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Abstract

In order for organizations to utilize the human resources at their disposal effectively and efficiently, they must look at motivation as a key ingredient. It has been argued that the motivation requirements of the African may be different from others. This study has attempted to illustrate the Kenyan situation.

A study conducted in a Kenyan institution proposed that the motivation profile of the Kenyan may be different from the profile that may be seen elsewhere. Would a study conducted in a different institution arrive at a similar conclusion?

Respondents obtained from all levels in the (Brookside Dairy) company's hierarchy were asked to answer structured questionnaires.

A 'hierarchy of needs' similar to that of Abraham Maslow emerged. All (100% ) those who perceived their job security and working conditions as being very good indicated being happy at work, while only 58.1% of the permanent workers indicated being happy at work.

The conclusion arrived at by the end of the study was that the motivation requirements of the Kenyan were similar to those applicable elsewhere in the world despite the big differences that may exist in the average incomes of the respective countries.
INTRODUCTION

1. Introduction

Management of any organization involves utilizing all the resources at the organization’s disposal as efficiently as possible. Resources are all those inputs required by an organization for survival and success. These include manpower, materials, machinery and money. Manpower includes all aspects of human effort put into the organization like human energy, skills, ideas, and managerial abilities. Materials refer to all the inputs to be transformed or to be utilized in the transformation process to produce salable/marketable products. Machinery is all the physical facilities that are used in the transformation process but do not form part of the product apart from the normal wear and tear. Money clearly refers to the financial consequences associated with the operations of the organization.

Management basically involves coordinating the activities of an organization aimed at achieving (pre-conceived) goals, ambitions or targets. Management has been defined as forecasting and planning, organizing, commanding, coordinating and controlling. It has also been described as a social process consisting of planning, controlling, coordinating and motivating. Another definition describes managing as an operational process consisting of the five

2 E F L Brech, 1957.
managerial functions of planning, organizing, staffing, directing and leading, and controlling.

Strategic management is a special approach to management and involves anticipating change of whatever form, magnitude or direction, before it actually happens. It involves positioning oneself in such a way as to obtain competitive advantage in its chosen industrial sector. Strategic management can be described as the process whereby managers establish an organization's long term direction, set specific performance objectives, develop strategies to achieve these objectives in the light of all the relevant internal and external circumstances, and undertake to execute the chosen action plans. Strategy in turn can be described as a blueprint of all the important entrepreneurial, competitive and functional area actions that are to be taken in pursuing organizational objectives and positioning the organization for sustained success. There are four distinct types of decision-making rules for guidance of organizational behavior. These are:

- objectives and goals,
- product market or business strategy,
- organizational concept, and
- operating policies.

---

5 Koontz and O'Donnel, 1976.
Strategy may also be described as the organized development of resources to achieve specific objectives against competition from rival organizations. It is the use of the entity's resources; financial, manufacturing, marketing, technological, manpower, and others in the pursuit of its objectives. Strategy may be viewed as a set of policies adopted by senior management that guides the scope and direction of the entity. It takes into account the environment in which the company operates\(^6\).

Strategy is a multi-dimensional concept that embraces all of the critical activities of the firm, providing it with a sense of unity, direction, and purpose, as well as facilitating the necessary changes induced by its environment. Further, strategy is a coherent, unifying, and integrative pattern of decisions that determine and reveal the organizational purpose, resource allocation priorities, the business the organization is in or to be in and attempts to achieve a long term sustainable advantage in each of its businesses by responding properly to the opportunities and threats in the firm's environment, and the strengths and weaknesses of the organization. A strategy engages all the hierarchical levels of the firm (corporate, business and functional), and defines the nature of the economic and non-economic contributions it intends to make to its stakeholders\(^7\).

\(^6\) Management and Strategy (ACCA textbook), 1996, p. 2
\(^7\) Hax and Majluf, 1984.
In all this, it is recognized that the human factor or input is basic for success. According to Pigors and Meyers, "The key to survival and success lies not in the rational, quantitative approaches, but rather in the irrational difficult-to-measure things like people, quality, customer service and most important, flexibility to meet changing conditions". And, "The true key to successful change, the winning attitude, is employee involvement and commitment". This is especially true when one considers that every operational aspect in an organization, no matter what the level of mechanization or automation, requires some form of human input or another. For a human being to perform optimally, he/she has to be motivated to want to produce optimally and voluntarily. Most research on employee motivation has been undertaken in the western world, mainly in the United States of America.

