CALIFORNIA STATE UNIVERSITY, NORTHRIDGE

Do Incentives Increase Employee Motivation in Public Sector?

A graduate project submitted in partial fulfilment of the requirements

For the degree of Master in Public Administration in Public Sector Management and

Leadership

By

Meri Manukyan

December 2019

The graduate project of Meri Manukyan is approved:

_____   _____

Dr. Rhonda Franklin   Date

_____   _____

Dr. Philip Nufrio   Date

_____   _____

Dr. Kay K. Pih, Chair   Date

California State University, Northridge

Acknowledgment

I would like to thank all my professors of the Master of Public Administration program for their guidance during this journey. A special thank you to my committee chair Dr. Kay K. Pih for his valuable and constructive suggestions and support throughout this process of writing this Capstone Project.

I would also like to show my gratitude to my friends and family for always supporting and encouraging me during my MPA studies. This accomplishment would not have been possible without their continuous support.

Table of Contents

Abstract

Employee Motivation in Public Sector

By

Meri Manukyan

Master of Public Administration in Public Sector Management and Leadership

Public service motivation has been a topic of research for many scholars due to
decreased motivation among public sector employees. Research has been done by many
scholars to define what are the factors affecting the motivation of workers. The purpose of
this study is to identify any internal and external factors that had an impact on employee
motivation to the organization, also, to determine whether the incentives increase the
motivation of public sector employees. The study will be done among DPSS employees that
had been selected through a simple random sample of cluster. The quantitative research
methodology will be utilized to collect data for the current study.

Section 1: Introduction

An essential factor that distinguishes a successful organization from a less successful one is due to the employee motivation (Sheran 2018). Motivation has been described by Robbins et al. (2008) as a process that explains the persistence, direction, and intensity of the desire and effort to achieve the goal. Motivation stands for "energizing, directing and sustaining behaviour" (Perry 1982). According to Vandenabeele (2008), motivation has also been defined as a factor that is affected by the workplace atmosphere and the environment the employees find themselves in.

When workers are satisfied with their jobs, they are more engaged and more productive, and this, in turn, benefits the company (Grant 2008). The connection and engagement have a direct relationship with the prosperity of the company. Those employees who are motivated to perform their duties and excel in the outcomes help the organizations to meet their goals and objectives and achieve better results (June et al. 2013). The research by Sorenson (2013) provides evidence that organizations with more motivated employees are 20 percent more productive. The collected data will supplement already existing research indicating the source of employee motivation, which in turn will become a trigger for high-yielding results in the organization.

In spite of the fact that motivation has been a topic of interest for an extended period and there have been multiple studies and research done to define the factors affecting employee engagement, there are still grey areas in the field that need to be examined more (Wright 2004). Many scholars and theorists like Alderfer, Deci, and Ryan, Herzberg, Maslow tried to find an answer to the question of what motivates employees to perform better in the workplace (Sheppard 2016). Based on their research and findings, organizations are trying to come up with unique and distinct solutions to keep their employees engaged and motivated

with their job (Sheppard 2016). This research will add more findings of what type of incentives do increase motivation within the public-sector employees.

According to Bowen and Lawler (1992), employee empowerment is a sophisticated management approach that involves a variety of diverse practices. Leaders and managers are looking for ways to motivate their employees as motivation can show progress in the organization. To do so, they have to determine and recognize some specific characteristics of their employee behaviour and know how to approach and motivate their employees. It is not an easy task to determine how to motivate employees. Based on Vrooms's expectancy theory, the staff can develop stimulus when they believe that showing a strong determination and motivation will lead to a better performance, which in turn will lead to desired rewards (Lunenburg 2011). However, the problem that occurs in this situation is that workers get motivated to a certain degree, and it becomes the responsibility of the managers and leaders in the organization to distinguish the factors that will give meaning and value to the job, which later will provide positive and gratifying results (Lunenburg 2011).

Employee motivation initiates a desire to accomplish a specific goal or objective in the organizational setting (Shahzadi et al. 2014). According to research done by Schneider (1987), there is a difference in the level of employee motivation between a public and a private sector. The reason that people are willing to be employed by public sector organizations is the result of unselfishness, altruism, the ambition to have an impact on society (Cawley 2013).

Even though employee motivation has been researched for decades now, work motivation has failed to get similar interest among the public sector (Bradley 2001). Public service motivation is the individual's focus to provide services with a good purpose for society (Perry and Hondeghem 2008). Public sector workers have always been pressured to improve their work productivity and at the same time, do it at a minimum cost (Wright 2004).

According to the Brookings Research Institution, it is harder to motivate people to work in public service than in the private sector (Choi et al. 2013). A public service career has been described as a calling (Holzer 1999). There is a stereotype that public sector employees are lazy, self-serving, and misguided (Baldwin 1984; Newstrom, Reif, and Monczka 1976), and to better understand how they are motivated, it is essential to define and develop the effectiveness and efficacy of public organizations. Compared to the private sector, it is harder to offer any incentives to public sector employees. For example, it is less likely to offer shareholdings to incentivize the managers to get the job done (Bandier et al. 2017). However, when there are fewer opportunities to offer monetary incentives to encourage employees, there are always alternatives to it. Non-monetary incentives can be as productive as monetary ones.

When one chooses to work for the public sector, it is more likely that their morals and values are consistent with the mission of the organization (Baldwin 1984). There are research and evidence that public sector employees value financial rewards less than private-sector employees (Boyne 2002). One of the common missions and goals of the public-sector employees is to help the community; they chose to be public servants (Boyne 2002). It is believed that public sector employees are more motivated by the sense of service, which is not found among private-sector employees (Staats 1988). Many people are motivated by experiences, while some are motivated by material things (Lauire 2010). Those who are motivated by experiences are keener to make a difference in the lives of other people (Lauire 2010).

There is an assumption that public sector employees' value intrinsic rewards more than extrinsic rewards (Houston 2000). According to Ryan and Deci (2000), intrinsic motivation is described as doing an activity for internal contentment rather than for the outcome. When people are intrinsically motivated, they do things for fun or for a challenge

rather than for reward. Extrinsic motivation is a concept that pertains whenever something is done to get some separable outcome (Ryan et al. 2000).

