

DIFFERENCE BETWEEN LEADERS AND SUBORDINATES ON WORK MOTIVATION

Shiv Mangal Singh¹ & Rahul Sharma²

1. Lecturer, Govt. P. G. College for Women, Jammu, J&K
2. Research Scholar, University of Jammu, J&K

Received : 12/11/2017

1st BPR : 15/11/2017

2nd BPR : 17/11/2017

Accepted : 21/11/2017

ABSTRACT

This study aims at accessing the difference in Work Motivation of leaders and subordinates at middle level of police personnel. 20 leaders and 140 subordinates were selected from the middle level of police organization. The 1:7 ratio was followed to select the sample. The Work motivation Scale developed by K.G. Aggarwal (1988) was used. Mean, SD and t-test was used to analyse the data. The findings suggested that Social locations or socially important positions (leaders) and organizational hierarchy (middle level) play an important role for greater work motivation both lower and higher order needs fulfilment.

Key Words : Work Motivation, Leaders, Subordinates.

Motivation is a process that accounts for an individual's intensity, direction and persistence of efforts towards attaining a goal (Robbins, 2007). Work motivation initiates and maintains goal-directed performance. It energizes our thinking, fuels our enthusiasm and colours our positive and negative emotional reactions to work and life. Motivation generates the mental effort that drives us to apply our knowledge and skills. Without motivation, even the most capable person will refuse to work hard. Motivation prevents or nudges us to convert intention into action and start doing something new or to restart something we've done before. It also controls our decisions to persist at a specific work goal in the face of distractions and the press of other priorities. Finally, motivation leads us to invest more or less cognitive effort to enhance both the quality and quantity of our work performance. Thus, motivational performance gaps exist whenever people avoid starting something new, resist doing something familiar, stop doing something important and switch their attention to a less valued task, or refuse to "work smart" on a new challenge and instead use old, familiar but inadequate solutions to solve a new problem (Clark, 1998). It is crucial to note that motivation does not directly influence work performance. Instead, motivation leads us to use our knowledge and skills and apply them effectively to work tasks. It is the force that initiates, starts, energizes and continues the application of our experience and expertise. Successful performance always involves the cooperation of motivation and knowledge in supportive work environments. Without adequate knowledge, motivation alone does not increase useful performance. Thus adequate motivation is necessary, but not sufficient for effective performance. Luthans (1998) asserts that motivation is the process that arouses, energizes, directs, and sustains behaviour and performance. That is, it is the process of stimulating people to action and to achieve a desired task. One way of stimulating people is to employ effective motivation, which makes workers more satisfied with and committed to their jobs. Money is not the only motivator. There are other incentives which can also serve as motivators. Luthans (1998) asserts that motivation should not be

thought of as the only explanation of behaviour, since it interacts with and acts in conjunction with other mediating processes and with the environment. He stressed that, like the other cognitive process, motivation cannot be seen. All that can be seen is behaviour, and this should not be equated with causes of behaviour. While recognizing the central role of motivation, Evans (1998) states that many recent theories of organizational behaviour find it important for the field to re-emphasize behaviour. Definitions of motivation abound. One thing these definitions have in common is the inclusion of words such as "desire", "want", "wishes", "aim", "goals", "needs", and "incentives". Luthans (1998) defines motivation as, "a process that starts with a physiological deficiency or need that activates a behaviour or a drive that is aimed at a goal incentive". Therefore, the key to understanding the process of motivation lies in the meaning of, and relationship among, needs, drives, and incentives. Relative to this, Minner, Ebrahimi, and Watchel, (1995) state that in a system sense, motivation consists of these three interacting and interdependent elements, i.e., needs, drives, and incentives. Motivational theories can be divided into two categories, *content* and *process* theories. *Content* theories assume that all individuals possess the same set of needs and therefore prescribe the characteristics that ought to be present in jobs. *Process* theories stress the difference in people's needs and focus on the cognitive processes that create these differences.

The biggest challenge is also how police leaders can develop police organizations that can effectively recognize, relate and assimilate the global shifts in culture, technology and information. The current and incoming generation of police leaders needs to understand and constructively manage the nuances of community expectations, workforce values, technological power, governmental arrangements, policing philosophies, and ethical standards for high quality service not only to the community but also to the subordinates/ supporting staff. The subordinates constitute an important component of police organization; their satisfaction about leadership is vital for organizational effectiveness. The paradigm shift towards egalitarian policing philosophies at global level has also warranted change in the relationship between police leaders and subordinates. Thus, leadership is a service rather an imposition. The police leaders must develop an inspiring relationship with subordinates if their subordinates are to accept their leadership. Lower level hierarchy includes the ranks of inspector, sub-inspector, assistant sub-inspector, head constable, selection grade constable and constable. Middle level consisted of Dy. SP, SP and SSP ranks where as high level hierarchy consisted of DIG, IGP, ADGP and DGP ranks.