Examples of such works include the works of such notables as:

1. Abraham Maslow and his hierarchy of needs theory,
2. Douglas McGregor and his management theories X and Y,
3. Chris Argyris and his Maturity-Immaturity theory,
4. Frederick Herzberg’s Hygiene-Motivator theory, and
5. the Hawthorne Studies of Elton Mayo and his associates
2. **Background**

Brookside Dairy was formed in September 1992 as a unit of Gicheha Farms Limited. Brookside Dairy Limited was incorporated in October 1997. After the liberalization of the Kenya dairy industry sometime in 1992, Gicheha Farms Limited with 18 years' experience in dairy farming, felt that it was a natural extension of the existing business. The Dairy started with a workforce of about 37 people with three senior staff recruited internally, and three from outside.

The dairy started operations in March 1993 processing 500 liters a day, which grew, to 13,000 liters per day in January 1995. The first expansion in 1996/97 expanded the processing capacity to 50,000 liters per day. The second expansion in 1998/99 expanded the processing capacity to 160,000 liters per day. This full capacity is to be built up in three years. The current staff strength stands at approximately 250 permanent staff, which is expected to increase to 350 people. The policy is that recruitment should compliment the various growth stages.

The company, as indicated in its mission statement, is to be the leading milk processing firm in the country. Brookside Dairy has now (July 1999) completed a series of capital-intensive investments to bring it to the forefront of the dynamic dairy industry. It now needs to commit itself to substantial human resource investment to maintain its leadership status, and expand the potential horizon.

---

6 Waithaka, W. M., Interview of 3\textsuperscript{rd} July 1999.
3. **Statement of the Problem**

The interest was to find out how the conclusions arrived at by Maslow, McGregor and Herzberg apply to the Kenyan context. Parmena (1998) observed that the emerging hierarchy of needs at Kenyatta National Hospital was somehow a modification of those of Maslow; that social need was the apex of fulfillment and not self-actualization as observed by Maslow. This may be reflective of African societal values contained in the various ethnic cultures and traditions. Most Africans have a strong sense of loyalty to the extended family, clan or tribe.

The questions that need to be answered are:

1. How much should the existing theories on (staff) motivation be modified to aptly fit the Kenyan context?

2. Is there any significant difference in motivation requirements between existing theories and the Kenyan situation?

3. Can conclusions/observations of Parmena (1998) be replicated in other institutions in Kenya?
4. Kenyatta National Hospital is classified as a parastatal organization. Would Maslow's observations also have to be modified for the private sector, which generally has a working environment and remuneration different from parastatals and other government agencies?

5. Kenyatta Hospital staffs are generally professionals (at least in Parmena's study). How would this compare in term of motivational requirements with Brookside Dairy where the majority of the workers are unskilled or semi-skilled?

6. At Kenyatta National Hospital, work regimes are not as rigid as those at Brookside Dairy, a private profit generating organization. Does this have any influence on the workers' sense of security?
4. **Objectives of the Study**

The objective of the study is to identify the various motivation factors among the
different cadres of employees at Brookside Dairy. Specific objectives of the
study include:

1. Identifying the different motivation systems in place within the organization.

2. Determining whether the different cadres of employees in the organization
   are motivated differently.

3. Ranking the different motivating factors applicable.

4. Determining the organizational reporting structure, the number of people
   reporting to each supervisor and how productivity compares to the number of
   people employed.

5. Quantifying the staff turnover rate and its possible relationship to productivity
   levels.
5. **Hypotheses**

There are significant differences between existing theories on motivation and the Kenyan situation.

6. **Importance of the Study**

This study is expected to be of particular interest to the following:

1. **Managers**

   Managers would like to use the human resources available as efficiently as possible. It has been suggested that the cost of employing the wrong person for a particular position and then having to replace him/her can cost an organization the equivalent of about two years’ pay for that particular position.

2. **Entrepreneurs**

   Before investing in a venture, an entrepreneur would be interested in knowing whether the mechanisms to obtain optimum productivity are already in place or need to be put in place to obtain an optimum return on investment.
3. Researchers and scholars

Most research on staff motivation has been in the western world. This study is likely to compare aspects in the western world and in Kenya, and point out similarities, dissimilarities, and their cross-applicability or non-applicability. This study may lay the foundation for future in depth research on staff motivation in Africa and particularly in Kenya.

4. Academicians and students

This study may increase their knowledge and the need to keep an open and inquisitive mind when studying subjects and conclusions arrived at by scholars of whatever origin.
RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

This chapter describes the research design and sampling procedures.

