Payoff

Employees who are motivated perform their jobs better. IS managers can enhance and leverage the human resource capability of their departments by understanding the role motivation plays in creating a responsive and productive IS staff. This article describes an effective method for managers to identify the motivational issues for individual employees. In addition, it proposes strategies for administering and scheduling these factors as consequences of employee performance.

Introduction

The question of how to motivate staff members remains one of the most challenging issues managers face. Because managers often are promoted into management from technical positions they may not be prepared to deal with such perplexing, ill-defined issues as motivating staff.

This article extracts from leading motivational theory some practical motivational guidelines for the IS manager. Second, it presents an effective and efficient method of identifying motivational issues for individual employees. Finally, it proposes strategies for administering and scheduling these factors as consequences of employee performance.

Drawing from the Best of Motivational Theories

The most highly regarded motivational theories developed during the past 50 years include Maslow's need hierarchy, reinforcement, attribution theory, Herzberg's dual-factor theory, expectancy theory, and goal setting. Only the essential points of each of these theories are reviewed; the sequence of discussion is based on progression of thought rather than chronological order.

Need Hierarchy

A.G. Maslow contended that individuals are motivated to satisfy the following set of needs:

- Basic physiological needs.
- Safety and security.
- Social activity.
- Esteem and status.
- Self-actualization.
Individuals fulfill these needs sequentially, starting with physiological needs and ascending up the hierarchy to self-actualization. As a need becomes satisfied, it loses effectiveness as a motivator.

The major contribution of Maslow's theory is the notion that motivation is achieved by identifying the needs of an employee and linking the satisfaction of those needs to the performance desired by the manager. For example, if an employee has a need for esteem, a manager could communicate that satisfactory performance on a project will result in recognition and visibility within the organization, thereby enhancing the employee's opinion of self-worth.

**Dual-Factor Theory**

F. Herzberg proposed a motivational theory based upon dual factors that concern employees—hygiene and motivational factors. Hygiene (or maintenance) factors are associated with company policy and administration, working conditions, salary, interpersonal relations, personal life, job security, and status. The absence of these factors results in dissatisfaction, whereas their presence results in no dissatisfaction. In either case, they are not considered useful motivators. By contrast, motivational factors are associated with the work itself, achievement, growth, responsibility, and recognition. The presence of these factors provides motivation.

Although Herzberg's theory has its weaknesses, aspects of it are useful. In particular, job enrichment, advancement, achievement, recognition, growth on the job, and responsibility are useful concepts for positively motivating employees. However, the natures and needs of different employees and jobs must be considered. Depending on the situation, strategies such as job enrichment may be ineffective.

**Goal Setting**

E.A. Locke proposed a model of task motivation based on the premise that an employee's conscious attention to goals is the primary determinant of motivation. This theory, called goal setting, also asserts that difficult goals result in greater effort than generalized goals or a lack of goals.

Research supports this proposition, with one qualification. For difficult goals to be effective motivators, they must be accepted by the employees as being realistic and worthwhile. Employee participation in goal setting facilitates acceptance of goals; however, there is no conclusive evidence that performance improves through participatory goal setting.

**Reinforcement**

According to B.F. Skinner and others in the area of reinforcement (or behavior modification) theory, behavior is a result of consequences. The behavior an employee chooses is influenced by the consequences or perceived consequences of the behavior. An employee learns through experience what behavior results in which consequences. Therefore, the manager must administer consequences in a manner that elicits the desired behavior from employees.

For example, a systems analyst who is behind schedule on a project can choose either to allow the project to be late or to work overtime to complete the project on schedule. If completing a project on schedule is reinforced, that behavior is motivated and more likely to recur. If meeting or not meeting a project deadline goes unnoticed (i.e., either behavior
results in the same consequences), there is little organization-based motivation to complete
the project on schedule, even though the employee may be internally motivated (e.g., from
pride or a sense of responsibility) to complete the project on schedule anyway.

There are four basic reinforcement strategies:

- **Positive reinforcement.** The manager presents a desirable consequence following
  particular employee behavior, causing an increase in the occurrence of that behavior.