One of the enduring images of public sector employees is that monetary incentives are not the primary goal in their career; they prefer job security over a higher salary (Houston 2000). Research done by Laure Langbein shows that employees at U.S federal government prioritize the value and the enjoyment of their job than extra money offered to them. She also found that these employees increase motivation when the job has a clear description and a step-by-step guide of how to do the job, when there are goals set for each employee and also when there is a cooperative work environment (Langbein 2009). For many employees, financial growth is not as substantial as professional and career growth (Langbein 2009).

The study done by Incentive Research Foundation shows that in the U.S. public and private organizations spend over $100 billion in one year on incentives for their employees, and if include cash incentives as well, the amount will reach $117 billion for one year (Stolovitch 2002). In spite of the amount that has been spent on incentives, only 25-44 percent of employees were motivated by these incentives offered to them (Stolvitch 2002). According to Gallup's recent survey, 70 percent of employees lack engagement or motivation at some level (Harter 2006). The indifference in their job can cost the U.S about $450 to $550 billion in lost productivity (Sorenson 2013). Battaglio and Condrey noted that monetary incentives have a negative effect on employee motivation as employees may feel that their job is being measured by monetary values, not by their contribution or by their worth as individuals (2009). According to Allan et al., forty-six percent of employees were more motivated and engaged in their job when they were offered alternative work schedules (1990). It shows that monetary incentives are not the only motivators for public-sector employees. There are less costly and more productive ways to do it. This research proposal will identify which motivation type is more relevant for public sector employees.

The main question that will be addressed in this paper is: do intrinsic or extrinsic rewards affect employee motivation in the public sector? In order to address this question, quantitative research will be done to analyse the types of incentives that motivate employees and the strategies that are used to keep employees engaged. Survey responses collected through simple random sample of cluster method will help add more data to already existing research.

Section 2: Literature Review

Motivation and commitment to the organization are in the subjects that are of interest to many disciplines (Moon 2000). Motivation is one of the principal research factors for many public administration scholars (Crewson 1997). Many have been interested in researching the motivation factor in the public sector as there was a decline in morale and engagement of federal employees at some point in their career (Commision), that is why the research in these fields has become more significant activity in modern times (1989).

Motivation has been recognized as the desire to make an effort, energize, and maintain the action (Latham et al. 2005). According to researchers, motivation can derive from different sources (Grant 2008). Some individuals are motivated by external factors; some are motivated by helping other people (Grant 2008). Whenever there is a desire to disburse an effort to benefit others, prosocial motivation comes into play. Prosaically motivated individuals are very likely to find employment within the public sector (Grant 2008).

Motivation has been studied for both public and private sector organizations; however public sector motivation had received comparably less attention and evaluation at first (Wright 2010). Due to different stereotypical descriptions in regards to public service employees, motivation has later gained more attention in the public sector (Wright 2010). Up until now, there are still mixed ideas and findings in regard to public and private-sector motivational factors. According to researcher Buchanan, public service employees had a lower level of organizational commitment than private sector employees; however, Belfour and Wechsler had the opposite research results, proving that public service workers are motivated and committed to their organization more than anyone else (Moon 2000). Because of many conflicting research results, many scholars have extended their research to give more distinct definitions and characteristics in regards to motivation and commitment in the public

sector (Moon 2000). Identifying the impact of the work environment and sectoral differences that affect employee job performance will contribute to this research and will help boost the motivational level and commitment. Therefore, to fill the research gap, this study will consider the impact of different environmental factors affecting employee motivation so that highly competent workforce is retained.

Public Sector Motivation

The definition of public sector motivation goes back to 1980 to define the differences in reward preference among public and private sector employees (Cawley 2013). In 1982 Hal G. Rainey did a study to outline the differences in the incentive preferences for different levels and different organizational employees (Bell et al. 2012). However, Perry and Wise were the first ones to explain the concept in detail in the 1990s (Cawley 2013). According to Perry and Wise public service motivation is a "predisposition to respond to motives grounded mainly in general intuitions and organizations (1996). They distinguish three sources of motivation in public service. The first one is the desire to participate, second is the commitment to a public program, and the third one is the desire to serve the interest of the pubic (Zoutenbier2015). Even though Perry and Wise's definition is still used among many, the current study also suggests that the environment and culture have a significant influence on employee motivation in the organization (Cawley 2013). The way the environment influences the personnel is defined by the characteristics and by the context. The characteristics portray the features of the job, and work context signifies the background of the organization, its rewards methods, goals, objectives, and representation of duties the employee has to do (Wright 2010).

Commonly, researchers thought that employees in all sectors are motivated by similar incentives, no matter if they work for public, private, or non-profit organizations (Battaglio 2009). However, the studies showed that there are both similarities and differences in

motivational factors for private and public sectors (Moon 2000). The research that had been

done by Rainey for employees working for the government and for employees working for

the business community showed that people working for government agencies considered

serving the public more important than private-sector employees (1979).

A fundamental belief of public service motivation research is that those who are eager

to provide services are more likely to be employed by the public sector (Wright and Grant

2010). The reason that these employees are attracted to public-sector jobs is that there they

have more opportunities to express their thoughts, achieve their goals, and fulfil their values

(Wright and Grant 2010).

There has been some empirical research done by scholars Perry and Porter that shows

that setting a goal increases employee motivation significantly (Perry, Porter 1982).

Numerous assessments and meta-analyses have found a secure connection between employee

motivation and specific and challenging goals (Wright 2010). If the goal is important for the

employee, then there is a motivation through self-efficiency to complete the tasks (Bandura

1977). The reason that employees are motivated by goals is because when difficult but at the

same time achievable goals are met, it proves that the individual can perform the assigned job

and can even do more than the job requires (Bandura 1986). If accomplishing appointed goals

and objectives can gratify employee motives, like performing public service, then these goals

will probably be considered as important as personal goals (Wright 2010). When public

sector workers see how their performance and achievement benefit the society, they consider

goals as an important, inspiring, and motivational factor (Wright 2010). When the employees

give importance to the goals of the organization, there is a less likelihood that these

employees will quit their job and leave; hence, it is considered as strong organizational point

during changes that can threaten and affect the institute (Kjeldsen 2013). Hence, identifying

what types of goals and objectives fulfil employee needs and what motivates them will help sustain more stable work environment with more devoted employees.