1. Data sources

Data were obtained using structured questionnaires. The respondents were assured of the independence of the study. This was so that they would not imagine that the study was to be used as a tool by the firm's management to determine the individuals to maintain in employment and those to get rid of, and that their answers to the questions posed would be as reliable as possible. Respondents were asked not to write their names anywhere on the questionnaire to further protect their individual identities. Questions that appeared ambiguous were clarified to the respondents before they attempted to respond to the questions asked. The completed questionnaires were to be submitted back to the researcher through the respective section supervisors. Some respondents however brought back their filled questionnaires personally to the researcher without going through any intermediary. All categories of workers, from the top of the "pyramid" to the bottom were involved in attempts to avoid personal bias and obtaining data from a "favorite" few. I expected that workers at the top of the pyramid would have different need profiles from those at the bottom because they are better paid and have different qualifications and experience. I expected that this would mean that their expectations in life would be different from those other categories of workers. Jobs at the bottom of the pyramid often tend to be routine, boring, and at times dehumanizing.
2. The questionnaire

The questionnaire is an "original" design of the researcher and is not knowingly modeled around any other current or previous research. Any similarity that may exist between this questionnaire and that used in any other research is therefore coincidental and should be seen as such.

The design of the questions is such that when a question is looked at singly, the results sought may be described as being general information or research content-based. What the latter means is that the information sought may relate the research findings with Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Herzberg's motivator-hygiene theory, and McGregor's management theories X and Y. Questions on the department a respondent works in, the sex, the age, or the income bracket may be seen to belong to the general information category. However, when comparing sets of data, the information that may result can relate directly to the research objectives even though a particular question initially appeared to search for "general information". For example, when "sex" or "age" is related to the "perception of being happy at work", the results would establish the existence of some association between the two sets of data.
3. **Sampling**

Brookside Dairy was a site of choice for the researcher who had been working there for over three years by the time of conducting the research. Familiarity with the site and people working therein was to assist in reducing the tendency for exaggeration and distortion when responding to the items in the questionnaire. The choice of site also facilitated full use of the time that would otherwise have been used in traveling to different study sites. There were also cost considerations. The researcher has had limited financial resources at his disposal.
Table 1

Staff establishment at Brookside Dairy Limited as at 31st January 1999:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Category</th>
<th>Number permanent</th>
<th>Number casual</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Directors</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Senior management</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>-</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Accounts</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>12</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Administration</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Sales and Marketing</td>
<td>56</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>80</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extension Services</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>75</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Production</td>
<td>86</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>100</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Technical</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>13</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Transport</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>32</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Quality Control</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>23</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>255</strong></td>
<td><strong>125</strong></td>
<td><strong>380</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>


The target was to obtain information from at least 50% of all the employees.
However every effort was made to obtain information from as many employees as possible in order to obtain the highest statistical acceptability possible.

All statistical calculations were obtained using the computer statistics package "SPSS for Windows" release 6.0 of June 17, 1993.
LITERATURE REVIEW

1. The evolution of management thought

Management evolved through time in various stages. These stages came to be classified as:
1. the classical management approach,
2. the behavioral approach,
3. the decision and information sciences approach,
4. the systems approach, and
5. the contingency management approach.

Daniel A. Wren divides his book, "The Evolution of Management Thought", into a number of significant divisions, namely:
1. Early management thought,
2. The Scientific Management Era,
3. The Social Person Era, and
4. The Modern Era.

Robbins in his book, "Management" (chapter two, pages 27 to 56), divides the evolution of management into four broad areas:

1. Historical background;
2. The period of diversity (scientific management, general administrative theorists, human resources approach and the quantitative approach);
3. Recent years: towards integration - the process approach, the systems approach, and the contingency approach;
4. Where are we today: and recent trends - Japanese-style management practices, stimulating innovation and change.