Objective

1. To access the Work Motivation of leaders and subordinates at middle level of police hierarchy.
2. To study the difference between leaders and subordinates at middle level of police hierarchy on Work Motivation.

Sample

The population from where the sample was being selected for the study was Jammu and Kashmir Police Organization. There were number of wings and sub-wings in this organization. This organization played an important role in the survival of the state. There were many leaders and the subordinates in this organization. The researcher was able to find the suitable sample from this organization. For the research purpose the researcher had considered only one wing of the Jammu and Kashmir Police i.e. Executive Police. The Executive Police wing constituted 50% of the total Police personal in Jammu and Kashmir Police's different wings.

The sample for the study consisted of 160 Executive Police personnel of J & K Police. Proportionate stratified multistage random sampling method was used to collect the data. Two types of samples were participated, one set was leaders and other was subordinates (subordinates). 20 leaders and 140

subordinates from middle level were selected. Thus the total sample consisted of 160 police personnel from middle level of police organization.

Tools Used

This scale was prepared by K.G. Aggarwal (1988). There were 26 items in this scale and the split-half reliability of this scale was .994 which is very high. The reliability of this scale for the population of this study was .73. All the items of this scale are Likert type which is rated on 5 point scale. It measures 62.12% of the construct of work motivation. Summated scoring was done by assigning 5 to the most positive and 1 to the extreme negative response. The scoring scheme thus is 5 Measures Work Motivation fully, 4 Measures Work Motivation to a great extent, 3 Measures Work Motivation to some extent, 2 Measures Work Motivation to a little extent and 1 Does not measures Work Motivation. There are six factors of this scale which are given below along with the items measuring those factors:

Factor No.	Factor Name	Item No.
Factor -1	Dependence	15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 & 23
Factor -2	Organizational Orientation	1, 5, 8, 11, 12 & 13
Factor -3	Work Group Relations	6, 14, 19 & 20
Factor -4	Psychological Work Incentives	2, 23, 24, 25 & 26
Factor -5	Material Incentives	2, 3, 4 & 5
Factor -6	Job Situation	7, 9 & 10

Results

Table 1 showed the mean, standard deviation and t-test analysis for work motivation of middle level police personnel. Middle level leaders (Mean=91.95, SD= 4.57) were high on work motivation than their subordinates level (M=89.67, SD=18.20). No significant difference found between middle level leaders & their subordinates (Table 1).

Table - 01

Mean, SD and t-test for Work Motivation of middle level leaders and subordinates

Work Motivation	Leader-subordinate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Middle Level Police Personnel	160	92.8125	6.72851		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	91.9500	4.57079	.556*	.579*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	92.9357	6.98633	1.234**	.220**
	Middle Level Leaders	20	91.9500	4.57079		
	Subordinates of Middle level	20	92.6500	9.06279	-.298	.769

* Equal variances assumed. ** Equal variances not assumed

Table 2 showed the mean, standard deviation and t-test analysis for the paired sample of leaders and subordinates at middle level of police hierarchy for work motivation. For middle level leaders and their subordinates, the mean and standard deviations were 91.95 & 4.97 and 92.65 & 9.062 respectively (N=20). In other words, middle level leaders and their subordinates were found to be highly motivated. No significant difference was found between middle level leaders and their subordinates on work motivation as the value of t-test came out to be -.298.

Analysis for dimensions of work motivation

Mean, standard deviation and significance level of t-test values for dimensions of work motivation for leaders and subordinates of middle level of police hierarchy were calculated (Table 2) and found that for 'dependence' dimension of work motivation subordinates of middle level showed highest mean

(Mean=26.7286 & SD=3.62613) followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=26.6438, SD=3.47561) and middle level leaders (26.0500 & SD=2.11449). There was no significant difference on 'dependence' dimension of work motivation was found between middle level leaders & their subordinates as the values of p were greater than .05. The highest mean value for 'organizational orientation' dimension of work motivation was of middle level leaders (Mean=21.4000 & SD=2.23371) followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=20.8438, SD=4.07253) and subordinates of middle level (Mean=20.7643, SD=4.27071). The differences on 'organizational orientation' between middle level leaders & their subordinates was not significant.