According to Baldwin, there is a high probability that public-sector organizations will employ people whose principles and values are coherent with the mission of the organization (1984). Accordingly, the public-sector employees value the goals and the mission of the organization more than private-sector employees (Wright 2007). Thrilled with supporting the social welfare, as well as safeguarding people and their community, public organization missions have a wider scope and more profound influence than any private company can offer (Wright 2010). Numerous study has been done where the mission motivation preferences have experimented. According to Baldwin and Farley (1991), because in public organizations the mission is usually very extensive, it is harder to achieve any altruistic or high-order needs, which sometimes can affect the motivation of an employee by bringing down the morel (Wright 2010). In contrast, the empirical research results show that those whose values and beliefs match with the mission of the organization, and those who are thrilled to serve the mission of the organization are more productive and show more interest than those who do not value the importance of the purpose of the organization (Tonin et al. 2012).

Employee Commitment

The research by Crewson showed that employees working for the government prefer service over financial rewards, and they are more committed to the organization they work at (1997). In spite of the fact that there are multiple studies, it is still hard to define what commitment means in the organizational setting. Angle and Perry defined the commitment based on municipal research that has been previously done (1981). For example, the term commitment has been used to define distinct phenomena as the eagerness to give their energy and loyalty to the social system (Angle and Perry 1981). Crewson identified the

organizational commitment based on three factors, such as a will to work hard for the organization, a desire to stay with the organization, and a strong belief and acceptance of the values and goals of the organization (1997). In order to increase motivation and commitment, organizations have been offering alternative schedules to maintain work-life balance, which in turn increases the performance of employees and competitiveness of the organization (Kumar & Chakraborty 2013). Based on qualitative research done by Sheppard, the organizations that offer alternative work schedules have a higher level of employee commitment than the organizations that do not offer work-life balance programs (2016). Low commitment and motivation can become a serious issue for the organization (Sheppard 2016). Employee motivation, commitment, and engagement are directly related to employee disengagement (Heikkeri 2010). Research done by Branham shows that disengaged workers influence the morale and revenues of the organization in negative ways (2005). The purpose of this study is to find out how to avoid employee disengagement so that it does not impact employee drive, determination and motivation.

According to Gallup's State of the Global Workplace report, in the U.S, only fifteen percent of employees in all sectors are engaged in their job, meaning they are willing to commit and give their energy and time for the development of the organization (Gallup 2001). This disengagement costs the organizations about $550 billion in one year as a loss of productivity (Gallup 2001).

Qualitative studies done by Kahn show that employee engagement and commitment to the organization can be increased by several factors like job enrichment, such as making work interesting and different, but at the same time fit the position of the employee (1990). Another important factor identified as a motivational factor is keeping a good relationship with workmates and supervisors. The availability of emotional, physical, and cognitive resource centers for employees will also boost engagement (May et a. 2004). Feedback for

10

job performance, coaching, and autonomy have also been distinguished as factors affecting employee engagement, and commitment in the organizational setting (May et al. 2004).

Wildermuth defines that it is not important to identify those who are born to be engaged, but it is more important to know how to make everyone engaged (2009). In the article Roots and Consequences of the Employee Disagreement Phenomenon by Elena Heikkeri, engagement is presented as an optimistic, satisfying, work-related state of mind that is characterized by the energy, dedication, and fascination (2010). Engaged and committed employees add great worth and value to their organization by providing exceptional service to the public and being very friendly but at the same time professional with their co-workers. (Heikkeri 2010).

Commitment to the organization foresees engagement, contentment, and no intent to quit the job (Saks 2006). The organization where employees are committed and engaged have advantages over others because the committed employees take less sick days off, they perform better on a daily basis and are more concentrated on their job (Gallup 2001).

Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

Even though public service motivation theory suggests that public service employees are motivated by commitment and compassion towards the organization, there have still been multiple studies done to define whether any intrinsic or extrinsic factors affect employee motivation (Perry and Hondeghem 2008). Based on various research, public-sector employees have consistently been giving lower value to financial rewards and a higher value on helping people than private-sector employees (Boyne 2002). Correspondingly, the studies show that for the personnel in the public sector, intrinsic rewards are more important than extrinsic rewards (Wright 2007). This research will fulfil the gap by finding whether the intrinsic factors play a greater role for employee motivation in the public sector as there is comparably less evidence on this segment.

11

Intrinsic motivation is usually interpreted as an inherent satisfaction received from the job (Houston 2011). For intrinsically motivated employees, the jobs or the tasks are categorized as exciting, inspiring, pleasing and challenging at the same time (Houston 2011).

Extrinsic motivation is defined as the job done to obtain or avoid the desired outcome (Houston 2011). The result of extrinsic motivation is satisfying personal needs by getting something in exchange, for example, performance-related pay (Houston 2011). Ryan Deci described intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as follows:

> "Intrinsic motivation is defined as the doing of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable consequence. When intrinsically motivated, a person is moved to act for the fun or challenge entailed rather than because of external products, pressures, or rewards.
> Extrinsic motivation is a construct that pertains whenever an activity is done to attain some separable outcome. Extrinsic motivation thus contrasts with intrinsic motivation, which refers to doing an activity simply for the enjoyment of the activity itself, rather than its instrumental value" (2000).

There have been multiple studies done to provide evidence as to whether intrinsic rewards affect employee motivation in the workplace. According to Georgellis et al., high extrinsic rewards produce low intrinsic motivation (2011). The study done by Deci shows that when monetary incentives are used, they decrease intrinsic motivation as they destabilize social values (1971). However, there is also data that indicates that extrinsic rewards do not reduce intrinsic motivation. Depending on the nature of the reward, it can have a positive effect on intrinsic motivation (Bandura 1977). If the employee is intrinsically motivated, that does not yet mean the extrinsic motivational factors are unimportant. There are situations where extrinsic rewards increase intrinsic motivation. For example, according to Houston, when the employee is offered monetary incentives to show appreciation and talent recognition for a well-performed task, it may increase motivation (2011). However, no matter whether public sector employees were offered a monetary incentive or not, if they like the nature of their job, the motivation level will be high (Vandenabeele 2008).

