

Intrinsic versus Extrinsic Motivation in Employees: A Study of Industries in Gujarat

Sameer S. Pingle*
Tanvi Kothari**

When you ask employee what do you look for in a job, she/he lists many options: job security, good supervisor, high compensation, good working condition etc. Because of these different preferences, many companies have started giving basic sets of benefits. Pay is an important job attribute which has significant influence on job attractiveness. However, components of pay systems other than pay may affect the value of a job. If organizations knew the pay preferences of their potential applicants, it might be possible to increase their attractiveness without affecting labour costs. Compensation systems may act as signalling devices to job seekers, affecting job and organizational attractiveness by providing information about less visible organizational attributes (Gerhart and Milkovich, 1992; Rynes and Miller, 1983). Motivation is what makes a person want to do something. It gives a person energy and direct and sustained behaviour in a certain direction. Motivation can be either intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivation comes from inside a person. Extrinsic motivation is the incentive that results from the influence of outside.

* Faculty, Institute of
Management, Nirma
University, Ahmedabad

** Faculty, Shri Jairambhai
Patel Institute of Business
Administration and Computer
Application, NICM,
Gandhinagar

THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Abraham Maslow, a behavioral psychologist, proposed ways how intrinsic motivation might be stimulated. Maslow said that before a person can come to be motivated intrinsically, that person must satisfy his basic human needs. He postulated that there were five basic levels of human needs: physiological needs, safety needs, social needs, needs for esteem, and the need for self-actualization. The extrinsic needs must come first and only then can the intrinsic needs that signify meaningful motivation follow. Maslow's hierarchy of needs is closely related to extrinsic and intrinsic motivation.

In 1959, Frederick Herzberg, a behavioural scientist, proposed a two-factor theory or the motivator-hygiene theory. According to Herzberg, there are some job factors that result in satisfaction while there are others that prevent dissatisfaction. Further, the opposite of "satisfaction" is "no satisfaction" and the opposite of "dissatisfaction" is "no dissatisfaction". He classified various factors into motivators and hygiene factors. Motivators include recognition, sense of achievement, growth opportunities, promotions, meaningfulness of work etc. while hygiene factors include pay, company policies, administration policies, fringe benefits, physical working conditions, job security etc. One can easily classify motivators as intrinsic factors which cause job satisfaction among employees while hygiene factors are mostly extrinsic factors if they are properly executed resulting in no job dissatisfaction among employees.

Self Determination Theory (SDT) proposes that intrinsically motivated employees engage in their work primarily because the work itself is satisfying for them. In contrast, extrinsically motivated employees perform their work mainly because work has an association with a separable outcome, such as achievement, salary, status (Amabile *et al.*, 1994; Ryan and Deci, 2000 a). In a refined conceptualization of SDT, extrinsic motivation was further categorized into three types of controlled regulation that vary in their degree of relative autonomy, i.e. external regulation, introjected regulation and identified regulation (Ryan and Deci, 2000 b).

LITERATURE REVIEW

The terms intrinsic and extrinsic have found frequent use in the field of organizational behaviour (OB). The intrinsic-extrinsic distinction has been used to describe several factors and hypothetical constructs in OB, including motivation, needs, outcomes, satisfaction, rewards, and values. (Broedling, 1977)

Dozens of experimental and field studies have distinguished between intrinsically and extrinsically oriented individuals and examined the correlates and consequences of autonomous intrinsic motivation (IM) and controlled extrinsic motivation (EM). For example, control-based HRM which emphasizes on controlling, monitoring and maximizing outcomes of employee behavior evokes employees' EM toward their work. Commitment-based HRM pays attention to employees' competencies, commitment and development potential stimulates employees' IM toward their work (Mossholder *et al.*, 2011). Both theoretical and empirical evidence supports the idea that variability in employee attitudes and behaviors can be explained by individual differences in terms of motivation (e.g. Amabile *et al.*, 1994).

Deci and Ryan (2000) explained employee motivation on a continuum ranging from autonomous (IM) to controlled (EM) forms. This theory suggests that certain environmental conditions can flourish or diminish employee motivation, either intrinsic or extrinsic to some extent, but they cannot change employee motivational orientation completely. This means an Intrinsically motivated person's motivation may be reduced by the poor conditions of autonomy offered by this persons' environment but that would not turn himself into an extrinsic motivated person and vice versa

When an individual is motivated, he feels energized or inspired to act, whereas an unmotivated person feels no impetus to do so (Ryan and Deci, 2000 a). *Intrinsic motivation* is defined as the execution of a task or activity because of the inherent satisfaction arising from it rather than due to some separate outcome. Intrinsic motivation reflects the natural propensity of people toward learning and assimilation. Extrinsic motivation is defined as whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome.