The table 2 also showed that middle level leaders (N=20) were having the highest mean (Mean=14.8500 & SD=2.18307), followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=14.3688, SD=2.55658) and subordinates of middle level (Mean=14.3000 & SD=2.60520) for the 'work group relation' dimension of work motivation. The differences between middle level leaders & their subordinates was not significant. For 'psychological work incentives' dimension of work motivation, subordinates of middle level were having highest mean (Mean=19.2857 & SD=3.55893) followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=19.2813, SD=3.48071) and middle level leaders (Mean=19.2500 & SD= 2.95359).

Table-2
Mean, SD and t-test of Work Motivation dimensions for leaders and subordinates of middle level of police hierarchy

Dimensions of Work Motivation	Leader-Subordinate Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	T	Sig (2-tailed)
Dependence	Middle level police personnel	160	26.6438	3.47561		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	26.0500	2.11449	-.816*	.416*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	26.7286	3.62613	-1.204**	.236**
Organizational Orientation	Middle level police personnel	160	20.8438	4.07253		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	21.4000	2.23371	.652*	.515*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	20.7643	4.27071	1.032**	.308**
Work Group Relations	Middle level police personnel	160	14.3688	2.55658		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	14.8500	2.18307	.899*	.370*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	14.3000	2.60520	1.027**	.313**
Psychological Work Incentives	Middle level police personnel	160	19.2813	3.48071		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	19.2500	2.95359	-.043*	.966*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	19.2857	3.55893	-.049**	.961**
Material Incentives	Middle level police personnel	160	14.3188	3.75905		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	14.3500	3.45307	.040*	.968*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	14.3143	3.81230	.043**	.966**
Job Situations	Middle level police personnel	160	10.8063	2.26401		
	Middle Level Leaders	20	11.4000	1.53554	1.256*	.211*
	Subordinates of Middle Level	140	10.7214	2.34158	1.712**	.096**

* Equal variances assumed. ** Equal variances not assumed

The calculated mean and standard deviation for 'material incentive' dimension of work motivation in table 2 showed the highest value of mean for middle level leaders (Mean=14.3500, SD=3.45307) followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=14.3188, SD=3.75905) and subordinates of middle level leaders (Mean=14.3143, SD= 3.81230).

Middle level leaders showed the highest mean (Mean=11.4000 & SD=1.53554) followed by middle level police personnel (Mean=10.8063, SD=2.26401) and subordinates of middle level (Mean=10.7214 & SD=2.34158) for 'job situation' dimension of work motivation.

Conclusion and Discussion

Social locations or socially important positions (leaders) and organizational hierarchy (middle level) play an important role for greater work motivation both lower and higher order needs fulfilment. The higher (middle) level police personnel and police personnel at leadership position were highly motivated. As revealed from the findings, higher work motivation among police personnel at higher occupational level and leadership position were due to the organizational orientation which include job satisfaction, benefit to the employees, policies of the organization, and well planned work assignments. Job satisfaction is directly associated with internal work motivation of employees that enhances as the satisfaction of employees increases (Salman et al, 2010). Another possible reason was the relations with their groups. Group's help to improve one's performance, able to discuss personal problem with immediate superior, and ones confidence and trust in the people in work group are positively related to work motivation. Trust is defined as the perception of one about others, decision to act based on speech, behaviour and their decision (Hassan et al, 2010). Recognition of the work done, responsibility of the work, freedom to plan the work and feeling of doing a useful work are all psychological work incentives and are responsible for high level of work motivation. Adding up, they work with a sense of responsibility and prefer benefits of the organization to theirs (Yazdani, B.O. et al, 2011). Recognition correlates significantly with employee work motivation (Kalimullah et al, 2010 and Reena et al, 2009). Employee participation and empowerment not only direct to efficiency, effectiveness and innovation but they also boost employee gratification, work motivation and trust in the organization (Constant. D, 2001). The findings showed that high level of work motivation was due to material incentives. Material incentives include pay, working conditions, promotions, and employee benefit which can be responsible for higher level of work motivation. Serasinghe, 1994; Dehigama. 1996; Karunaratna, 2000 and Perera, 2003 concluded that people do respond well to monetary rewards. Diverse literature on the effectiveness of monetary rewards suggests the need for proper design and sound execution (Dharmasiri & Wickremasinghe, 2006). Money is the fundamental inducement, no other incentive or motivational technique comes even close to it with respect to its influential value (Sara et al, 2004). Smithers & Walker (2000) proved that workers' environments do affect their level of motivation, for instance, long hours of work, non recognition for work done and colleagues' aggressive management style. Job situations which include nature of work and the development of one's skills and abilities is also responsible for high level of work motivation. Robbins (2004) reported that rewarding professionals with educational opportunities - training, workshops, and attending conferences allow them to keep current in their field and motivate them. Staff training is an indispensable strategy for motivating workers (Tella et al. 2007). Middle level police personnel were found to be high in the dependence. The factors like immediate supervisor's behaviour, encouragement, suggestions, directions, not critical, helping behaviour, non-harassing, feel free to discuss personal problems and work group behaviour such as going out of the way to help, non-problem maker and satisfaction over one's work related recognition are also responsible for work motivation. The factors which enhance employee motivation are fair pay, incentives, special allowances, fringe benefits, leadership, encouragement, trust, respect, joint decision making, quality of