Correspondingly, one type of intrinsic motivation in the public sector becomes enjoyment-based motivation (Houston 2011). The opportunity of learning new skills, and new staff, accomplish goals and get satisfaction from the performed job is a motivating factor for public sector employees. Also, when the completed work is meaningful, it increases the motivational level of public service employees (Houston 2011). There have been numerous studies done about job-satisfaction being a motivational factor in the public sector (Wright 2010). The empirical research examination done by Emmert and Taher back in 1992 provides evidence that working in a public-sector organization where employees provide social services to different communities have elevated motivation due to the fact that they are fulfilled with their employment even in the case when their salary was not high, however, the contentment was not at the same level when the work was done in a different environmental setting with similar or even higher pay (Wright 2010). The data gathered by General Social Survey (GSS) and other surveys that included a large group of people for participation showed the outcome that public employees rate the feeling of performing work that is helpful for the society and for the environment are more critical than their private-sector peers do (Houston 2000).

Rational, Norm-Based and Affective Motivation

Georgelli et al. define three categories that boost employee motivation in the public sector, such as rational, norm-based, and affective (2011). Rational motivation is when the individual wants to participate in policymaking and chase the diplomatic agenda. Norm-based motivation is the desire to pursue public interest as they are patriotic, or they are very loyal to the government. Affective motivation is the emotional response and the will to help others (Georgelli et al. 2011).

Shahazadi's research illustrates that self-development and growth are another motivational factor for employees working in the public sector. Whenever there is a potential

and availability for workers to learn new things and grow within the organization, the employees are more enthusiastic and more determined to perform better (2014). Naveed et al. determined that there is a progressive and substantial correlation between promotion and motivation (2011). Kosteas suggests that the personnel who anticipate getting advancement in their job report a high level of motivation and enthusiasm (2010). This highlights that public-sector employees are intrinsically motivated as they give preference to non-monetary rewards.

A study done by Mehmod shows that rewards are necessary to increase motivation and performance, yet the rewards can be intrinsic. When the employees are given intrinsic rewards, like appreciation of their work, they have a better understanding of their standing and performance, and they work harder to accomplish more during the whole period of their career (2013). Recognition and appreciation are effective tools to boost motivation (Heikkeri 2010).

Besides appreciation and recognition, another intrinsically motivating factor is providing training, which will as well increase employee motivation. Because the training increases and updates the knowledge of the employee, it leads to contentment from the job and gives the enthusiasm to do more (Ameeq-ul-Ameeq et al. 2013).

Feedback can also become a motivational factor to increase engagement and performance (Zoutenbier 2015). Numerous studies show that performance feedback has a constructive and positive outcome on performance (Azmat et al. 2014). In spite of the fact that feedback is considered as an intrinsically motivational factor, it might only work for a short-term period, and it might not be as effective in the long run (Azmat et al2014).

Impact of Motivation in Public Sector

According to the Incentive Research Foundation (IRF), the longer the incentive duration, the better the outcome. For example, short term incentives that are one week or less

produce a twenty percent increase in performance, the six-month-long incentive will produce a thirty percent increase, and if the incentive is given for a year, there will be more than forty-four percent of increased performance. Consequently, if the employees are consistently provided with training, they will improve their knowledge, which in turn will boost their inspiration and motivation to perform more and better (Stolovich 2010).

The Incentive Research Foundation has also done experiments on recognition as one type of intrinsic motivational factor. Nominating the workers as an employee of the month, giving service awards, or publishing the names on the company newsletter as a valuable employee can also boost motivation. Mercer identified that recognition and gratitude towards the involvement in the job the employees perform along with nonmonetary rewards increases motivation and engagement (2007). According to the Incentive Research Foundation findings, this is the least expensive form of motivation given to an employee, which shows significant outcomes. Survey findings show that recognition increases motivation by twenty-six percent (Stolovich 2010). Anticipating that the work is going to be appreciated and recognized gives a strong aspiration and motivation to go the extra mile and achieve better results (Stolovich 2010). Identify

Gallup analysis in 2018 found that only one in three employees in the US agreed that they had received recognition or praise for doing a great job at their workplace (Harter 2018). Additionally, Gallup research also provides data showing that both public and private organizations are trying to satisfy the basic needs of their employees. This move leads to increased engagement and motivation at work. Gallup also reports that in the public-sector, thirty-four percent of employees are engaged and motivated, and sixteen percent of employees are disengaged. This is almost two to one ratio, and this is the highest number of engagement the Gallup has had so far in the history of tracking employee motivational factors (Harter 2018). The UK Institute for Employment Studies determined that the key

driver of employee engagement and motivation is the awareness of being valued and involved in the job (Houston 2011).

Engagement and motivation are at its peak in the public sector because of the factor of job security (Harter 2018). In the Forbes article, What Really Motivates Employees by Ken Sundheim, the author states that the employees who have a fear of losing the job are less energetic and have less drive to complete their tasks. The worker's motivation is increased if they have the assurance of keeping the employment for at least some specific period of time (Sundheim 2013). Houston remarks in his research that private-sector employees give less importance to job security than public-sector employees, hence valuing intrinsic motivational factors less than extrinsic ones (2011).

Sundeheim also provides research, which shows that when employees are constantly presented with extrinsic motivational factors, it decreases their work performance. The example provided as an external motivational factor is gifting employees with stocks and bonds. The idea of monetary incentive decreases motivation as in this case, the organization fails to value the self-worth of the employee and their performance based on employee values (2013). Early research was done by Kilpatric, Cummings, Jennings, and Schuster, which included 275 middle-level employees from the private and public sector, showed that federal government employees valued monetary incentives less than business sector employees (Houston 2011).