Çınar, Bektaş, and Aslan (2011) studied the effectiveness of intrinsic and extrinsic factors on employee motivation. They found that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors affect employees while they achieve their tasks. Another result was that intrinsic factors are more motivating than extrinsic factors.

Lei (2010) conducted research on college students and found that intrinsically motivated individuals have been able to develop high regards for teaming various types of course information without the inclusion of external rewards or reinforcements. In contrast, extrinsically motivated individuals rely solely on rewards and desirable results to act as a catalyst for their motivation.

Haines, Saba, and Choquette (2008) explored how the motivational construct of intrinsic motivation for an international assignment relates to variables of interest in international expatriation research. They found that higher intrinsic motivation for an international assignment was associated with greater willingness to accept an international assignment and to communicate in a foreign language. Externally driven motivation for an international assignment was associated with perceiving more difficulties associated with an international assignment. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations for an international assignment were, however, associated with comparable reactions to organizational support.

Cameron and Pierce (1994), studied the effects of reinforcement/reward on intrinsic motivation. The findings of their research were that verbal praise and positive feedback increased people's intrinsic interest. Rewards could have a negative impact on intrinsic motivation when they were offered to people for engaging in a task without consideration of any standard of performance. The same reward became motivator if they were made contingent upon successful completion of task.

Clugston, Howell, and Dorfman (2000) studied whether individual measures of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and positive and negative affect predict a job seeker's attraction to organizations offering merit pay, skill-based pay, or broad banding. Intrinsic motivation was found to predict a decision for merit pay. Job seekers who were intrinsically motivated or experienced positive affect were attracted to pay plans that offer high levels of personal involvement.

SDT ON WORK MOTIVATION

Studies done by Grant (2008) and Grant *et al.* (2011) showed that the element of autonomy embedded in IM pulls individuals in the direction of approaching tasks, as those individuals view it as bringing enjoyment. A meta-analysis by Fried and Ferris (1987) suggested that the motivating potential of the work characteristics (thus IM) is associated with employee TP.

Building on Motowidlo, Borman, and Schmit (1997) work, it is argued that employee commitment as a variable of characteristic adaptations transmits the effect of work motivation to employee performance. This is important as IM has traditionally been regarded as a key attribute of high quality professional practice such as in healthcare sector (McDonald *et al.*, 2007). A study conducted in healthcare context reported motivation to enter a profession to be a strong predictor of occupational commitment of registered nurses

(Gambino, 2010). Once employees commit to their occupation and show willingness to remain in that occupation, they try to perform their tasks better despite the external constraints placed upon them (Ladebo, 2005).

In workplace settings, extrinsically motivated employees are sensitive to both implicit and explicit rewards (i.e. salary, promotion) and punishment (i.e. demotion, demission) from the organization (Podsakoff and MacKenzie, 1994). If an organization wants employees to perform well, both TP and CP need to be regulated or controlled. This means that extrinsically motivated employees not only care about the technical core (TP) but also about the broader environment in which the TP functions.

Extrinsically motivated employees are sensitive to organizational rewards and punishments. They are stimulated to develop their TP and CP in line with organizational goals. There is evidence that individual incentives, merit pay and bonuses, and gain-sharing can contribute to high performance (Gerhart and Milkovich, 1992). Once their performance meets the organizational requirements, they are expected to be rewarded by their organization. In arguing the relationship between employees' predisposition and their commitment, Knoke and Wright-Isak (1982) have pointed out that employees who have a stronger EM are supposed to be more committed to their organization compared to their less extrinsically motivated counterparts. Their commitment in turn stimulates employees to perform their work and fulfill their functions successfully in accordance to organizational needs. The satisfied employees further reciprocate their feelings by demonstrating high levels of affective commitment toward their organization (Blau, 1964). Empirical studies (Wang, 2010) have shown that EM is positively associated with employees' organizational commitment.

Although the evidence is mixed regarding the relative influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational elements, most of the motivation studies have found that both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational components are important (Krishnamurthy, 2006). However, many motivation theories treat motivation as a unitary concept that varies in amount rather than type (Ke and Zhang, 2010). Extant literature on work performance has suggested that employees' motivation is one of the key factors in promoting work performance (Pinder, 2011). As such, managers seek effective ways to support the motivation of their employees in order to improve employees' work performance (Imran *et al.*, 2014). According, the relationship between motivation and work performance has received considerable empirical attention in industrial and organizational psychology for many years (Steers, Mowday, and

Shapiro, 2004). Although the exact understanding of motivation continues to evolve (Kanfer, Chen, and Pritchard, 2012). However, extant literature suggests that sometimes individuals' behaviour cannot be well explained by either intrinsic interest or extrinsic incentives (Vansteenkiste, Niemiec, and Soenens, 2010). For instance, employees may engage in work activities because they feel responsible for their work or they identify with the importance of the work rather than being interested in their work (i.e. intrinsically motivated) or pressured to do it (external regulation). This sense of identifying the work as important is also a type of motivation within self-determination theory (SDT) and could therefore also promote various work outcomes (Burton *et al.*, 2006; Deci and Ryan, 2000).