supervision, adequate working relationships, appreciation, chances for growth, loyalty of organization, identification and fulfilment of their needs, recognition, empowerment, inspiration, importance attached to their job, safe working conditions, training and information availability and communication to perform actions (Quratul-Ain Manzoor, 2012).

References

- Clark, A.E., Georgellis, Y. and Sanfey, P. (1998), "Job Satisfaction, Wages and Quits: Evidence from German Panel Data". *Research in Labor Economics, forthcoming*.
- Dehigama N.D.P. (1996), Relationship Between Monetary Incentives Employee Satisfaction and Employee Productivity, MBA Thesis, Colombo, PIM, p. 191.
- Evans L (1998) Teacher Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation. *London: Paul Chapman/Sage*.
- Hassan R. A., Fuwad B. A., Rauf A. I. (2010). *Academy of Strategic Management Journal* 9(2) 123-131.
- Kalimullah K. U., Farooq S. U., Ullah M. I. (2010). The relationship between rewards and employee motivation in commercial banks of Pakistan. *Research Journal of International Studies*, 14, 37-52.
- Karunaratna, W.M., (2000), Employee Preference for Monetary Rewards in Sri Lankan Organisations, Unpublished MBA Research, Colombo, PIM.
- Luthans, F. (1998). *Organisational Behaviour*. 8th ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Manzoor, Q.A. (2012), Impact of Employees Motivation on Organizational Effectiveness. *European Journal of Business and Management*, ISSN 2222-1905 (Paper) ISSN 2222-2839 (Online) Vol 3, No.3.
- Minner, J.B., Ebrahimi, B., & Wachtel, J.M. (1995). How deficiency in management contributes to the United States' competitiveness problem and what can be done about it? *Human Resource Management*. Fall, p. 363.
- Perera, D.M.S. (2003), The Effectiveness of Performance Based Reward Systems in Motivating Senior Managers in the Commercial Banking Sector In Sri Lanka, Unpublished MBA Research, Colombo, PIM.
- Reena Ali and M.Shakil Ahmed (2009). The Impact Of Reward And Recognition Programs on Employee's Motivation And Satisfaction, *International Review of Business Research Papers* Vol. 5 No. 4 June 2009 Pp.270-279.
- Robbins, S.P. (2004). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, 10th edition.
- Salman K., Irshad M. Z. (2010). Job satisfaction among bank employees in Punjab, Pakistan: A comparative study. *European Journals of Social Sciences*, 17, 570-577.
- Sara L. Rynes, Barry Gerhart and Kathleen A. Minette (2004): The importance of pay in employee motivation: Discrepancies between what people say and what they do, *Human Resource Management* Volume 43 Issue 4 pp. 381-394.
- Serasinghe D, (1994), Monetary Rewards and Employee Motivation in Sri Lanka, Unpublished MBA Research, Colombo, PIM.
- Smithers GL, Walker DHT (2000). The effect of the workplace on motivation and demotivation of construction professionals. *Construction Management and Economics*. Australia: Melbourne. 18(7): 833-847.
- Tella, A., Ayeni, C. O., & Popoola, S. O., (2007). Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Organizational commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-16.
- Yazdani, B.O., Yaghoubi, N.M., & Giri, E.S. (2011). Factors affecting the Empowerment of Employees. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 20(2), 267- 274.

