EFFECTS OF EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION ON ORGANIZATIONAL PRODUCTIVITY: A CASE OF KENYA WILDLIFE SERVICE

Florence Njeri Karanja
PhD. Student in Business Administration, Jomo Kenyatta University of Agriculture and Technology, Kenya

Introduction

Different authors have defined motivation differently. According to Armstrong, motivation is concerned with the factors that influence people to behave in certain ways (Armstrong, 2006). Kreitner defines it as the psychological process that gives behavior purpose and direction (Kreitner, 1995). Higgins states that motivation is an internal drive to satisfy an unsatisfied need (Higgins, 1994) and Bedeian states that it is the will to achieve (Bedeian, 1993). Motivation can also be defined as the inner force that drives individuals to accomplish personal and organizational goals.

Motivation can be done in various ways, for example providing good working conditions, giving rewards, incentives and opportunities for learning to employees. Motivation in organizations is mainly done to achieve added value through people in the sense that the value of their output exceeds the cost generating it. This can only be achieved through discretionary effort, employees at work can choose how much effort they want to exert, they can do little or more and deliver added value. This discretionary effort can be a key component in organizational performance (Armstrong, 2006).

Motivated employees help organizations survive since they are more productive and effective (Smith, 1994). Well motivated employees are those with clearly defined goals and take action that they expect will achieve those goals. The organization as a whole can provide the context within which high levels of motivation can be achieved and they need to understand what motivates employees. Making work more interesting can be an example of a great motivator (Armstrong, 2006).

Over the past decades there have been many approaches to motivation, trying to understand what motivates employees. The most influential theories according to Armstrong are in three categories; Instrumentality Theory, Content/Need Theory and Process Theory (Armstrong, 2006).

The Instrumentality Theory states that people only work for money. It further states that a person is motivated to work if rewards and penalties are tied directly to his/her performance (Taylor, 1911) Taylor stated that it is not possible for workers to work harder than the average men around them and still get the same pay, they will work hard only if they are assured a large and permanent increase of pay. Skinner is also a contributor to this theory by developing the
The principle of reinforcement. He states that people can be conditioned to act in certain ways if they are rewarded for behaving as required (Skinner, 1953).

The basis of the Content Theory is the belief that the content of motivation consists of needs. Employees’ needs are to be satisfied or else it will create tension and a state of equilibrium. This theory was originally developed by Maslow. According to him, employees have five level needs; psychological, safety, social, ego and self actualization. (Maslow 1943). He argued that the lower level needs had to be satisfied before the next higher level need to motivate employees. Herzberg also identified a number of fundamental needs. He categorized motivation into two; satisfiers and dissatisfiers. He highlighted the two groups of factors affect job satisfaction (Herzberg, 1957). The intrinsic motivators/satisfiers include achievement, recognition of work, responsibility and growth while the extrinsic motivators or hygiene factors include pay and working conditions.

The basis of the process theory consists of Vroom whose contribution is based on the belief that employee effort links to the reward and it should be achievable and worthwhile (Vroom, 1964). According to Latham and Locke, performance of people will only improve if they have difficult but agreed goals and receive feedback. Adams contribution was that workers are better motivated if they are treated equitably. This can only be achieved if the rewards, employment practices and inputs are equal to other employee rewards, employment practices and inputs (Adams, 1965).

Background Information of Kenya Wildlife Service

Kenya Wildlife Service (KWS) is a State Corporation established by the Wildlife (Conservation and Management) Act, CAP 376 and The Wildlife (Conservation and Management) (Amendment) Act no. 16 of 1989. They provide for the establishment of national parks and national reserves and define how they are to be managed. The Environmental Management and Coordination Act (EMCA) of 1999 provides for the legal and administrative co-ordination of the diverse sectoral initiatives, including management and conservation of wildlife so as to improve the national capacity for the management of biodiversity and the environment in general.