Some have argued that, in the workplace, job performance is more closely related to extrinsic motivation than intrinsic motivation (Lazear, 2000) because most people work to earn a living. Thus, using monetary rewards and punishments as a central motivational strategy seem practical and appealing, and they are widely integrated into management systems in today's enterprises (Benabou and Jean, 2003). This indicates that managers are likely to consider extrinsic motivation as a core factor in promoting followers' performance. Second, most managers believe that contingent rewards serve as "positive reinforcements" for desired behaviours (Grant and Shin, 2011) because jobs are likely to be boring and lacking in interests value, so managers would view supporting intrinsic motivation as impractical. Further, employees' personal interest may not be directly related to what they need to do to perform well at work, and their goals may not align with those of the organization. Thus, when an individual's goals do not fit with the organization's goal, intrinsic motivation may at times fail as a motivational strategy for promoting work performance, although, empirical evidence does indicate that more autonomous motivation does on average promote more effective performance, especially high-quality performance (Cerasoli, Nicklin, and Ford, 2014). Intrinsically motivated employees are process-focused, because they see the work as an end in itself (Amabile, 1993). Further, they are also present-focused, because they are interested in their work *per se*, they are concerned with the experience of performing the work itself (Grant, 2008).

Research on career success of psychologists is scarce: first evidence suggests that psychologists put a lower value on earning money and a higher one on receiving social appreciation (Sobiraj, Schladitz, and Otto, 2016). Hence from the SDT viewpoint (Ryan and Deci, 2000 b), psychologists tend to be motivated less by external regulation. Newcomer literature has suggested that pre-entry expectations about intrinsic work aspects determine employees' perceptions about intrinsic work values (Taris, Feij, and Capel, 2006). This effect

is attributed to newcomers' pre-entry expectations that consciously or unconsciously influence their decision whether they will invest in the relationship with the organization (Taris, Feij, and Capel, 2006). In case that this exchange is perceived as inequitable, newcomers are likely to lessen their investments in the organization (Adams, 1965). In addition, according to person-job fit theory, which is a dimension of person-environment fit, the extent to which work environment fulfills employees' values, goals, and aspirations (needs-supplies fit) may elicit positive or negative experiences and cognitive outcomes (Kristof-Brown, Zimmerman, and Johnson, 2005). In this vein, prior empirical research has shown the relationship between job-person fit and facets of intrinsic motivation (Greguras and Diefendorff, 2009; Ru, 2012).

Various studies have been carried out to compare the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation along performance, job satisfaction, value system, organizational citizenship behaviour, job attractiveness, and acceptance of international assignments. No study is available to compare different demographic factors along with intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the Indian context, especially in Gujarat. This paper seeks to find answers to:

- What motivates employee at the workplace?
- Do motivational preferences change with age, gender, designation, and sector?

RESEARCH OBJECTIVES

- To explore the most preferred variables of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for an individual in relation to job
- To compare managers and non-manager's motivational needs
- To identify motivating variables for male and female employees
- To find out most preferred variables of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation for employees in manufacturing and service sector
- To find out extrinsic and intrinsic motivation preferences among employees

METHODOLOGY

The sampling frame consisted of working executives from manufacturing and service sector in Ahmedabad. There were 90 respondents in the sample. The instrument developed by Udai

Pareek, ‘What do you look for in a job?’ was used for the study. The reliability of the instrument was tested by calculating Cronbach Alpha. The value was found to be 0.71 which is satisfactory for such research.

Data Collection

Data was collected through a questionnaire. The questionnaire was personally explained to respondents by the researchers. They were asked to rank 14 factors on the basis of importance (1 being most preferred and 14 being least preferred). In selecting the sample, personal contacts of the researchers, convenience, and willingness of respondents to cooperate were major criteria. The demographic characteristics of the sample are shown in Table 1.