Every successive stage in the development of management thought was an improvement of previous stages. Improvement was targeted at increasing efficiency, productivity and profitability. The period before the development of management thought can be classified as the pre-scientific era. The pre-scientific era can be equated to the pre-industrial era. No important managerial tools of analysis developed during this period until much later when commerce began to grow, especially in the Mediterranean region. Prior to the industrial revolution, organizations still existed that required some form of managerial input or another\(^{10}\). These ‘organizations’ were basically the church, the military, the state, the family or clan, or other such like institutions\(^{11}\). There were no deliberate attempts aimed at developing management theory, and management

\(^{10}\) Koontz et al, 1984, pp. 25 - 30

\(^{11}\) Wren, 1994, p. 13
was regarded as being mere commonsense. Early management practice was
founded on past experience and based on trial and error. Some of the early
factory owners concentrated mainly on improving the methods of production.
No consideration was made for the state of the worker. Early forms of
management resulted in social upheavals and the development of master-
servant relationships. Such individuals as James Watt Jr., Mathew Robinson
Bouton, Robert Owen (1771 - 1858) and Charles Babbage (1792 - 1871) made
outstanding contributions to management thought during this time. These were
people who would have fitted better in different times. In those early years,
workers were regarded as 'inert' as other means of production like machinery
and equipment, and financial resources. Watt and Bouton were sons of pioneers
who developed and invented the steam engine. Their contributions can be
summarized as follows (quoted from Koontz et al., 1984, p. 28):

"These two men took over the management of the Soho Engineering Foundry in
Great Britain when it was established by their fathers in 1796. Watt was in
charge of organization and administration, and Bouton paid particular attention
to the sales and commercial activities ... managerial techniques developed by
these men for Soho were such things as market research and forecasting,
planned machine lay-out in terms of work-flow requirements, production
planning, production process standards, and standardization of product
components ... In the personnel area, they developed both worker and executive
training and development programs, work study, and payment by results based on work study, and such welfare programs as a sickness benefit program administered by an elected committee of employees."\(^{13}\)

Robert Owen has been referred to as "the father of modern personnel management" and was one of the most successful industrialists of the early nineteenth century. His philosophy was that good personnel management pays dividends to the employer and is an essential part of every manager’s job. A verbatim quote (from Koontz et al.) reads, "Owen improved working conditions in the factory, raised the minimum working age for children, reduced hours of work for employees at the factories, set up stores to sell necessities to employees at cost, and sought to improve the entire community in which his employees lived by building houses and streets, and making the community and factory attractive."\(^{14}\) Robert Owen believed that human resources were just as valuable in the production process as were financial and other material resources. Factory workers would be more productive if motivated through rewards rather than through directives and punishment. He (Owen) experimented through various motivating techniques and became a strong advocate for improving conditions of work by reducing the hours of work, provision of meals at the factory, and others. All these can aptly be summarized thus, "Owen was truly a revolutionary before his time. He was uncomfortable with the management

---

\(^{12}\) Wren, 1994, pp. 13 - 33  
\(^{13}\) Koontz et al., 1984, pp. 25 - 30  
\(^{14}\) Koontz et al., 1984, p. 28
practices prevailing during his time. He argued against spending “thousands” on the best machines, yet buy the cheapest labor. He scolded that people spent time improving machines, specializing labor, and cutting costs, yet make no investment in the human resource. He appealed to his contemporaries complaining that, “money spent on labor would return you, not five, ten or fifteen per cent for your capital so expended, but often fifty, and in many cases a hundred per cent.”\footnote{Wren, 1994, pp. 55 - 58} Problems, especially those of poor production efficiency still persisted. Owen’s ideas were considered too radical by his contemporaries in industry and politics, and rejected his ideas. A biographer even suggested that he became slightly mad in 1817.\footnote{G. D. H. Cole, The life of Robert Owen, 1966, p. 197 - quoted in Wren, 1994, p. 58}

Charles Babbage was a scholar who expounded the idea of mathematical applications in management, and demonstrated the world’s first practical mechanical calculator, his \textit{difference machine} in 1922. He was interested in the economics of division of labor and the development of scientific principles to govern a manager’s use of facilities, materials, and labor to get the best possible results. He advocated for a kind of profit sharing and bonus systems as ways of permitting better relations between owners (or managers) and workers, and for increased productivity.\footnote{Koontz et al., 1984, pp. 28 - 29}
Quoting Wren (1994, p. 62), “Babbage’s profit sharing scheme had two facets: that a portion of wages would depend on factory profits; and that the worker should derive more advantage from applying any improvement he might discover, that is a bonus for suggestions.” Workers would receive a fixed salary based on the nature of their task plus a share in the profits, and the suggestion system would use a committee to determine the proper bonus for production savings.

Babbage saw a number of advantages in his proposal:

- each worker would have a direct interest in the firm’s prosperity;
- each would be stimulated to prevent waste and mismanagement;
- every department would be improved; and
- it would be the common interest of all to admit (or hire) only the most respectable and skillful (workers).