- **Negative reinforcement.** The manager withdraws an undesirable consequence
  following particular employee behavior, causing an increase in the occurrence of that
  behavior.

- **Punishment.** The manager presents an undesirable consequence following particular
  employee behavior, causing a decrease in the occurrence of that behavior.

- **Extinction.** The manager withhold a desirable consequence from an employee
  following particular behavior, causing a decrease in the occurrence of that behavior.

Reinforcement theory raises some concerns about manipulating people; however, it can
be useful to managers attempting to motivate employees. An operational problem with
reinforcement theory is the difficulty in determining exactly what reinforces behavior in
different employees. Often managers make incorrect assumptions and can actually punish
an employee when attempting to provide positive reinforcement. Promoting someone into
management who really prefers technical tasks is an example of incorrect application of
this strategy. For reinforcement strategies to work, a manager must assess what reinforces
behavior in different employees and administer consequences accordingly.

**Expectancy**

V. Vroom's expectancy theory of motivation is based on the concepts of valence (i.e.,
the effective orientation toward particular outcomes, both positive and negative),
epectancy (i.e., employees' view of the risk or probability of their performing a task and
belief that it will be followed by a particular outcome), and force (i.e., the combined effect
of valence and expectancy that directs the employee to engage in certain behavior).

Expectancy theory provides one of the better frameworks for analyzing and
understanding motivation. To address valence, the manager needs to identify outcomes that
are valued by the employee. To address expectancy, the manager needs to focus on two
issues. First, the manager must ensure that the employee is able to perform as required. To
accomplish this, the employee may need training, assistance, or more self-confidence, for
example. Second, the employee must believe that if he or she performs as required, the
desired outcome will be forthcoming. To accomplish this, the manager must closely link
performance to outcome, possibly through incentive plans, merit raises, promotion, praise,
or better communication.

**Attribution Theory**

Attribution theory involves what F. Heider originally termed a “naive psychology” and
describes how the average individual explains (attributes) causes of events. This approach
is less stimulus-response oriented than reinforcement theory and therefore has a more
human orientation.
An individual may believe that events were caused by factors under control of the environment or under control of a person. Exhibit 1 illustrates how four important factors for success may be classified according to two dimensions. For example, a developer describes a successful systems implementation as a job well done (implying internal attributions), but users may attribute the success to other factors. If past performance has been stable, the developer perceives his or her own ability to be the reason for success. The users may believe that the task is simply not difficult. If there was previously wide variation in success, the developer may feel that effort explains current success, whereas the users may attribute success to luck.

### Classification of Success Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Internal</th>
<th>External</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Stable Ability</td>
<td>Task Difficulty</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unstable</td>
<td>Effort Luck</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

For IS, casual inferences may have impact on motivation. If an individual considers luck or task difficulty to be a major success factor, levels of effort may be undesirably low. Experiments that specifically address IS issues are needed for proper applications of the theory.

### Practical Guidelines

Though each of the preceding theories takes a somewhat different view of motivation, some general guidelines can be extracted from each for the manager's practical use. Specifically, the following guidelines emerge:

- Efforts to increase motivation must first focus on the employee's needs.

- Work assignments and goals should be realistic and clearly defined; rewards for performance should be practical and should fulfill the motivational needs of the employee. Employees must be competent to do the work required and must believe that their needs will be reasonably fulfilled by the work and the rewards of having done the work well.

- Consequences or outcomes of good performance must approximate the expectations of the employee.

These guidelines are simple enough to understand but extremely difficult to apply effectively and efficiently. The reasons: First, employees' needs are difficult to define because they vary among employees and change over time. Frequently, employees are not even sure themselves what they want from their work experience. Second, management is often negligent in clearly defining for employees what is expected of them, or managers are not responsive to employee needs when employees are responsive to organizational demands.

The issues of identifying employee needs and effectively using them as motivators are addressed in the next two sections. First, a method for identifying employee needs is
presented; subsequently, strategies for effectively administering consequences or outcomes are discussed.

**Identifying Employee Needs**

When it comes to assessing employee needs, it is a case of different strokes for different folks; in fact, it is different strokes at different times for each individual. In assessing the needs of a particular employee, a manager must be careful and specific. Statistics on what in general motivates a category of employees may be irrelevant to particular employees. For example, on the average most programmers would be motivated by an opportunity to work with new technology. However, a programmer who is lacking confidence may see such an opportunity as a threat to his or her job security.