Table 1: Demographic Characteristics of Sample

Variables		Frequency	Per cent
Designation	Managers	46	51.11
	Non-managers	44	48.88
Gender	Female	19	21.11
	Male	71	78.88
Sector	Manufacturing	43	47.7
	Service	47	52.22
Experience (Years)	0 to 5	42	46.66
	6 to 10	24	26.66
	11 to 15	15	16.66
	16+	9	10

ANALYSIS AND DISCUSSION

The major thrust of the study was to investigate the impact of demographic factors on employee motivation. The following is the discussion based on the results obtained from the study.

Table 2: Employee Expectations from Jobs (Overall)

	Mean	SD
Job Security	4.87	4.10
Adequate Salary	4.94	3.58
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	5.12	3.30
Opportunities for promotion	5.91	3.31
Comfortable working conditions	5.99	3.35
Interesting work	6.29	2.99
Sound company policies and practices	6.83	3.55
Respect and Recognition	7.47	3.71
Responsibility and independence	7.63	3.68
Doing something worthwhile	8.72	3.34
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	9.01	4.11
Technically competent supervisor	10.67	3.28
Restricted hours of work	10.84	3.19
Pay according to ability and competence	10.93	2.63

Table 2 shows the overall mean and standard deviation of the different factors.

In Table 3, interesting work is given more importance by employees from the manufacturing sector (4.42) than employees from the service sector (5.77). For the service sector 'job security' is very important (4.32) compared with the manufacturing sector (5.47). 'Adequate salary' (4.55) is very important for service sector employees as compared with manufacturing sector employees (5.49). Table 4 also shows that there is a significant difference between service sector and manufacturing employees for this variable. 'Technically competent supervisor' and 'restricted hours of work' are not given much importance in both the sectors.

Table 3: Employee Expectations from Jobs (Overall)

	Manufacturing (43)		Service (47)	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Interesting work	4.42	2.84	5.77	3.54
Job Security	5.47	4.58	4.32	3.57
Adequate Salary	5.49	3.68	4.55	3.49
Comfortable working conditions	5.93	3.58	6.04	3.20
Opportunities for promotion	5.98	3.40	6.13	3.42
Responsibility and independence	6.02	3.27	6.45	6.45
Respect and Recognition	6.37	3.65	7.17	3.46
Sound company policies and practices	7.51	3.47	7.36	3.95
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	7.84	3.61	7.51	3.78
Doing something worthwhile	8.37	3.59	8.87	3.27
Pay according to ability and competence	8.86	3.61	9.11	4.53
Technically competent supervisor	10.47	3.11	10.77	3.49
Restricted hours of work	10.81	3.45	10.81	2.95
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	11.07	2.58	10.77	2.69

Significant difference was found among manufacturing and service sector employees for the variable 'adequate salary' (Table 4). Salary is very important for service sector employees. No significant difference was found between manufacturing and service sector employees for other variables.

Table 4: Mann Whitney U Test - Employee Expectations from Jobs (Sector wise)

Variable	Z	Asmp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Hypothesis Testing	Interpretation
Job Security	-0.39	0.69	Accept Ho	No significant difference between manufacturing and service sector employees
Adequate Salary	-2.37	0.018	Reject Ho	There is significant difference between manufacturing and service sector employees
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	-1.57	0.12	Accept Ho	No significant difference between manufacturing and service sector employees
Comfortable working conditions	-0.54	0.59		
Sound company policies and practices	-0.05	0.96		
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	-0.12	0.91		
Restricted hours of work	-0.62	0.54		
Opportunities for promotion	-0.27	0.79		
Interesting work	-0.8	0.42	Accept Ho	
Respect and Recognition	-1.43	0.15		
Responsibility and independence	-0.95	0.34		
Doing something worthwhile	-0.25	0.8		
Technically competent supervisor	-1.49	0.14		
Pay according to ability and competence	-1.56	0.12		

Table 5 shows that 'job security' and 'adequate salary' are more important for non-managers than managers. In both sectors, 'supervision' is not given much importance. 'Comfortable working conditions' and 'opportunities for promotion' are other factors being considered important by non-managers compared to managers.

Table 5: Employee Expectations from Jobs (Designation wise)

Variable	Managers (46)		Non-Managers (44)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Interesting work	5.04	3.26	5.20	3.33
Job Security	5.48	4.42	4.23	3.69
Adequate Salary	5.59	3.71	4.39	3.40
Responsibility and independence	5.63	2.89	6.89	3.04
Comfortable working conditions	6.50	3.51	5.45	3.17
Opportunities for promotion	6.78	3.16	5.30	3.49
Sound company policies and practices	6.80	3.56	8.09	3.79
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	7.26	3.65	8.09	3.70
Respect and Recognition	7.35	3.91	6.20	3.08
Doing something worthwhile	8.20	3.84	9.09	2.88
Pay according to ability and competence	8.26	4.36	9.75	3.69
Restricted hours of work	10.78	3.57	10.84	2.76
Technically competent supervisor	10.89	3.23	10.34	3.38
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	10.93	2.34	10.89	2.92

There is significant difference between managers and non-managers for 'opportunities for promotion' (Table 6). Table 5 shows that non-managers give higher preference (5.30) for this variable than managers (6.78). No significant difference was found among managers and non-managers for other variables.