According to Brookings Institute, pay-for-performance has a negative effect on employees as it can become detrimental to their job satisfaction, it can become a reason of decreased morale, injustice in the organization and can cause disturbance (Choi et al. 2016). Evidence from the 2008 Federal Employee Viewpoint Survey illustrates that working in an organization that uses monetary incentives to increase motivation has a negative effect as it affects the satisfaction that employees get from the job. Employees associate every aspect of

their career with their pay, and they do not see their performance as a valuable input for the organization (Choi et al. 2016).

The Incentive Research Foundation provides evidence from surveys that giving monetary incentives destroys personal interest in work. As soon as the employee gets paid for performance, the attentiveness and curiosity about the work tasks get reduced, and it creates a "money digging" mentality (Stolovich 2010). The job becomes less exciting and stimulating and decreases performance level within some period of time during the employment (Stolovich 2010).

Sectoral Differences

In contrast to public sector employees, the pay is a favourably inspirational factor in the private sector (Houston 2011). The Incentive Research Foundation reported that in the private sector seventy-two percent of employees are highly motivated and enthusiastic about their job when they are offered monetary incentives. Eight percent of workers stated that no matter the incentives, they would have completed the job. Only six percent reported that recognition would have increased their motivation more than any other type of stimulus (Stolovich 2010). There is less research and evidence associated with factors to why public sector employees value monetary rewards less than private-sector employees do. Due to this factor, this research will contribute to the study and will add more data to make it more perceptible for other research purposes.

Another interesting finding from Incentive Research Foundation data indicates that there is a dissimilarity in the level of motivation when employees are offered different incentives. When employees were proposed to take monetary incentives, survey data revealed the motivation increased by twenty-seven percent. When the workers were offered gift incentives, the motivation only increased by thirteen percent. The reason could be that money

has universal value while the gift is very particular and has to be used at a specific place (Stolovich 2010).

In sum, based on previous research done by different scholars, public-sector employees have been more motivated by intrinsic rewards than private-sector employees. The majority of the research is based on need-based or drive-based theories; hence, these theories were illustrated based on the needs, values, and reward preferences. Most of the research that has been done is comparably older, or it is more concentrated on the sectoral differences. Also, the data that has been provided so far is limited to local or regional samples, such as information is collected from surveys done in one city and in one state, and it does not compare the results with different entities. The current study will combine theoretical and empirical evidence to contribute to the research on public employee motivation using data collected from surveys. This research will add new and up to date results in regards to the motivational factors in public sector organizations showing whether intrinsic or extrinsic motivational factors have a great influence on workers in the public sector.

Section 3: Methodology

In order to complement previous studies done to determine whether internal or external factors affect employee motivation in the public sector, this research will provide data collected from a survey questionnaire using a simple random sample of a cluster sampling method. Survey questions will help to find answers to what stimulates employees to perform better and spread awareness so that the organizations know which means they should use to motivate their personnel.

The paper will attempt to answer the following main questions:

1. Which are the factors that attract and give motivation to employees to work in the public sector?

2. Do public sector employees give greater value to intrinsic or extrinsic motivational factors?

3. Do monetary incentives play more significant role in keeping employees engaged with their work?

4. Is there any difference between motivational factors between private and public sector employees?

5. Will the motivation and engagement be increased if different and specific reward systems are utilized?

Research Design

This research will utilize a quantitative research methodology. The reason for choosing the quantitative research method is that it will give the advantage of getting more wide-ranging and complete utilization of the collected data. It will also allow gathering reliable and valid results that will be easier to generalize for a larger group. Survey questions will aim to expand the knowledge of how to motivate employees, meanwhile distinguishing whether internal or external factors play a greater role. The quantitative research questions

will be based on close-end questions, numerical comparisons, and statistical inferences in the survey questionnaire format. The survey questionnaire will help include as many participants as possible. For this study, the descriptive research design will suit the best as it will define and inspect the association of variables in their natural setting without influencing them. Also, through the descriptive research design, it will be easier to find more facts about the current research problem. In addition to this, it will be the least costly way to collect data and will have a large sample size.

As the Department of Public Social Services (DPSS) is considered one of the largest social service agencies in the United States, the first survey questionnaire will be asked within the DPSS employees. Its staff is nearly 14000 employees that work at more than 40 offices throughout Los Angeles County. Because it has a lot of employees, the cluster sampling method will be utilized to include employees from different groups in the survey. The cluster sampling method will be used to avoid bias and will give the ability to account for employees with a common interest, which will be relative to a larger group or population. Another advantage of using cluster sampling will be the convenience, cost, and easy implementation with a higher margin on data accuracy. To determine sampling size, participants from different organizational units will be randomly selected from each categorized group, with the total number of 2000 participants. DPSS employees, such as Eligibility Workers, Social Workers, and Gain Services Workers and their managers, will be important stakeholders for this study because information collected from participants in different groups that share the same interest in the department will help find answers to what motivates employees in different units; whether the internal or external factors has more influence on employee motivation and performance.

As soon as the approval received from the DPSS board, email notifications will be sent to all staff to recruit workers for participation. The volunteers will be asked to complete

the survey online through SurveyMonkey.com to keep the anonymity of participants. The confidentiality of information will be mentioned during the recruitment process and also while completing the survey.

All the survey participants will be given three weeks to complete the survey. They will also be sent weekly reminders if they do not complete the survey within the given time. The questionnaire will have 30 questions. The questions will be measured by a 5-point scale. The format will consist of responding to whether they "Strongly Agree," "Agree," Neutral" "Disagree" to "Strongly Disagree". In order to make the best use of collected data, the question format will be based on different variables. The survey will have some questions that will determine demographics, workplace diversity, and also their level in the organization.

Ethical Considerations

Participants for the survey will be selected and recruited from the DPSS government agency. The participants will be recruited by email invitation. Every single participant of the survey will be given a consent form to sign. When the participants are filling out the online questionnaire, they will have to sign the online consent form. There will be no dishonesty and deception at all.