In effect, the work group, operating under a profit-sharing plan, would act to screen out undesirables who would reduce its share. Finally, Babbage saw his scheme as removing the necessity for combinations of workers, since their interests would be the same as those of the employers. With this mutuality of interests between workers and manager, neither would oppress the other and all would prosper.
Babbage was considered to be an eccentric and may be even on the verge of lunacy. His contemporaries also rejected his ideas.\textsuperscript{16}

In the late 19\textsuperscript{th} century, owners of business began to raise questions on the problems of work efficiency and management. Problems were compounding with markets becoming saturated and increasing competition, amid demands for greater profits.\textsuperscript{10}

The \textbf{scientific management era} developed as a result of the need to increase efficiency and productivity of a \textbf{rapidly expanding workforce}; the need to improve management techniques that would integrate technology, materials and worker activities in production and efficiency. The era can be characterized as the beginning of the systematic study of management. The approach however to the human factor in management was simply as a force to be used as an adjunct to machinery. Early thought linked physiological variables like bread and butter to the energy required to operate machines.\textsuperscript{20,21}

\begin{flushleft}
\textsuperscript{16} Wren, 1994, pp. 59 - 62  \\
\textsuperscript{19} Wren, 1994, pp. 100 - 102  \\
\textsuperscript{20} Ivancevich et al., 1994, pp. 45 - 46  \\
\textsuperscript{21} Wren, 1994, p. 105
\end{flushleft}
The **classical organization theory**\(^{22}\) of the scientific management era focused its attention on the methods that managers could use to structure the whole organization to make it more productive. Max Webber, who is regarded as the father of bureaucracy, emphasized that the bureaucratic organization is the most rational means for carrying out imperative control over human beings.

Bureaucracy is a basic concept of classical management theory relating to structure and the administrative process. Henri Fayol is seen as the father of administrative management theory, and forwarded that organizations' problems can be arrested by applying six basic functions: technical, commercial, financial, security, accounting and managerial functions.\(^{23,24}\)

The **scientific management thought** of the scientific management era addressed issues concerning the management of work. This school of thought basically concentrated on the factory floor where the work is actually done, ignoring other elements of the organization. Frederick Taylor developed principles of work management and included such issues as selecting, training and developing the worker. Taylor's assumptions were based on the belief that people are motivated basically by economic considerations and that when given adequate information, they will choose rationally the alternative that maximizes

\(^{22}\) Robbins, 1991, p. 37 refers to the classical organisation theory as "The General Administration Theory."

\(^{23}\) Ivancevich et al., 1994, pp. 47 - 50

their economic well being. Frank and Lillian Gilbreith developed principles of work simplification and sought to find the best and easiest way to do any particular job. Henry Gantt developed principles of work scheduling. Gantt believed that expertise should be the sole criterion for the exercise of authority, and that managers as the recipients of authority have the moral obligation to make decisions by scientific methods not based on opinions. Harrington Emerson proposed the creation of a strict organization whose activities would be defined by clear statements of goals and purposes. According to Taylor and his colleagues of the classical era (scientific management era), management is responsible for planning, organizing and controlling the work.\textsuperscript{25,26}

The behavioral or human relations approach was a major milestone in the development of management theory and thought. The behavioral approach developed partly because practicing managers found that the ideas of the classical approach did not always achieve the desired levels of efficiency and workplace harmony. The various researches and observations conducted during this period discovered that the real cause of human behavior was more than the classical theorists' approach of viewing behavior as being based on human physiology. The behavioral approach uses concepts of psychology, sociology, anthropology and other behavioral sciences to assist managers in understanding human behavior in the workplace. An important occurrence during this time was

\textsuperscript{25} Ivancevich et al., 1994, pp. 46 - 47
\textsuperscript{26} Robbins, 1991, pp. 33 - 37
the 'Hawthorne Experiment' carried out in various stages between 1924 and 1936. What started off as a study of the physical effects like lighting on performance turned out to be an eye opener in the study of the motivation of the worker. The main contributions of the Hawthorne Studies may be outlined as having been responsible for the growth and development of the human relations approach in personnel administration. They underscored the importance of the human and social factors in industrial relations. A worker is not merely an "economic man" who is motivated only by the paycheck. Non-economic incentives are sometimes more important in influencing his attitude towards his work. These studies developed the field of personnel counseling and stressed the value of the talking-out process in alleviating personal stress and preoccupations, and in bringing about cooperative relations amongst members of a group. They revealed that the factory is a social system and that informal groups in any work situation vitally affect human behavior. They influenced the general teaching and practice of industrial management, and have served to provide course material for teaching and training in the past quarter of a century. Elton Mayo, Frintz Roethlisberger and their collaborators conducted the 'Hawthorne studies'. Some very important work carried out during this period include Abraham Maslow's hierarchy of needs theory, Douglas McGregor's theories X and Y, Chris Argyris' maturity-immaturity theory, and Frederick Herzberg's hygiene-motivator theory.