Table 6: Mann Whitney U Test - Employee Expectations from Jobs (Designation wise)

Variable	Z	Asmp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Hypothesis Testing	Interpretation
Job Security	-1.08	0.28	Accept Ho	No significant difference between managers and non-managers
Adequate Salary	-1.73	0.084		
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	-1.05	0.29		
Comfortable working conditions	-1.66	0.098		
Sound company policies and practices	-1.77	0.077		
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	-0.39	0.70		
Restricted hours of work	-0.74	0.46		
Opportunities for promotion	-2.26	0.024	Reject Ho	There is significant difference between managers and non-managers
Interesting work	-0.26	0.79	Accept Ho	No significant difference between managers and non-managers
Respect and Recognition	-1.35	0.178	Accept Ho	
Responsibility and independence	-1.86	0.063		
Doing something worthwhile	-1.07	0.284		
Technically competent supervisor	-0.98	0.33		
Pay according to ability and competence	-1.61	0.106		

Table 7: Employee Expectations from Jobs (Gender wise)

Variable	Female (19)		Male (71)	
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD
Job Security	3.89	3.45	5.13	4.25
Interesting work	4.95	3.26	5.17	3.3
Adequate Salary	5.42	4.31	4.89	3.4
Respect and Recognition	5.95	3.49	7.01	3.56
Opportunities for promotion	6.00	3.67	6.07	3.34
Responsibility and independence	6.00	2.40	6.31	3.16
Comfortable working conditions	6.11	2.51	5.96	3.58
Sound company policies and practices	8.00	4.46	7.28	3.5
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	8.58	4.05	7.42	3.56
Pay according to ability and competence	8.58	3.55	9.1	4.24
Doing something worthwhile	9.05	2.91	8.52	3.55
Technically competent supervisor	10.53	3.19	10.65	3.33
Restricted hours of work	11.32	2.94	10.68	3.25
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	11.37	2.31	10.79	2.7

Table 8: Mann Whitney U Test - Employee Expectations from Jobs (Gender wise)

Variable	Z	Asmp. Sig. (2-tailed)	Hypothes is Testing	Interpretation
Job Security	-0.92	0.36	Accept Ho	No significant difference between male and female employees
Adequate Salary	-0.37	0.71		
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	-1.22	0.22		
Comfortable working conditions	-0.56	0.57		
Sound company policies and practices	-0.80	0.42		
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	-0.74	0.46		
Restricted hours of work	-0.64	0.52		
Opportunities for promotion	-0.11	0.91		
Interesting work	-0.21	0.83		
Respect and Recognition	-1.02	0.31		
Responsibility and independence	-0.43	0.67	Accept Ho	No significant difference between male and female employees
Doing something worthwhile	-0.41	0.68		
Technically competent supervisor	0.39	0.69		
Pay according to ability and competence	-0.89	0.37		

According to Table 8, there is no significant difference between male and female employees for any of the variable. This shows that job expectations are independent of gender.

Table 9: Employee Expectations from Jobs (Experience wise)

	<i>0-5 years</i>		<i>6 – 10 years</i>		<i>11 – 15 years</i>		<i>More than 16 years</i>	
	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>	<i>Mean</i>	<i>SD</i>
Job Security	4.12	3.34	4.33	4.23	5.27	4.57	9.11	4.23
Adequate Salary	4.50	3.52	5.29	3.94	4.67	2.77	7.11	3.92
Interesting work	4.55	3.01	5.50	3.53	5.73	3.59	5.78	3.35
Opportunities for promotion	5.40	3.41	5.67	3.43	7.93	2.58	7.00	3.54
Comfortable working conditions	5.98	3.27	5.46	3.04	4.87	3.04	9.33	3.61
Respect and Recognition	6.76	3.13	6.67	3.41	8.07	4.43	5.11	4.04
Responsibility and independence	6.83	2.87	7.04	3.26	5.27	2.31	3	1.12
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	7.88	3.80	6.63	3.75	7.40	3.54	9.89	2.20
Sound company policies and practices	8.29	3.79	7.92	3.22	6.40	3.18	3.89	3.37
Pay according to ability and competence	9.26	4.09	9.50	3.83	8.47	4.55	7.22	4.12
Doing something worthwhile	9.57	2.94	8.58	3.45	7.67	3.83	6.00	3.39
Restricted hours of work	10.17	3.47	11.50	2.28	11.27	3.90	11.22	2.28
Technically competent supervisor	10.52	3.31	11.04	3.32	11.00	2.95	9.33	3.91
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	10.98	2.81	10.33	2.75	11.60	1.84	11.00	2.60