The participants will have to be aware that the information might be shared with other agencies for study purposes. However, no information about their personal identification will be provided to others. Before proceeding to complete the survey, they will have to agree to this type of terms and conditions as well.

Before completing the survey, the volunteers will be informed that their responses are anonymous. Anonymity will not only help protect respondents from any possible personal or career harm, but it will also help the participants give unbiased and fair answers to survey questions. All the participants will be notified that the survey results will only be available to

the person who is conducting the survey, and the results will be confidential. The results will be stored either in a password-protected computer or in a locked cabinet. The results of the study will be kept up until the research is presented for the designated purposes, and afterward, it will be destroyed. The participants might not directly benefit from the survey; however, it will have some positive outcome for public organizations.

Before the survey questionnaire is provided, the participant will also be kept aware that there might be questions that can cause anxiety and emotional discomfort. If the participants feel any type of discomposure while completing the survey, they will be given an option to stop the survey any time during the process.

Section 4: Background

The word "motivation" derives from a Latin word "movere," which means move. Hence, it generates an image of something growing up, keeping working, and helping to achieve the goals (Korth 2007). There are many ways to define motivation, depending on the perspectives. The term motivation refers to factors that activate, direct, and sustain behaviour (Nevid 2013). For organizational setting, motivation has been described as "the sum of the process that influences the arousal, direction, and maintenance of behaviours relevant to work settings" (Moran 2013).

The research about motivation in the public sector is usually associated with studies done by Rainey (1982) and Perry (1990). Rainey did a study on the two sectoral differences. Based on his research, the motivation of employees in private and public organizations showed a huge difference in between both sectors. He came to the following conclusion, "Since the sharp differences on this item appear to be meaningful, they also underscore the need for the future development of the concept of service motivation" (Rainey 1982). For almost a decade, Reiney's findings were not of interest to researchers, and for about a decade, no one was interested in continuing the study on motivational factors between the sectors. Only years later, when Perry and Wise used Reiney's data for their research, many other scholars have become interested in researching motivation in the work environment (Perry 2014). The reason for examining motivational factors in the public sector is that reasonable choice models were dominant, and the public employees were waiting for merit pay and similar incentives to complete their assigned tasks. However, in 1993, the US federal government ended Performance Management, and Recognition System program polices, and it changed the perspective of government employees towards their job. (Jerry 2014). The change in the system has become a reason for many scholars to continue subsequent research as it decreased employee motivation and had a negative effect on their performance.

Motivation has also been investigated by many scholars as an originator of numerous ethical and work-related behaviours (Perry 2014). The initial attempt has been made to link the theory of motivation, empirical research, and practice together by Paarlberg, Perry, and Hondegham. The reason for the effort was to fill the knowledge gap and add more data to already existing research (Perry 2014). The previous and current research is adding more value by giving more opportunities to improve the policies in public sector motivation and influence on the policy standards (Sheppard 2016).

Section 5: Recommendations

The purpose of the paper was to study the correlation of incentives and increase motivation in public sector employment. Even though the research on employee motivation in the public sector has received less attention compared to the private sector (Wright 2000), it is still possible to draw some conclusions from studies that have been provided. Based on research, there are different factors affecting employee motivation and commitment. As the study shows, public sector employees are motivated by intrinsic factors more than by extrinsic factors (Wright 2010), hence implementing polices with increased intrinsic motivational factors will benefit the organization. To escalate motivation, organizations have to go through some changes both in their policies and in management styles.

It is important that the organizations provide work-life balance, as this is one of the motivational factors. Implementation of family-friendly policies will boost the commitment and productivity of employees which will positively affect the growth of the organization. Also, the employees should be provided with different training as keeping the employees up to date with current changes that take place in the organization increases proficiency. Motivation can be increased when employees are given feedback and recognition. The managers should have meetings with their employees to discuss their progress and what needs to be worked at. This will boost the confidence and motivation of the employees. The mangers should set goals for their employees and give them recognition upon completion of the goals. This will increase employee self-assurance and motivation. Not only public service employees value intrinsic rewards more, but also they prefer non-monetary rewards over monetary ones. Job satisfaction, safety and recognition can be more valuable than monetary incentives depending on the sector and circumstances.

Section 6: Conclusion

In spite of the fact that there has been a lot of studies about motivation, motivation in the public sector needs more in-depth research. The purpose of this research was to add and expand the knowledge about the factors and incentives that influence employee motivation in the public sector.

By understanding factors that affect employee motivation in the public sector, it will be easier to plan new ways to motivate employees, implement ideas, and technologies and increase employee productivity for the prosperity of the organization. Even though this research has been done in one public agency, expanding it to other public service organizations will add more data and value to this study. There are definitely other factors that affect motivation, and more research will help find answers to more questions.

References

Allan,N. J & Meyer, J.P., 1990. The measurement and antecedents of effective, continuous and formative commitment to the organization. Journal of Occupational Psychology,

Ameeq-ul-Ameeq & Hanif, F., 2013. Impact of Training on Employee's Development and Performance in Hotel Industry of Lahore, Pakistan. Journal of Business Studies Quarterly, Volume 4, pp. 68-82.

Angle, H. L., & Perry, J. L., 1981. An empirical assessment of organizational commitment and organizational effectiveness. Administrative Science Quarterly,

Ghazala A., Bagues M., Cabrales A and Iriberri N., 2014. What You Know Can't Hurt You (For Long): A Field Experiment on Relative Feedback Performance, Mimeo.

Baldwin, J. Norman, 1984. Are We Really Lazy? Review of Public Personnel Administration: 80 – 89 .

Baldwin, Norman, 1987. Public versus Private. Not That Different, Not That Consequential, Public Personnel Management, The American Review of Public Administration.