27 Personnel Management, p.958.
28 Ivancevich, 1994, pp. 50 - 52
The Quantitative Approach⁵⁰ (Management Science stream) is premised on the desire to apply mathematics and statistics in management. This has been found very useful and tends to make the work of managing easy. It involves the use of such tools as business mathematics, business statistics, linear programming, computers and calculators to help solve managerial problems, and increase the efficiency of work.

Management by Objectives (or Results Management) is the brainchild of Peter Drucker. Peter Drucker believed that management of work and productivity would be greatly improved if focused on objectives or desired results. This style counters authoritarian management practices and encourages collaborative practices. There is improved two-way communication between superior and subordinate and includes involving the subordinate in the setting up of the objectives to achieve.⁵¹

The Systems Approach is an integrating approach and considers the organization in its totality taking into account all the variables at play. Variables here refer to factors that are both internal and external to the organization.⁵²,⁵³,⁵⁴

---

⁵⁰ Robbins, 1991, pp. 45 - 46
⁵¹ Drucker, 1997, pp. 335 - 349
⁵² Hitt et al., pp. 55 - 56
⁵³ Ivancevich et al., 1994, pp. 54- 57
⁵⁴ Robbins, 1991, pp. 47 - 48
The *Contingency (or Situational) Approach* is a form of comparative management and is premised on the idea that organizational behavior is contingent to a given situation. The foundation to this approach is the belief that there cannot be a particular management approach or design, which will be appropriate for all situations.\(^{35,36,37}\)

As management thinking developed and continues to develop from the pre-scientific era to the current management practices, the only consistent feature is the human factor. All input factors have changed considerably. On top of this list may be technology and the resultant shift in the measurement of productivity and efficiency. The human factor is the determinant one in the efficient use of such varied resources as finances, materials, ideas, machinery and equipment.

Steven Kerr in his book, "*Ultimate Rewards*" (1997, pp. 63 - 64) states, "... the key to success for people who run their own small businesses is the desire to do something better or more efficiently than it has been done before, what can be termed as achievement motivation. The need to achieve leads people to behave in ways that do not necessarily engender good management. They focus on personal improvement and doing things better by themselves. Achievement-motivated people want to do things *themselves*. They want concrete short-term feedback on their performance so that they can tell how well they are doing."

\(^{35}\) Hitt et al., pp. 56 - 57  
\(^{36}\) Ivancevich et al., 1994, pp. 57 - 59  
\(^{37}\) Robbins, 1991, pp. 48 - 51
However managers in large and often complex organizations cannot perform by themselves all the tasks necessary for success. They must manage others to perform for the organization. They must be willing to do without immediate and personal feedback since tasks are spread out amongst many people. The manager’s job seems to call more for someone who can influence people through the use of appropriate leadership skills than for someone who does things better alone. This need for influencing people must be so disciplined and so controlled as to be directed toward the benefit of the institution as a whole and not toward the manager’s personal aggrandizement. Consequently a good manager is one who, among other things, helps subordinates feel strong and responsible, rewards them properly for good performance, and sees that things are organized so that subordinates feel they know what they should be doing. Managers should foster among subordinates a strong sense of team spirit, of pride in working as part of a team. If a manager creates and encourages this spirit, his or her subordinates certainly should perform better.9

Motives can be described as the needs and wants that cause a person to act. In the workplace, motivation is the process of influencing an employee to act so that the organization’s goals are achieved and the employee’s needs are satisfied98. Motivation is concerned with why people do (or refrain from doing) things. A motive is a need or a driving force within a person. The process of motivation involves choosing between alternative forms of action in order to
achieve some desired end or goal. The term motive has also been defined as an inner state that energizes, activates, or moves, and that directs or channels behavior towards goals. Motivation can be looked at as involving a chain reaction, starting out with felt needs, resulting in wants or goals sought, which give rise to tensions (that is unfulfilled desires), then causing action toward achieving goals, and finally satisfying wants. Motivation represents the psychological processes that cause the arousal, direction and persistence of voluntary actions that are goal-directed. Carl Rogers (1951), a psychologist, recognized that humans have needs. He stressed the inherent tendency of the individual to coordinate these needs in order to develop the self. Abraham Maslow, a contemporary of Rogers also came to the same conclusion, that humans have a need for self-actualization.