The operations of the KWS are also impacted and guided by other overarching policy and legal frameworks (e.g. those relating to Forests, Fisheries, Mining, Lands, Water, Industry, Rural Development, Agriculture, Local Government, National Security, National Museums and the research programmes under KEFRI, KEMFRI and KARI) which necessitate structured and functioning relationships with other GOK departments/agencies and the international and local communities.
The Mandate of the Kenya Wildlife Service

The overall mandate of KWS is to conserve and manage wildlife in Kenya. KWS has sole jurisdiction over National parks. It also has a Supervisory role in the management of National Reserves, Local and Private Sanctuaries License control and supervise all wildlife conservation and management activities outside the protected areas. KWS conducts conservation Education and Training and Wildlife Research. KWS has several departments with a total number of 4,300 employees countrywide. The departments have various specialized functions that ensure organization and communication between the supervisors and employees. This can be summarized by their organizational chart shown on the next page. (Source: KWS HR Department)

Problem Statement

Different needs motivate different employees. Some want money; others want a word of praise. Some employees want power while others just want a good working environment. Employers therefore need to find out what motivates each employee. The employee needs relate to the work itself and how challenging the work is (Lauby, 2005).

Many employees in different organizations have various complaints such as poor pay, bias organizational policies and work structures, discrimination, lack of adequate protective clothing e.t.c. These issues lead to dissatisfaction of employees who in turn may affect the productivity of the organization negatively. It is therefore important for employers to acknowledge that they affect their employees’ motivation to perform. The employers should thus act positively in ways that will affect their employees’ motivation levels to perform at higher levels and work more effectively with others (Bruce and Pepitone, 1999).

The needs and motivation of employees should be the Primary focus of managers (Bedeian 1993). Understanding employee motivation by managers in KWS will thus lead to outcomes such as interesting work, responsibility growth and development on the job, and a sense of accomplishment and achievement which will help satisfy their employee’s needs and increase the productivity of the organization.

Objectives of the study

The study examined the effect of employee motivation on organizational productivity. The objectives of the study are:

1. To analyze how employee motivation leads to high employee retention.
2. To find out how motivation results to customer loyalty.
3. To establish the relationship between employee motivation and productivity of the organization.
Literature Review

Motivation is the performance or procedure of presenting an intention that induces a person to capture some accomplishment. According to Butkus & Green (1999), motivation is derived from the word “motivate”, which means to move, push or influence to proceed for fulfilling a want. Also motivation is a progression of moving and supporting goal-directed behavior (Chowdhury, 2007). It is an internal strength that drives individuals to pull off personal and organizational goals.

Organizational productivity fundamentally depends on many factors like performance appraisals, employee motivation, employee satisfaction, compensation, training and development, job security, organizational structure and others, but the area of this study is focused only on employee motivation as this factor highly influences the performance of employees and thus the productivity of the organization. Employee motivation is one of the policies of managers to increase effectual job management amongst employees in organizations (Shadare et al, 2009).

Employee Motivation on Employee Retention

Taylor and his colleagues interviewed 200 people who had recently changed employers about why they left their last jobs. They found that a mix of factors at work in most cases but concluded that push factors were a great deal more prevalent than the pull factors as causes of voluntary resignations (Taylor 2002). Very few people appear to leave jobs in which they are broadly happy in search of something even better. Instead the picture is overwhelmingly one in which dissatisfied employees seek alternatives because they no longer enjoy working for their current employer.

Samuel and Chipunza (2009) looked at why long-serving staff had remained in their jobs, rather than focusing on why leavers left. Their study took place in four large South African organizations, two in the private sector and two in the public sector. They found that the four key factors that served to retain staff were motivating them through; training and development, giving challenging and interesting work, allowing freedom for innovative thinking and job security. It would follow logically that organizations that do not provide these to their people will lose staff to competitors who can.

There’s some debate about the extent to which raising pay levels reduces staff turnover. On the other hand there is evidence to show that that on average employers who offer the most attractive reward packages have lower attrition rates than those who pay poorly (Gerhatt 2009) an assumption which leads many organizations to pay rates as their prime weapon in retaining staff (White 2009). On the other hand there’s evidence that suggests that pay is a good deal less important than other factors in a decision to quit one’s job (Bevan et al.1997; Taylor2002)
The consensus among researchers specializing in retention issues is that pay has a role to play as a satisfier, but that it will not usually have an effect when other factors are pushing an individual towards quitting. Raising pay levels may thus result in greater job satisfaction where people are already happy with their work, but it will not deter unhappy employees from leaving. Sturges and Guest (1999), in their study of leaving decisions in the field of graduate employment, summed up their findings as follows: As far as they are concerned, while challenging work will compensate for pay, pay will never compensate for having to do boring, unstimulating work.