**Progressive Binary Sort Method**

The progressive binary sort is a method of assessing the preferences of individuals. Incorporated into the motivation strategy for business professionals, this technique provides a fairly reliable indication of personnel needs both at the present and in the future, and it has been used successfully in a wide range of applications, including personnel analysis in high-technology professions.

The progressive binary sort is a comparative rating method in which individuals are required to rank available alternatives. This ranking is usually conducted within preference levels ranging from extremely desirable to extremely undesirable. The number of preference levels and the number of alternatives that are allowed to be included in a preference level are design decisions regarding the specific application.

**Motivational Categories and Statements**

Fifty statements representing job-related motivation factors are provided for the sort process, 5 within each of 10 major motivation categories (see [Exhibit 2](#)). Each category represents a potential area of motivation. The specific alternative statements within each category are based on pilot studies conducted by the authors.

**Motivational Categories and Related Statements**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Achievement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Successful completion of a major project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Mastery of a new, difficult skill</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Completion of a project made possible by the employee's contribution.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Inability to complete work assignment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Marginal performance record.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Responsibility</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Freedom to plan own work.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Responsibility for critical project.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Autonomous work environment.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Little latitude allowed to make own decisions.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Subordinate role in work assignment.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Advancement</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Promotion within technical or administrative ranks.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Lateral move for opportunity for promotion.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Assigned management position over current peer group.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Present position maintained.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Demotion accepted to remain employed.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
For each of the 10 motivational categories there are 3 positive statements and 2 negative statements. The use of both positive and negative statements provides a balanced perspective for each motivational category. The use of one more positive than negative statement provides a slightly positive bias, which is appropriate for this type of sort because many respondents will be indifferent about some positive statements.

Individuals' comparative evaluations of alternatives change over time. For example, an employee may view a promotion into management as undesirable today but may desire it three years from now. In designing a motivational strategy for an employee, the manager needs to know current as well as forecasted needs and aspirations of an employee. To compensate for the time factor, respondents conduct three sorts. The first sort represents current attitudes. The second and third sorts reflect attitudes as projected into the future—one and three years, respectively.

**Motivation Profiles**

MOTIVATOR is an interactive, computer-based system, designed by the authors, to generate individual motivation profiles based on the normal distribution pattern derived from the progressive binary sort process. Designed to operate on an IBM or compatible microcomputer, the system allows an individual to interactively sort job-related motivation factor statements, then immediately review summary information of the resulting motivation profile. The system is also capable of analyzing the distribution of a cluster of statements related to a specific motivational category, further enhancing the user's understanding of the individual profile.

Exhibit 3a is an example of the list of 10 motivational categories ranked according to an individual's preference. The graph in Exhibit 3b better illustrates the relative differences between the motivation categories considered most important in the example.

**Individual Motivation Profile**

The tool calculates a composite value for each motivation category based on the relative position (preference level) of the 5 related motivation factor statements. Greater significance is attributed to the positively oriented statements on the basis of a higher order of preference, and to the negatively oriented statements on the basis of a lower order of preference. Thus, the motivation category that is most significant has the highest composite value of the 5 statements related to that category. A comparison of the relative value of each category indicates an individual motivational profile for each employee. Individual profiles can then be combined to develop composite profiles for departments and job classifications. The composite can be used to analyze groups of employees in order to compare a specific employee's motivational profile with the overall profile of one or more groups.

**Interpreting Motivation Profiles**

The motivation profile is instructive to both the employee and the manager. The comparative ranking process puts into perspective the incentives that may be available to an employee. For example, few employees would not like a 15% increase in salary, but for some people a 15% salary increase may be a second choice to an interesting work
assignment. This information is helpful to the employee's manager when a 15% salary increase may not be possible but an interesting work assignment is. Accordingly, the manager has at least one incentive to offer that is valued by the employee. To systematically interpret and evaluate an employee's motivation profile the manager can take several steps.