Baldwin, J. Norman, and Farley, Quinton A., 1991 Comparing the Public and Private Sectors in the United, A Review of the Empirical Literature. Handbook of Comparative and Development Public Administration, New York

Bandiera, O., Khan, A. and Tobias, J., 2017. Rewarding bureaucrats: Can incentives improve public sector performance? IGC Growth Brief Series 008. London: International Growth Centre

Bandura, Albert. 1977. Self-efficacy: Toward a unifying theory of behavioural change. Psychological Review 84:191-215

Battaglio, P. R., & Condrey, S. E., 2009. Reforming Public Management: Analysing the Impact of Public Service Reform on Organizational and Managerial Trust. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 19(4), 689-707

Belle, N., & Cantrelli, P., 2012. Public Service Motivation: The State of the Art. In Tria G. & Valotti G. (Eds.), Reforming the Public Sector: How to Achieve Better Transparency, Service, and Leadership (pp. 96-126). Brookings Institution Press. http://www.jstor.org/stable/10.7864/j.ctt127xbv.8

Bowen, David E., and Edward E. Lawler., 1992. The empowerment of service workers: What, why, how, and when. Sloan Management Review 33:31—39. . 1995. empowering service employees. Sloan Management Review 36

Boyne, George A., 2002. Public and Private Management: What's the Difference? Journal of Management Studies 39 (1); 97 – 122 .

Bradley E. Wright, Public-Sector Work Motivation, 2001. A Review of the Current
Literature and a Revised Conceptual Model, Journal of Public Administration
Research and Theory, Volume 11, Issue 4, Pages 559–
586, https://doi.org/10.1093/oxfordjournals.jpart.a003515

Cawley, Brian, 2013. Public Service Motivation, State of Public Service Series, Institute of
Public Admistration

Choi Sungjoo, Whitfort A., 2016. Merit-based Pay and Employee Motivation in Federal
Agencies, Brookings Institute, University of Georgia

Crewson, P., 1997. Public service motivation: Building empirical evidence of incidence and
effect. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory, 7, 499-518.

Gallup Organization 2001. Gallup Study indicates actively disengaged workers cost U.S.
hundreds of billions each year. Gallup Management Journal.
http://gmj.gallup.com/content/466/gallup-study-indicates-actively-
disengagedworkers-cost-us-hundreds.aspx (Accessed on 14 April 2010)

Harter J., Gallup Organization 2018. Employee Engagement on the Rise in the U.S
https://news.gallup.com/poll/241649/employee-engagement-rise.aspx

Georgellis, Y., Iossa, E., & Tabvuma, V. 2011. Crowding Out Intrinsic Motivation in the
Public Sector. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 21(3),
473-493. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.csun.edu/stable/25836116

Grant, A. M. 2008. The significance of task significance: Job performance effects, relational
mechanisms, and boundary conditions. Journal of Applied Psychology, 93, 108 –124.

Harter, J., 2006. The Elements of Great Managing, talks about the power of Gallup's 12
questions. Gallup Press, New York

Heikkeri Elena 2010. Roots and Consequences of the Employee Disengagement
Phenomenon, Saimaa University of Applied Sciences

Houston, D. 2011. Implications of Occupational Locus and Focus for Public Service
Motivation: Attitudes Toward Work Motives across Nations. Public Administration
Review, 71(5), 761-771. Retrieved from
http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.csun.edu/stable/23017443

Houston, D 2000. Public Service Motivation, A Multivariate Test, Journal of Public
Administration, Oxford University Press

Kahn, W.A. 1990. Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at
work. Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 33, Issue 4, pp. 692–724.

Kilpatrick, Franklin P.; Cummings, Milton C.; and Jennings, M. Kent. 1964 .The Image of the Federal Service. Washington, D.C.: Brookings.

Kjeldsen, A., & Jacobsen, C., 2013. Public Service Motivation and Employment Sector: Attraction or Socialization? Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART, 23(4), 899-926. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.csun.edu/stable/24484910

Korth, M. 2007. Maslow - Move Aside! A Heuristical Motivation Model for Leaders in Career and Technical Education. Journal of industrial teacher education, 5-36.

Kosteas V.D 2010. Job Satisfaction and Promotions. Industrial Relations: A Journal of Economy and Society 50(1), 174-194

Latham, G. P., & Pinder, C. C. 2005. Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. Annual Review of Psychology, 56, 495–516.

Lunenburg, C. F., 2011. Expectancy theory of motivation: Motivating by altering expectations. International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration, 15(1), 1-6. Retrieved from http://www.nationalforum.com/

Mahmod Shafighi, A. 2013. The Effect of Work Motivation on Employees' Job Performance: International Journal of Academic Research in Business and Social Sciences, Vol. 3, No. 9 ISSN: 2222-6990.

May, D.R., Gilson, R.L., and Harter, L.M. 2004. The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology, Vol. 77, pp. 11–37.

Mercer LLC. 2007. Engaging employees to drive global business success: Insights from Mercer's What's Working™ research. http://www.mmc.com/knowledgecenter/Engaging_Employees_To_Drive_Busine ss.pdf (Accessed on 23 November 2010).

Moon, M. 2000. Organizational Commitment Revisited in New Public Management: Motivation, Organizational Culture, Sector, and Managerial Level. Public Performance & Management Review, 24(2), 177-194. doi:10.2307/3381267

Moran, B. B. 2013. Library and Information Centre Management. Santa Barbara, CA. Libraries Unlimited.

Nakao, Keiko; Hodge, Robert W.; and Treas, Judith. 1990 On Revising Prestige Scores for All Occupations, GSS Methodological Report No. 69. Chicago: National Opinion Research Cent

Naveed, A., Usman, A., & Bushra, F. 2011. Promotion: A Predictor of Job Satisfaction A Study of Glass Industry of Lahore (Pakistan). International Journal of Business and Social

Science, 2(16), 301 – 305

Nevid, J. S. 2013. Psychology: Concepts and Applications. Belmont, CA. Wadsworth
Cengage Learning.

Perry, J. and A. Hondeghem., 2008. Editors' Introduction. Motivation in Public
Management: The Call of Public Service, edited by J. Perry,
and A. Hondeghem. Oxford, England: Oxford University Press

 Perry L. James 2014. The motivational bases of public service: foundations
For a third wave of research, Asia Pacific Journal of Public Administration, 36:1, 34-
47,

Ryan, R. M. and Deci, E. L., 2000. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and
new directions. Contemporary Educational Psychology, 25:54–67.