Recent findings thus appear to confirm the views expressed by Herzberg (1966) that their pay is a “hygiene factor” rather than a motivator. This means that it can be a cause of dissatisfaction at work, but not of positive job satisfaction. Employees may be motivated to leave an employer who is perceived as paying badly, but once they are satisfied with their pay, additional increases have little effect. Using pay as a measure to retain staff also has a disadvantage because it is an approach that is very easily matched by competitors. It is important that employees do not perceive their employers to be treating them inequitably. Provided pay levels are not considerably lower than those paid by an organization’s labour market competitors, other factors will usually be more important contributors towards high labour turnover levels. If employers are paying competitive salaries, little purpose is served by increasing them further. The entity can make itself more attractive in its recruitment processes, but the retention will be limited. The wage costs will also increase.

An organization can be more competitive if it enhances its benefits packages, because they are less easily imitated or matched by competitors. The benefits may include staff discounts, holiday entertainments, pension schemes or healthcare schemes. These benefits are appreciated more by staff and are more likely to have a positive effect on staff turnover than simply paying higher base wages. However, research evidence suggests that except for older employees who have completed many years of service, most pension schemes are not sufficiently valued by staff to cause them to stay in a job with which they are dissatisfied (Taylor 2009).

A major cause of job dissatisfaction, and hence high staff turnover is the experience of having one’s high hopes of new employment dashed by the realization that it is not going to be as enjoyable or stimulating as anticipated. Managing expectations reduces high labour turnover during the early months of employment (Wanous 1922; Breaugh 2008). The need is to strike a balance at the recruitment stage between sending out messages which are entirely positive and sending out those which are realistic. Therefore it is important not to mislead candidates about the nature of the work that they will be doing.

Realistic job previews are most important when candidates, for whatever reason cannot know a great deal about the job for which they are applying. This may be because of limited past experience or it may be because the job is relatively unusual and not based in a type of workplace with which job applicants are familiar. The realistic job preview is highly appropriate in such a situation as a means of avoiding recruiting people who subsequently leave within a few
weeks. The importance of unmet expectations as an explanation for staff turnover is also stressed by Sturges and Guest (1999), in their work on the retention of newly recruited graduates. A solution, apart from the introduction of more honest recruitment literature, is to provide periods of work experience for students before they graduate. Internship in an organization is the best possible way of finding out exactly what a particular job or workplace is really like.

Gregg and Wadsworth, (1999) show in their analysis of 870,000 workers starting new jobs in 1992 that as many as 17% had left within three months and 42% within 12 months. No doubt a good number of these departures were due to either to poorly managed expectations or to ineffective inductions.

Rankin (2006) demonstrates that employers in the UK rarely evaluate their induction programmes in terms of the impact they are having. Employees are asked from time to time to rate specific induction courses, but it is rare for more sophisticated analysis to be carried out. As a result the programmes themselves are not always designed very effectively. They reflect what managers think new employees need in their first week of work and not what employees may actually need. They also tend to be standardized across organizations, little thought being given to the particular requirements of different employee groups (Wolf 2009). Given these findings it is fair to conclude that there is room for a good deal of improvement in this area of HR work and that improved employee retention may well be a result.