For the purpose of this study, I have examined motivation primarily from the following three perspectives:

1. Individual needs, and Abraham Maslow's theory on the 'Hierarchy of Needs',
2. Job content and context, and Frederick Herzberg's 'Hygiene - Motivator Theory', and
3. The manager's assumptions and attitudes as addressed in Douglas McGregor's 'Theory X and Theory Y'.

39 Cole, 1993, p. 27.
40 Berelson and Steiner, 1964, p. 20.
41 Koontz et al., 1984, pp. 478 - 479.
2. Hierarchy of Needs

(Refer: Kreitner and Kinicki, 1995, pp. 46)

In 1943, Abraham Maslow, a psychologist, published his now famous theory on the hierarchy of needs. His theory was based on the clinical observation of a few neurotic individuals. It has since been used to explain the entire spectrum of human behavior. He proposed that motivation is a function of five basic needs - physiological, safety, love, esteem and self-actualization.

The basic human needs arranged in ascending order are:44,45

1. Physiological Needs

These are the most basic needs and entail having enough food, water and air. Also included in this category are clothing, shelter, sleep and sexual satisfaction. Until these needs are satisfied to the degree necessary to maintain life, other needs will not motivate people.

2. Security (or Safety) Needs

These consist of the need to be safe from physical and psychological harm. Also included here is the need to be free of fear of loss of a job, property, food, clothing or shelter.

3. Love Needs

These have also been classified as social needs, and as affiliation or acceptance needs. In this category belongs the desire to be loved and to love, and also contains the needs for affection and belonging. People are social beings and need to be accepted by others, and giving and receiving in interpersonal relationships.

4. Esteem (or ego) Needs

These include the need for reputation, prestige, and recognition from others. Also contained here are the needs for self-confidence and strength, including self-respect, respect from others, and status.

5. Self-Actualization Needs

This is regarded, as the highest need in the hierarchy and includes the desire for self-fulfillment, to become the best that one is capable of becoming. Included here are personal growth, realization of one's potential and accomplishment.
Individuals are motivated by a desire to satisfy these needs. Needs that have been satisfied do not motivate employees. When a need is sufficiently satisfied, a higher level of needs will satisfy an individual. People are never completely satisfied on any level. Needs affect motivation in many ways. If an employee's needs are met in the workplace, the employee will most likely be highly motivated. If an employee's needs are not being met in the workplace, the employee will be continually frustrated. For those employees who have goals that are incompatible with their needs, low motivation may result. Sometimes helping an employee define realistic and achievable goals will improve an employee's motivation.\textsuperscript{42, 43}

One of the roles of a manager is to recognize the employee's needs and determine how the job can help meet those needs. For example, when employees feel secure in their jobs, management might attempt to satisfy esteem needs. Using status symbols, participative management, and positive performance feedback can do this. When employees' esteem needs are satisfied, management can enhance motivation by redesigning jobs to provide more autonomy and responsibility.\textsuperscript{46, 47}

\textsuperscript{46} Motivating, 1996, p. 22.
\textsuperscript{47} Kreitner and Kinicki, 1995, p. 147.
3. Motivator-Hygiene Theory

Frederick Herzberg's conclusions were based on the results of surveying 1,600 individuals. His findings uncovered two categories of factors, **hygiene factors** and **motivators**.

Hygiene factors serve to **prevent dissatisfaction** but they cannot motivate by themselves. These factors are peripheral to the job and are present in the work environment, or the **job context**. Motivators are factors that encourage employees to do their best. These factors have an effect on employee motivation resulting in personal satisfaction. Motivators are found in the **job content**.