Rainey, Hal G. 1979. Perceptions of Incentives in Business and Government: Implications for
Civil Service Reform . Public Administration Review 39 (5): 440 – 48 .

Saks, A.M. 2006. Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. Journal of
Managerial Psychology, Vol. 21, Issue 7, pp. 600–619

Shahazadi Irum, Javed Ayesha, 2014. Impact of Employee Motivation on Employee
Performance, European Journal of Business and Management, Vol 6

Staats, Elmer B. 1988. Public Service and the Public Interest. Public Administration Review
48:601-05.

Sattar, T., Ahmad, K., & Hassan, S., 2015. Role of human resources practices in employee
performance and job satisfaction with mediating effect of employee
engagement. Pakistan Economic and Social Review, 53(1), 81-96. Retrieved from
http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.csun.edu/stable/26153249

Sorenson, Susan, Garman Keri, 2013. How to Tackle U.S Employees' Stagnating
Engagement, Business Journal

Shahazadi, I., Javed, A, Pizada S., 2014. Impact of Employee Motivation on Employee
Performance, European Journal of Business and Management, The Uslamia
University of Bahawalpur, Pakistan

Sheppard, George, 2016. Work-life Balance Programs to Improve Employee Performance,
Walden University

Stolovich, Harold, 2010, Incentive, Motivation and Workplace Performance: Research and
Best Practices, Incentive Research Foundation, New York,

Sundheim Ken, 2013 What Really Motivates Employee Forbes Press

Tonin, Mirco and Michael Vlassopoulos 2012. Social Incentives Matter: Evidence from an Online Real Effort Experiment, IZA Discussion Paper No. 6716.

Vandenabeele W., 2008. Development of a Public Service Motivation Measurement Scale: Corroborating and Extending Perry's Measurement Instrument. International Public Management Journal, 11 (1), 143-167

Vandenabeele, W., and Steven Van de Walle. 2008. International Differences in Public Service Motivation: Comparing Regions across the World. In Motivation in Public Management: The Call of Public Service, edited by James L. Perry and Annie Hondeghem, 223-44. Oxford, UK: Oxford Un

Volcker Commission., 1989. Leadership for America: Rebuilding public service. Lexington, MA: D. C. Heath.

Wildermuth, C. 2009. The personal side of engagement. http://www.theeffectivenessgroup.com/images/ThePersonalSideofEngagement. pdf (Accessed on 10 April 2010).

Wright, B., 2004. The Role of Work Context in Work Motivation: A Public Sector Application of Goal and Social Cognitive Theories. Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory: J-PART,14(1), 59-78. Retrieved from http://www.jstor.org.libproxy.csun.edu/stable/3525830

Wright B. and Grant A., 2010. Unanswered Questions about Public Service Motivation: Designing Research to Address Key Issues of Emergence and Effects. Public Administration Review. September-October 2010

Zoutenbier Robin, 2015. Work Motivation and Incentives in the Public Sector Erasmus University Rotterdam,

Appendix A: Introduction Letter

Dear Sir/Madam

      Thank you for taking time to participate in this brief survey. You have been selected to participate in this survey as your input will help identify factors affecting employee motivation in the public sector, which in its turn will help develop more productive and more efficient work environment. The information provided will be used for educational purposes and will be used with maximum confidentiality.

      If there are any questions or need any clarification on any of the questions, please do not hesitate to contact.

Thank you for cooperation

Sincerely,

Meri Manukyan, MPA Student
California State University, Northridge

This questionnaire has been put together to collect information from employees of the Department of Public Social Services on employee motivation in public sector.
You are kindly asked to complete this survey by filling in the blank with the most appropriate answer.

Section One: Demographics

1. Gender: Male ( ) Female ( )
2. Age Range: Below 30 ( ) 31-40 ( ) 41-50 ( ) Above 50 ( )
3. Level of Education: HS Graduate ( ) Some College ( ) AA ( ) BA degree ( )
   Masters ( ) PhD ( ) other ( )
4. Years of Service with the County 0-5 ( ) 6-10 ( ) 11-20 ( ) 21-30 ( ) Over 30 ( )

Section Two:

Please rank the following statements ranging from strongly disagree to strongly agree:
Where: 1 = Strongly Disagree; 2 = Disagree; 3 = Neutral; 4 = Agree and
5 = Strongly Agree. Choose N/A if the item is not appropriate or does not apply to your situation.

1. I enjoy working for DPSS
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

2. My organization motivates me to go beyond what I would do in a similar role elsewhere
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

3. My organization believes in setting goals.
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

4. The leaders have conversed a vision that motivates employees.
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

5. The managers are role models for employees
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

6. I have access to learning and developmental tools that is needed to do the job
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

7. Recognition is given when the work is done good.
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

8. When at work, I am completely focused on my job duties.
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

9. I am inspired when the goals are met
       1   2   3   4   5   N/A

10. The work-life balance has great impact on employee commitment
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

11. Monetary incentives are the best source of motivating employees.
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

12. The purpose and the mission of the organization is higher than monetary rewards
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

13. The developmental goals are supported by managers
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

14. The work is sufficiently evaluated and praised
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

15. Rewarding employees will increase motivation
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

16. Job satisfaction is more important than money
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

17. Job security over high salary
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

18. Feedback boosts motivation
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

19. Frequent salary raise will increase motivation
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

20. Family-friendly work setting over higher-paying job
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

21. Gifts and rewards are important factors to keep employees engaged
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

22. The amount of rewards determine the level of engagement
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

23. Money is the most important factor keeping employees enthusiastic about the job
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

24. Work related challenges make the work interesting
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

25. Work environment has an impact on employee motivation
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

26. Training boosts the interest towards the job
   1 2 3   4   5   N/A

27. Recognition of a well-done job is a key factor affecting employee performance
      1   2   3   4   5   N/A

28. Incentives have great influence on performance
      1   2   3   4   5   N/A

29. Commitment is determined by the amount of incentives provided
      1   2   3   4   5   N/A

30. Money is the key detrimental factor for job satisfaction
      1   2   3   4   5   N/A