**Step One.**

The manager can review the ranking of statements, focusing on the statements ranked in the desirable and undesirable ends of the distribution pattern. These are the items that are most important to the employee.

**Step Two.**

Managers can discuss the rankings with the employee to determine how the employee relates the statements to his or her situation. For example, if an employee has ranked “freedom to plan own work” as extremely desirable, the manager needs to know what specifically that statement means to the employee and whether or not that need is fulfilled by the current work situation. If the work situation does not fulfill this need, the manager must ask the employee what changes are required in the work situation to allow the employee adequate freedom to plan his or her own work. (For negative statements, the manager must modify questions to see whether the employee was dissatisfied about a statement and under what conditions that dissatisfaction could be resolved.)

**Step Three.**

After the evaluation of the current motivation profile is complete, steps 1 and 2 are repeated for the sorts that represent employee attitudes as projected into the future. Questions asked of employees in step 2 are modified to a future time frame (e.g., “What type of advancement into administrative ranks is the employee looking for in three years?”). For example, an employee with a technical degree who wants to move into management in three years may be advised to pursue an MBA degree on a part-time basis.

**Examining Incentive and Rewards Alternatives**

This type of discussion gives the manager insight into what an employee wants from the job and provides the framework for developing a relevant incentive system and career path planning strategy for the employee. The manager can then begin to communicate what is required of the employee to maintain fulfillment (if a need is currently fulfilled) or achieve fulfillment (if a need is not fulfilled). The manager can also discuss how to avoid the outcomes the employee considers to be undesirable. The result is better understanding and communication, more realistic expectations, and a fairly reliable indication of incentives that motivate an employee.

An analysis can also be made comparing an employee's profile with the group profile or an employee's profile with a profile of that employee as perceived by the manager. These comparisons can help the manager devise more effective incentive and reward programs. **Exhibit 4a** compares the motivation category lists of a manager's perceived profile of an employee (left column) with the employee's actual profile (right column). **Exhibit 4b** is a graphic representation of the same comparison. The solid bar indicates the manager's perceived profile and that patterned bar indicates the employee's actual profile.
Administering Consequences

The use of MOTIVATOR can facilitate the difficult task of identifying and assessing relevant motivational issues for an employee. Once these issues have been defined, the next step is to properly convey to employees the organizational requirements that must be fulfilled if they are to have their motivational needs fulfilled. Then, rewards for good performance must be effectively administered. Methods for conveying requirements and administering consequences are discussed following a review of positive and negative control strategies.

Positive Versus Negative Control

An individual's motivation profile can be used to determine the basic reinforcers of behavior through positive and negative control strategies. The statements ranked as desirable in an employee's profile provide a repertoire of positive reinforcements for a manager to use as incentives for an employee. The statements ranked as undesirable in an employee's motivation profile offer alternatives for negative reinforcement and punishment.

Although negative control can influence employee behavior, it often has undesirable side effects. Perhaps the most common is that an employee develops fear of or resentment toward a manager who frequently presents undesirable consequences. Employees avoid that manager. Negative control also tends to elicit dysfunctional emotional behavior, such as anger and a desire for revenge.

Positive control is virtually without undesirable side effects. Because positive control provides employees with desirable consequences, the manager is usually regarded cordially. Employees tend to do what is requested of them, and dysfunctional emotional behavior is not provoked.

To administer positive control, an employee must first exhibit desirable behavior. A manager must wait for desirable behavior to occur before it can be reinforced. Time and patience are required.

Though positive reinforcement is generally considered more effective and desirable, managers employ negative control strategies for several reasons. First, negative control is closely aligned with traditional values (e.g., the “eye for an eye” philosophy). Second, negative control is often satisfying to the manager applying it (i.e., a manager's frustrations are relieved by taking them out on a subordinate who has performed poorly). Third, negative control tactics require less effort and creativity (i.e., it is easier to punish an employee for undesirable behavior than to develop a positive control strategy). Finally, negative control can be applied more quickly than positive control. For example, when employees make mistakes, they can be punished immediately. In certain situations, as in the case of security violations or reckless behavior that endangers the safety of other employees, a manager may not be able to wait to correct the behavior.