Table 10: Kruskal Wallis Test - Employee Expectations from Jobs (Experience wise)

Variable	Chi Square (DF=3)	Asmp. Sig.	Hypothesis Testing	Interpretation
Job Security	8.3	0.04	Reject Ho	There is significant difference between experienced and inexperienced employees
Adequate Salary	4.89	0.18	Accept Ho	
Fringe benefits (perk etc.)	5.5	0.14	Accept Ho	There is significant difference between experienced and inexperienced employees
Comfortable working conditions	9.17	0.03	Reject Ho	
Sound company policies and practices	11.08	0.01	Reject Ho	
Considerate and sympathetic supervisor	2.03	0.57	Accept Ho	No significant difference between experienced and inexperienced employees
Restricted hours of work	3.97	0.26	Accept Ho	
Opportunities for promotion	8.28	0.04	Reject Ho	There is significant difference between experienced and inexperienced employees
Interesting work	2.32	0.51	Accept Ho	No significant difference between experienced and inexperienced employees
Respect and Recognition	3.27	0.35	Accept Ho	
Responsibility and independence	15.97	0.00	Reject Ho	There is significant difference between experienced and inexperienced employees
Doing something worthwhile	9.65	0.02	Reject Ho	
Technically competent supervisor	1.31	0.73	Accept Ho	No significant difference between experienced and inexperienced employees
Pay according to ability and competence	2.51	0.47	Accept Ho	

The result shows that there is significant difference between different experience groups of employees for 'job security'. Significant difference was also found for 'opportunities for promotion', 'comfortable working conditions', 'responsibility and independence' and 'doing something worthwhile', and 'sound company policies and practices' (Tables 9 and 10). Junior employees have given high preference to 'job security' as compared with seniors. Employees who have 0-5 years' experience have given preference for 'opportunities for promotion' compared with other age groups. For employees with 11-15 years' experience, 'comfortable working conditions' is very important. Senior most employees have given higher preference to 'sound company policies and practices'. The same group has also given high importance to 'doing something worthwhile' and 'responsibility and independence'. This is in line with Maslow's Need Hierarchy theory which states that motivational needs change with time.

Table 11: Demographic Comparison of Extrinsic and Intrinsic Motivation

Variable		Extrinsic Score	Intrinsic Score	Interpretation
Overall		4741	4721	Intrinsic motivation is given more preference
Gender	Male	3702	3751	Extrinsic motivation is given more preference
	Female	1039	970	Intrinsic motivation is given more preference
Designation	Managers	2454	2399	Intrinsic motivation is given more preference
	Non-managers	2287	2322	Extrinsic motivation is given more preference
Sector	Manufacturing	2327	2171	Intrinsic motivation is given more preference
	Service	2414	2550	Extrinsic motivation is given more preference
Experience	0 to 5 years	2180	2222	Extrinsic motivation is given more preference
	6 to 10 years	1235	1296	Extrinsic motivation is given more preference
	11 to 15 years	772	812	Extrinsic motivation is given more preference
	16 + years	554	391	Intrinsic motivation is given more preference

In this study, intrinsic motivation was found to have more preferences than extrinsic motivation. Male as well as female employees have preferred intrinsic factors over extrinsic factors. Interestingly non-managers have preferred extrinsic factors unlike managers. Similar trend is observed with experienced and inexperienced employees, as only employees having more than 16 years' experience have preferred intrinsic factors while others have preferred extrinsic factors. This is again in line with Maslow's need hierarchy theory. Surprisingly, employees from the manufacturing sector have given preference for intrinsic factors and service sector employees have given preference for extrinsic factors (Table 11: Score have been

calculated by summing the score of all respondents for the particular demographic factor. For example, extrinsic motivation score of male respondents is 71 and their rank for the each factor of extrinsic motivation is added to calculate total score which is 3702.)