Providing flexible working opportunities is a very good way of retaining staff, particularly when organizations do more than their competitors. This is because juggling family and work responsibilities is a big issue in many employees’ lives and because evidence suggests that it is thus hugely appreciated by them (Di Petro et al 2007)

Many employees especially women nowadays take voluntary resignations from jobs in due to the inability to juggle the demands of a job with those of the family. According to Hom and Griffeth (1995), they quote an American research indicating that 33% of women quit their jobs to devote more time to their families. The women are individuals of great talent, highly competent with good experience that can be a great loss to an entity. Organizations should thus consider employment practices that are more family friendly. This can be done by provision of more paid maternity leave, offering child care vouchers, providing career breaks by allowing people to take a few months off and flexible work systems which will lead to the retaining of employees and remaining competitive. This is because juggling family and work responsibilities is a big issue in many employees’ lives and because evidence suggests that it is hugely appreciated by them (Di Petro et al, 2007)

Training and Development enhance employee commitment to an employer making them less likely to leave voluntarily than they would if no training were offered. (Green et al, 2000). Training which can be paid for by the employer is a good deal less likely to raise job mobility than that paid for by the employee or the government. The most type of training
intervention involves long-term courses of study such as an MBA. In financing such courses, employers are sending a very clear signal to the employees concerned that their contribution is valued and that they can look forward to substantial career advancement if they opt to stay. The fact that leaving will also mean an end to the funding for the course, and in some cases a requirement to pay back a sum equivalent to the fees, provides more direct incentives to remain with the sponsoring employer.

**Employee Motivation on Customer loyalty**

Customer loyalty is the willingness of a customer to continue patronizing a firm over the long term, and recommending the firm’s products to friends and associates (Lovelock and Wirtz, 2011). Customer loyalty mostly emanates from excellent customer service and it is widely seen as a key determinant of a firm’s profitability, since customers are the source of every company’s revenue.

Well managed customer retention programmes that are based on communication and tactics and which strive to improve customer service are generally used to encourage customers’ loyalty in a competitive market place (Malan, 2003). Research points out the fact that effective customer service satisfies customers and in turn increases customer loyalty. Customer service can be defined as what a customer expects and the perceptions of how these services are performed. (Lewis and Booms, 1983) Effective customer service effectively builds commitment and loyalty. This is due to the fact that customers like to feel appreciated and the best way of achieving this is by developing favourable relationships between employees and customers.

Gitomer (1998) asserts that the most important brick in the foundation of customer service is being friendly. This can only be achieved by motivating the employees in a number of ways. A friendly foundation is further complimented by a positive attitude which represents the best possibility of creating a positive customer perception of the organizational image.

Organizations should provide high quality customer service to build and maintain the commitment and loyalty of their best customers (Levy and Weitz, 2007). Heskett et al. (1994), cited by Wiles,(2007) suggest that customer service will lead to increase in an organization’s productivity. He proposes that customer service created positive customer cognitions and behaviours such as satisfaction and loyalty that create financial benefit for an entity (Wiles, 2007). Satisfaction thus leads to customer loyalty (Anderson and Mittal, 2000).

Customer loyalty can also be enhanced through a well organized employee training. According to Cram (1994), employee training requires the right staff with the right attitude. There should also be clear operational controls for employees and communication should be clear and relevant to the fulfillment of organizational goals and objectives. This motivates the employees and provides them with a sense of direction on how to solve problems and thus serve customers effectively.
Employee Motivation on Performance of the Organization

The corporate goal of every organization is to survive. If it can make a profit or crate a surplus at the same time, it’s even better. But a corporate entity by itself does not make profits, people do. The sum total of all employees’ efforts and the efforts of distributors creates the wealth which allows the company to invest in new systems, products and services for its future survival. Almost everyone has the capacity to perform better, whether they produce documents, deliver services or create company policy. Individual one-to-one coaching can help but the most cost effective solution is a group performance improvement programme. The regular use of these programmes can help identify what your current operating standards are, how your organization really functions and what capacity for improvement there might be. Organizations can improve such standards through specific training, better internal communication, regular feedback and appropriate rewards to create incremental benefits at every level in business. Improving performance is the goal of most organizations today (Fisher, 2008).

An internally satisfied, delighted and motivated worker or employee is very productive in an organization thus contributing in efficiency and effectiveness of organization which leads to maximization of profits (Matthew et al, 2009). Among financial, economic and human resources, the latest are more essential and have the capability to endow a company with competitive edge as compared to others. A motivated employee is responsive of the definite goals and objectives he/she must achieve, therefore he/she directs efforts in that direction.

