and "full appreciation of work done." A job enrichment/job enlargement program would probably work for all income groups except the lowest one, while an incentive pay program (piece-rate, Scanlon plan, etc.) might be a good investment in regard to motivating lower income employees.

Job Types

The most striking difference between the unskilled, blue-collar worker and the unskilled, white-collar worker is the difference in emphasis placed on "good working conditions." The unskilled, white-collar workers judged this to be second in importance on their list of preferences and were the only group that rated this factor so high. The supervisors of this group should be able to address the physical working conditions for the unskilled, white-collar worker by a simple environmental analysis and reap some motivational return.

The difference between the blue-collar skilled and the white-collar skilled is significant in the positioning of "full appreciation of work done." The blue-collar,

skilled worker evidently has a high self-awareness of his/her job and how well s/he does it, whereas the white-collar worker has little sense of self-awareness concerning his/her job and needs outside confirmation of its worth. The blue-collar, skilled worker should be included in more decision-making activities, as s/he seems to have a need for being in on things. The skilled, white-collar worker would respond to the same stimuli as the skilled blue-collar but for a different reason. For the skilled, white-collar worker greater participation in decision-making activities gives him/her the feedback needed to define the job and better opportunities to receive the exposure needed for advancement.

Organization Level

Employees at the lower organizational level would respond to pay incentives and greater job security, and in the middle and higher levels to job enrichment/job enlargement programs. Respondents in the middle organizational level ranked job security in the number four position, the same position as the total respondent ranking. Thus, the insecurity experienced by workers in the industrial sector is a factor that should be considered seriously by management. Evidently job security matters when you don't have it, as evidenced by the under-thirty group ranking it in the number two position, the thirty-one to forty group (a group that may find it more difficult to change jobs) ranking it first, and the over-fifty group (the group with the most security) ranking it as seventh. The higher organization level group, probably those with the most security, ranked job security in the number six position. Again, one finds evidence to support Maslow's contention that fulfilled needs no longer motivate.

ATTITUDE SURVEYS

With the exception of two groups, the under-thirty group and the under-\$12,000/year group, all of the respondents ranked "interesting work" in one of the three top positions. Jurgensen, in a study that drew on a thirty-year practice in a large utility company of asking job applicants to rank-order ten job characteristics in terms of importance to the applicants, came up with a similar result [6]. Over this period of time, job security declined in importance and "type of work" increased in importance. Furthermore, Jurgensen sorted the respondents out by groups according to educational attainment and found that higher educated persons attached more importance to type of work, while those with only high school diplomas attached more importance to job security. The author would argue that since our labor force contains a higher percentage of persons with postsecondary education each year, the increasing importance of interesting work is to be expected and will continue in the future. Making work interesting is not an easy task, however. It is much easier to pay more, to make work cleaner and safer, even to insure reasonable job security, than it is to make some kinds of work interesting.

As stated previously, perhaps job enlargement and enrichment are ideas worth trying in the future on a far larger scale than has been done in the past. Organizations with considerable numbers of younger, lower-paid workers may well take a long look at these behavioral concepts.

The author would never argue that attitude surveys are the only answer needed to all motivation problems, for it goes without saying that job satisfaction is a difficult thing to measure because it is tied to the expectations of the worker who answers the questions and is difficult to evaluate against a fixed scale of intensity. At what point, for example, do the cumulative negative feelings of an individual add up to an overall assessment that s/he is dissatisfied with the job? Only the individual can make such an overall judgment. However, this doesn't mean that we can't generalize from these surveys. For example, we can say that based on these surveys, it appears that in most cases the basic needs of the worker are met by industrial organizations. That is, wages are not a burning issue except with the under-thirty-year-old age group, the under-\$12,000-a-year pay group and the lower organizational level employees. What is important to the majority of employees surveyed is "interesting work," "appreciation of work," and the "feeling of being in on things." Obviously, then, supervisors should make every effort to be aware of the importance of these particular values and encourage upper-level management to become involved in job restructuring programs and constructing better communications within the organization. They should be aware that the employees want to be appreciated and should make an effort to give credit where credit is due, and whenever possible, include all levels of employees in some forms of decision making so that the employee has a feeling of belonging and participation.

The more often surveys are taken, the more likely managers will heed them and take a personal interest in the progress of programs that they have initiated. It would also enable them to spot potential dissatisfaction factors that could arise because of changes in the make-up of the work force and in the background of the employees. But above all, frequent surveys would help to impress managers with the responsibility of taking the needs of employees into account. To know what the specific needs are, attitude surveys are necessary, and because of today's rapid changes in our society and organizations, these surveys need to be taken often. Self-reference, a *major* problem in employee motivation for at least forty years, will not and cannot be eliminated or even minimized any other way!

The results of attitude surveys should also be disseminated to the supervisors directly in charge of the employees and not held in the hands of upper-level management. This may help to dispel the false notion held by supervisors that their employees are motivated by high wages above everything else, even though this false notion has been disproven by practically every study over forty years. Gellerman, in 1963, stated that "myths die hard. It is quite clear that money's reputation as the ultimate motivator is going to be a long time a-dying" [7]. As the present survey shows, this myth still is alive and flourishing with most supervisors in the industrial sector.

Maslow contended that under current business conditions most American employees have lower-level or deficit needs substantially satisfied. Therefore, such management strategies as increasing employee incomes or strengthening job security will not accomplish as much as is often expected. The results of these surveys both bear out Maslow's contention and yet point out that there exists a class of employees who still have basic needs to be satisfied. The surveys show the degree to which various respondents' job circumstances are or are not providing sufficient rewards in each job area. The author believes this survey serves an important function in pointing out both the problem of self-reference in motivation and the differences between subgroups of employees in terms of motivational factors and their relative importance.

* * *

Dr. Kenneth A. Kovach is a Full Professor of Human Resource Management and Industrial Relations. He is a specialist and recognized expert in these areas and has published six books, 65 articles and over 150 cases. Additionally, he is a consultant to numerous local and national firms including the U.S. Department of Defense, American Red Cross, and the American Council on Education.

ENDNOTES

1. K. A. Kovach, Why Motivational Theories Don't Work, *S.A.M. Advanced Management Journal*, p. 56, Spring 1980.
2. A. H. Maslow, A Theory of Human Motivation, *Psychological Review*, pp. 370-396, July 1943.
3. F. Herzberg et al., *The Motivation to Work*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1959.
4. A. C. Filley and R. J. House, Some Empirical Evidence about Needs Theory, *Managerial Motivation and Compensation*, Michigan Business Studies, University of Michigan, Ann Arbor, p. 239, 1972.
5. D. C. McClelland, The Role of Money in Managing Motivation, *Managerial Motivation and Compensation*, p. 527, 1972.
6. C. E. Jurgensen, Job Preferences: What Makes a Job Good or Bad?, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, p. 63, 1978.
7. S. W. Gellerman, *Motivation and Productivity*, AMA, New York, p. 64, 1963.

Direct reprint requests to:

Kenneth A. Kovach
 B371B Robinson
 George Mason University
 4400 University Drive
 Fairfax, VA 22030