CONCLUSION

The objective of this research was to find impact of demographic variables on employee job preferences. It is found that adequate salary is a significant factor for service sector employees. No significant difference was found between male and female employees for any of the variables of intrinsic or extrinsic motivation. Significant difference was observed among different age groups of employees for 'opportunities for promotion' (intrinsic factor) 'job security', 'comfortable working conditions' and 'sound company policies and practices' (all extrinsic factors). Extrinsic motivational factors were found to be important for non-managers, service sector employees, and inexperienced employees. Intrinsic motivational factors were found to be important for managers, manufacturing employees, and extrinsic employees. Overall, intrinsic factor was found to be preferred by all employees. Thus, companies should focus on intrinsic factors so as to attract, motivate, and retain employees.

SCOPE FOR FUTURE RESEARCH

A similar study can be conducted with more female respondents so as to have comprehensive results. Employees working with multinational companies can be compared with those working in family owned businesses to understand the difference between motivational factors. It would be interesting to conduct such a study for non-profit organizations and educational institutions as their objectives are different from corporates. A study with final year engineering and management students will be useful for campus recruiters so as to better understand and manage the next generation.

REFERENCES

Adams, J.S. (1965), "Inequity in Social Exchange," *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299.

Amabile, T.M.; Hill, K.G.; Hennessey, B.A.; and Tighe, E.M. (1994), "The Work Preference Inventory: Assessing Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation Orientations," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 34(5), 950-967.

Benabou, R. and Jean, T. (2003), "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation," *Review of Economic Studies*, 70(3), 489-520.

Broedling L. A. (1977), "The Uses of the Intrinsic-Extrinsic Distinction in Explaining Motivation and Organizational Behavior," *Academy of Management Review*, 2(2), 267-276.

Burton, K.D.; Lydon, J.E.; D'Alessandro, D.U.; and Koestner, R. (2006), "The Differential Effects of Intrinsic and Identified Motivation on Well-Being and Performance: Prospective, Experimental, and Implicit Approaches to Self-Determination Theory," *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 91(4), 750-762.

Cameron J. and Pierce W. D. (1994), "Reinforcement, Reward, and Intrinsic Motivation: A Meta-Analysis," *Review of Educational Research*, 64(3), 363-423.

Cerasoli, C.P.; Nicklin, J.M.; and Ford, M.T. (2014), "Intrinsic Motivation and Extrinsic Incentives Jointly Predict Performance: A 40-year Meta-Analysis," *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 980-1008.

Çınar, O.; Bektaş, Ç.; and Aslan, I. (2011), "A Motivation Study on the Effectiveness of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Factors," *Economics and Management*, 16, 690-695.

Clugston, M.; Howell, J. P.; and Dorfman, P. W. (2000), "Dispositional Influences on Pay Preferences," *Journal of Business and Psychology*, 15(2), 311-321.

Deci, E.L. and Ryan, R.M. (2000), "The 'What' and 'Why' of Goal Pursuits: Human Needs and the Self-Determination of Behavior," *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.

Emilio, F.; Joaquín, G.; Marybel, P.; and Francisco, J. S., (2006), "The Art of Entrepreneurial Foresight," *Foresight*, 8(6), 3 – 13.

Fried, Y. and Ferris, G.R. (1987), "The Validity of the Job Characteristics Model: A Review and a Meta-Analysis," *Personnel Psychology*, 40(2), 287-322.

Gambino, K.M. (2010), "Motivation for Entry, Occupational Commitment and Intent to Remain: A Survey Regarding Registered Nurse Retention," *Journal of Advanced Nursing*, 66(11), 2532-2541.

Gerhart B, Milkovich GT. (1992), "Employee Compensation: Research and Practice," In Dunnette, M.D and Hough L.M. (eds.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Vol. 3, Palo Alto, CA: Consulting Psychologists Press, 481-569.

Grant, A.M. (2007), "Relational Job Design and the Motivation to Make a Prosocial Difference," *Academy of Management Review*, 32(2), 393-417.

Grant, A.M. (2008), "Does Intrinsic Motivation Fuel the Prosocial Fire? Motivational Synergy in Predicting Persistence, Performance, and Productivity," *Journal of Applied Psychology* , 93(1), 48-58.

Grant, A.M.; Nurmohamed, S.; Ashford, S.J.; and Dekas, K.D. (2011), "The Performance Implications of Ambivalent Initiative: the Interplay of Autonomous and Controlled Motivations," *Organizational Behavior and Human Decision Processes*, 116, 241-251.

Grant, A.M. and Shin, J. (2011), "Work Motivation: Directing, Energizing, and Maintaining Effort (and Research)," in Ryan, R.M. (ed.), *The Oxford Handbook of Human Motivation*, Oxford: Oxford University Press, 505-519.

Greguras, G.J. and Diefendorff, J.M. (2009), "Different Fits Satisfy Different Needs: Linking Person-Environment Fit to Employee Commitment and Performance Using Self-Determination Theory," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 94(2), 465-477.