Employees want to earn a reasonable salary and payment, and employers desire their workers to feel that is what they are getting (Houran. J). Money is the fundamental inducement, no other incentive or motivational technique can come close to it with respect to its influential value. It has the supremacy to magnetize, maintain and motivate individuals towards higher performance.

Frederick Taylor and his scientific management associate described money as the most fundamental factor in motivating the industrial workers to attain greater productivity (Tella et al, 2007). Research has suggested that reward can cause satisfaction of the employee which directly influences performance of the employee Rewards hopefully contribute to firm’s effectiveness by influencing individual or group behavior. All businesses use pay, promotion, bonuses or other types of rewards to motivate and encourage high level performances of employees (Ali et al, 2009). To use salaries as a motivator effectively, managers must consider salary structures which should include the importance in which the organization attach to each job, payment according to performance, personal or special allowances, fringe benefits, pensions and so on (Tella et al, 2007).

Organizations can consider this option but it should be known that money is an expensive way to incentivize or reward behavioural change. Offering more money may change the speed at which people work but it does not in isolation, solve the problem of lack of focus or inefficient working practices. Nor does it instill long-term loyalty, (Fisher, 2008). Motivation is the power that
strengthens behavior, gives route to behavior, and triggers the tendency to continue (Abadi et al, 2011). This explanation identifies that in order to attain assured targets and increase productivity in sales and profits; individuals must be satisfactorily energetic and be clear about their destinations.

Porter and miles (1974) proved that the motivation boosts expresses and continues conduct. The motivation of an individual envelops all the motives for which he selects to operate in a definite approach. Motivated employees focus their job and work-life with additional importance and this leads to constant progress in coordination and work procedures. Employees execute their finest novelties and thoughts with the sense of belonging, enthusiasm, and delight, in empowered organizations. Adding up, they work with a sense of responsibility and prefer benefits of the organization to theirs (Yazdani, B.O et al, 2011).

If an organization wants to improve and be successful, trust plays a significant role so it should always be preserved to ensure an organization’s existence and to enhance employees’ motivation (Annamalai, T, 2010). It can make intrapersonal and interpersonal effects and influence on the relations inside and out the organization (Hassan et al, 2010). No matter how automated an organization may be, high productivity depends on the level of motivation and the effectiveness of the workforce so staff training is an indispensable strategy for motivating workers. One way managers can instigate motivation is to give appropriate information on the sentences of their actions on others (Tella et al, 2007).

According to Maurer (2001) rewards and recognition are essential factors in enhancing employee job satisfaction and work motivation which is directly associated to organizational achievement (Jun et al., 2006). Motivation is illustrated that the distribution of power and control enhances organizational effectiveness. (Honold, L, 1997). Empowerment is defined as an approach to leadership that empowers subordinate as a main constituent of managerial and organizational effectiveness (Honold, L, 1997).

Employee contribution and their energetic participation in configuring up the organization are tremendously essential to the hale and hearty place of work (Matthew, J, 2009). Employee empowerment and participation consists of contribution of employees in administration and decision making associated to policies, objectives and strategies of the organization. Employees’ perceptive of the goals, standards and political principles of their firms are positively and significantly related to employee motivation and gratification towards work thus increasing productivity (Ali et al, 2009).

Empowerment directs faster decision of customer troubles for the reason that employees did not dissipate time referring customer objections to managers. Increased autonomy enhances work productivity, amplifies employees’ wisdom of self-efficacy and their motivation to get upon and complete certain tasks (Mani, V, 2010). Employee participation in organization measures develop motivation and job-satisfaction level (Ali et al, 2009). Moreover, the loyalty of
employees towards the organization and the higher the motivation works best for the effectiveness and growth of a business.

Thus motivation of employees increases the sales and profits of any organization. Organizations can also offer stock options for improved company performance, but it takes some time for the figures to be generated and there may be a little correlation between an ordinary individual’s performance and the success of the company as a whole. There is also strong evidence that performance-related pay for senior managers often randomly awarded and fails to promote lasting organizational improvement (John Fisher, 2008).
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