When positive control strategies require too much time or are not achieving desired results, negative control must be used. Negative control can be combined with positive control to minimize undesirable side effects. If programmers are punished for not
completing a project on time, they can quickly be given another project to rectify the situation. If the programmers complete this next project on schedule, positive reinforcement is provided. The information provided from an individual motivation profile provides several alternatives for selecting an appropriate reinforcement for the situation. When employees are subjected to any negative control tactic, they should be immediately provided with an opportunity to obtain positive reinforcement.

Conveying Organizational Requirements: Three Strategies

Managers must properly inform employees of what is expected of them in order to obtain desired outcomes. Failure to do so can result in frustration, confusion, and poor performance from employees. There are three straightforward strategies for conveying performance requirements: communication, imitation, and shaping. Each strategy can be used with positive control or negative control.

Communication

Communication is the most straightforward positive control strategy. It consists of clearly articulating to an employee, preferably at the beginning of a work relationship, what the expectations are for the employee’s performance. If the employee adopts the desired behavior, the employee should be provided with positive reinforcement.

In spite of the simplicity of this approach, managers frequently fail to capitalize on it. Managers are often too busy or are simply negligent about providing necessary reinforcement, and this is unfortunate. Employees can be impressionable, especially when a new work relationship is being developed. If a manager fails to systematically reinforce an employee for desired behavior, the frequency of that behavior will decrease unless it is reinforced by some other means.

If a programmer meets several demanding programming deadlines that were requested by the manager, and the manager fails to recognize (i.e., to otherwise reinforce) the programmer’s efforts, the programmer may assume that the manager is not sincere about the importance of meeting deadlines. Therefore, the programmer may decide not to be as concerned or as punctual about future deadlines. The manager would then have to use negative control strategies to change the programmer’s behavior.

In short, the manager would miss the opportunity to use a more effective and efficient positive control strategy. The programmer would be disappointed for not getting credit for a job well done and would be humiliated at having subsequent performance criticized. Proper use of positive control can prevent a work relationship from deteriorating to the point at which negative control is required.

Imitation

Imitation can be used in situations in which a manager’s expectations have been communicated but an employee is still not exhibiting the desired behavior. The manager can tactfully but publicly reward (i.e., through a promotion or salary increase) another employee who is performing effectively.

This approach allows the manager to avoid criticizing the employee who is not yet performing up to standards and thereby allows the relationship between the manager and the underachiever to remain positive. The objective is to provide a behavior model for the underachiever to emulate. If the underachiever takes the cue and properly imitates improved behavior, the manager administers positive reinforcement.
An effective means for establishing an environment for imitation is to either hire or transfer an outstanding employee into a group of underachievers. The new employee can then set a new standard for the underachievers to imitate. The new employee must also be given reinforcement so as not to be pressured by the underachievers to lower performance standards.

**Shaping**

This third strategy can be applied in combination with communication or imitation. In many situations, employees attempting to perform in a manner consistent with management expectations may not perform totally as desired; that is, they will approximate what has been requested. In these cases, a manager can shape (or mold) substandard behavior into the desired behavior. Initially, the manager reinforces any behavior that approximates the desired behavior. As reinforcement is administered, the manager indicates how the performance can be improved even more.

Over time, the manager becomes more discriminating in what is reinforced, thereby establishing a higher standard that more closely aligns with the desired behavior. If the shaping process is systematically applied, the employee will eventually achieve the desired behavior.

**Scheduling Reinforcement**

Scheduling reinforcement is often as important as the consequence administered. It is usually not practical to reinforce employees each time they exhibit desirable behavior. Often reinforcement has to be administered periodically. An effective reinforcement has to be devised.

There are two basic types of scheduling: continuous and intermittent. Intermittent scheduling consists of subtypes: fixed ratio, variable ratio, fixed interval, and variable interval. A description of these reinforcement schedules is provided in Exhibit 5.