Haines III V. Y.; Saba, T.' and Choquette, E. (2008), "Intrinsic Motivation for an International Assignment," *International Journal of Manpower*, 29 (5), 443 – 461.

Imran, H., Arif, I., Cheema, S. and Azeem, M. (2014), "Relationship between Job Satisfaction, Job Performance, Attitude towards Work, and Organizational Commitment," *Entrepreneurship and Innovation Management Journal*, 2(2), 135-144.

Kanfer, R.; Chen, G.; and Pritchard, R.D. (2012), *Work Motivation: Past, Present, and Future*. Oxford: Routledge.

Ke, W. and Zhang, P. (2010), "The Effects of Extrinsic Motivations and Satisfaction in Open Source Software Development," *Journal of the Association for Information Systems*, 11(12), 784-808.

Knoke, D. and Wright-Isak, C. (1982), "Individual Motives and Organizational Incentive Systems," *Research in the Sociology of Organizations*, 1(2), 209-254.

Krishnamurthy, S. (2006), "On the Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation of Free/Libre/Open Source (floss) Developers," *Knowledge, Technology and Policy*, 18(4), 17-39.

Kristof-Brown, A.L.; Zimmerman, R.D.; and Johnson, E.C. (2005), "Consequences of Individuals' Fit at Work: A Meta-Analysis of Person-Job, Person-Organization, Person-Group, and Person-Supervisor Fit," *Personnel Psychology*, 58(2), 281-342.

- Ladebo, O.J. (2005), "Effects of Work-Related Attitudes on the Intention to Leave the Profession," *Educational Management Administration and Leadership*, 33(3), 355-369.
- Lazear, E.P. (2000), "The Power of Incentives," *American Economic Review*, 90(2), 410-414.
- Lei, S. A. (2010), "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation: Evaluating Benefits and Drawbacks from College Instructors' Perspectives," *Journal of Instructional Psychology*, 37(2), 153-160.
- McDonald, R.; Harrison, S.; Checkland, K.; Campbell, S.M.; and Roland, M.; (2007), "Impact of Financial Incentives on Clinical Autonomy and Internal Motivation in Primary Care: Ethnographic Study," *BMJ*, 334(6), 1357.
- Mossholder, K.W.; Hettie, A.; Richardson, A.; and Settoon, R.P. (2011), "Human Resource Systems and Helping in Organizations: A Relational Perspective," *Academy of Management Review*, 36, 33-52.
- Motowidlo, S.J.; Borman, W.C.; and Schmit, M.J. (1997), "A Theory of Individual Difference in Task and Contextual Performance," *Human Performance*, 10(2), 71-83.
- Pinder, C.C. (2011), *Work Motivation in Organizational Behavior*. New York: Psychology Press.
- Podsakoff, P.M. and MacKenzie, S.B. (1994), "Organizational Citizenship Behaviors and Sales Unit Effectiveness," *Journal of Marketing Research*, 31(3), 351-363.
- Ru, Y. (2012), "Mediating Roles of Intrinsic Motivation and Self-Efficacy in the Relationships between Perceived Person-Job Fit and Work Outcomes," *African Journal of Business Management*, 6(7), 2616-2625.
- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000 a), "Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions," *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Ryan, R.M. and Deci, E.L. (2000 b), "Self-Determination Theory and the Facilitation of Intrinsic Motivation, Social Development, and Well-being," *American Psychologist*, 55(1), 68-78.
- Rynes, S.L. and Miller, H.E. (1983), "Recruiter and Job Influences on Candidates for Employment," *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 68, 147-154.

Sobiraj, S.; Schladitz, S.; and Otto, K. (2016), "Defining and Explaining Career Success in Psychologists using Person and Job Based Resources," *Psychology and Education Journal*, 53(2), 1-20.

Steers, R.M.; Mowday, R.T.; and Shapiro, D.L. (2004), "Introduction to Special Topic Forum: The Future of Work Motivation Theory," *Academy of Management Review*, 29 (3), 379-387.

Taris, T.W.; Feij, J.A.; and Capel, S. (2006), "Great Expectations – and What Comes of it: The Effects of Unmet Expectations on Work Motivation and Outcomes among Newcomers," *International Journal of Selection and Assessment*, 14(3), 256-268.

Vansteenkiste, M.; Niemiec, C.P.; and Soenens, B. (2010), "The Development of the Five Mini-Theories of Self-Determination Theory: An Historical Overview, Emerging Trends, and Future Directions," in Timothy, C.U and Stuart, A.K. (eds.), *Advances in Motivation and Achievement*, 16, 105-165.