**Reinforcement Schedules**
<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Schedule</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Examples</th>
<th>Effects</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Continuous</td>
<td>Ongoing reinforcement presented each time behavior occurs.</td>
<td>Piecework (e.g., paid for every task).</td>
<td>--High rate of behavior acquisition. --Continuous high rate of performance. --Rapid extinction when reinforcers are withdrawn. --May result in early satiation.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intermittent</td>
<td>Fixed reinforcement presented after a fixed time period.</td>
<td>Monthly wage, scheduled evaluations.</td>
<td>--Pronounced performance pause. --Leads to less consistent rates of behavior.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variable ratio reinforcement presented after a certain number of times—the number varies around an average.</td>
<td>Sales bonuses or commissions.</td>
<td>--Performance consistently high. --Extinction slower. --Considered the best schedule.</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Variable interval reinforcement presented after a certain time interval—the length of time varies around an average.</td>
<td>Pop quizzes or evaluations; praise; recognition.</td>
<td>--Tends to produce sustained performance. --High frequency does not speed up reinforcement.</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

If a behavior is being continuously reinforced, it will probably stop if the manager stops (consciously or unconsciously) commending the employee. When continuous reinforcement is withdrawn, the change in consequences is noticed by the employee. Therefore, if continuous reinforcement is not practical, a manager is wise not to start it.

The fixed ratio and fixed interval schedules generally create cyclical behavior patterns. Employees usually repeat desired behavior as they approach the next scheduled reinforcement. Behavior frequency declines after reinforcement.

The cyclical nature of fixed ratio and fixed interval reinforcement scheduling indicates that total reliance on annual or monthly performance reviews for reinforcement will have disappointing results.

The variable ratio and variable interval schedules provide the most sustained performance level. An employee appears to be more reinforced by a schedule that introduces an element of surprise (i.e., an unexpected reward). Receiving unscheduled rewards such as promotions, salary increases, or recognition tells an employee that good performance is noticed and appreciated all the time, not just when reviews are scheduled.
However, in many organizations certain rewards can be provided only on a fixed ratio or fixed interval basis. For example, salary increases or promotions can be awarded only during an annual review. Other reinforcers are independent of fixed schedules.

**Conclusion**

By effectively administering consequences, IS managers can exert considerable influence over the behavior and productivity of their personnel. Though there are different points of view on motivation, certain practical guidelines can be drawn from existing motivational theory. First, motivation must focus on identification of employee needs. Second, work assignments and objectives should reasonably fulfill the needs of the employee. Third, consequences for good performance must approximate the needs of the employee.

Proper identification of an employee's motivational needs, possibly through the creation of an individual motivation profile, must be combined with proper administration of consequences. Administration of consequences preferably is accomplished by using positive control strategies, though negative control strategies are often necessary. Positive control can be effected through communication, imitation, and shaping. Scheduling of reinforcement is most effective when using a variable ratio and variable interval scheduling rather than totally depending on traditional fixed interval or fixed ratio scheduling.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Category</th>
<th>Description</th>
<th>Comparative Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A</td>
<td>ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B</td>
<td>ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C</td>
<td>RECOGNITION</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D</td>
<td>ORGANIZATION POLICY</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E</td>
<td>RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>4.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F</td>
<td>MANAGEMENT RELATIONS</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G</td>
<td>WORKING CONDITIONS</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H</td>
<td>WORK ITSELF</td>
<td>3.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I</td>
<td>WAGE LEVEL</td>
<td>2.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J</td>
<td>LEISURE TIME</td>
<td>1.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Comparative Ranking value generally ranges between 1 and 10 based on the distribution of statements related to each Motivation Category. However, a negative ranking value is possible and will be indicated as such.
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<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivation Category</th>
<th>Comparative Rankings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>A ADVANCEMENT</td>
<td>7.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>B ACHIEVEMENT</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>C RECOGNITION</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>D ORGANIZATION POLICY</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>E RESPONSIBILITY</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>F MANAGEMENT RELATIONS</td>
<td>5.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>G WORKING CONDITIONS</td>
<td>2.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>H WORK ITSELF</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>I WAGE LEVEL</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>J LEISURE TIME</td>
<td>3.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The Comparative Ranking value generally ranges between 1 and 10 based on the distribution of statements related to each Motivation Category. However, a negative ranking value is possible and will be indicated as such.

**a. Motivation Profile Comparison List**

**b. Motivation Profile Comparison Graph**

- **Supervisor's evaluation**
- **Employee's self-evaluation**