Hygiene factors sustain the employee on the job and maintain a level of satisfaction. Without hygiene factors, an employee may decide not to stay on a job. Examples of hygiene factors include:

- company policy and administration,
- supervision (technical aspects and interpersonal relations),
- working conditions,
- salary and benefits,
- job status, and
- job security.
Motivators affect the employee's level of motivation. Real motivation comes from the employee's accomplishments (the job content) and not from the environmental factors (the job context). Examples of motivating factors include:

- achievement,
- recognition,
- work itself,
- responsibility,
- career development, and
- personal growth.\textsuperscript{48,49}

A key distinction between the motivators and the hygiene factors is that motivators bring about positive satisfaction, and that hygiene factors only serve to prevent dissatisfaction. If motivators are absent from a job, the employee will experience real dissatisfaction. On the other hand, even if the hygiene factors are provided for, they will not in themselves bring about job satisfaction.\textsuperscript{46,47}

Herzberg advocated using \textit{job enrichment} to increase the factors that are considered as motivators. Increasing employee skill levels, recognizing the importance of an employee's work, and providing feedback all help to strengthen motivators. Some job enrichment strategies that may be followed include:

• increasing job demands so that more responsibility is given to the employee,
• providing feedback so that an employee has reports on his/her progress,
• providing new learning experiences that encourage personal growth, and
• increasing employee accountability so that the individual has more control over the work.\textsuperscript{50}

Rather than give employees additional tasks of similar difficulty (horizontal loading), one should use vertical loading. This consists of giving workers more responsibility. Seven principles to be followed have been proposed\textsuperscript{51} when vertically loading jobs. These are:

1. Removing some controls while retaining accountability. The motivators involved are responsibility and personal achievement.

2. Increasing the accountability of individuals for their own work. The motivators involved here are responsibility and recognition.

3. Giving a person a complete natural unit of work (division, area, etc.). The motivators involved are responsibility, achievement and recognition.

4. Granting additional authority to an employee in his activity and job freedom. The motivators involved are also responsibility, achievement and recognition.

5. Making periodic reports directly available to the worker himself rather than to the supervisor. The motivator applied is recognition.

6. Introducing new and more difficult tasks not previously handled. The motivators involved are growth and learning.
7. Assigning individuals specific or specialized tasks, enabling them to become experts. The motivators involved here are responsibility, growth and advancement.

A direct outgrowth of job enrichment is the job characteristics model, which attempts to pinpoint those situations and those individuals for which job design is most effective. This involves attempting to structure work in such a way that employees are internally motivated. Internal motivation occurs when an individual is ‘turned on’ to one’s work because of the positive internal feelings that are generated by doing well for the motivation to work effectively. These feelings power a self-perpetuating cycle of motivation. Internal work motivation is determined by three psychological states: 52

1. Experienced meaningfulness of the work. The individual must perceive his/her work as worthwhile or important by some system of value he accepts.
2. Experienced responsibility for the outcomes of the work. He must believe that he personally is accountable for the outcomes of his efforts.

52 Kreitner and Kinicki, 1995, pp. 155 - 157
3. Knowledge of the actual results of the work activities. He must be able to determine, on some regular basis, whether or not the outcomes of his work are satisfactory.

Five core job dimensions foster these psychological states:

- **Skill variety** – the extent to which the job requires an individual to perform a variety of tasks that require him or her to use different skills and abilities.
- **Task identity** – the extent to which the job requires an individual to perform a whole or completely identifiable piece of work. Task identity is high when a person works on a product or project from beginning to end and sees a tangible result.
- **Task significance** – the extent to which the job affects the lives of other people within or outside the organization.
- **Autonomy** – the extent to which the job enables an individual to experience freedom, independence and discretion in both scheduling and determining the procedures used in completing the job.
- **Feedback** – the extent to which an individual receives direct and clear information about how effectively he or she is performing the job.
Core job dimensions are common characteristics found to a varying degree in all jobs. The outcomes from the critical psychological states include:\textsuperscript{53}

1. high internal work motivation,
2. high growth satisfaction,
3. high general satisfaction, and
4. high work effectiveness.

People respond positively to jobs that contain these core job characteristics when they have the knowledge and skills necessary to perform the job, high growth needs, and high context expectations.

4. Theory X and Theory Y Management

Douglas McGregor believed that managers' views of human nature determine how they motivate their employees.

The Theory X manager uses an authoritarian approach and believes that people need to be controlled or threatened to be motivated. This type of management results in strict chains of command, enforcement of rules and regulations, and severe monitoring of employees' performance.

The theory X manager believes that:
- people inherently dislike work,
- people lack ambition and avoid responsibility,
- people seek security and want to be led, and
- managers must control, direct, and coerce their employees.

The theory Y manager believes that:
- work is natural for people,
- people desire self-control and self-direction,
- people not only accept, but seek responsibility, and
- external controls are not needed to motivate people.
Theory Y management is based on the belief that people are motivated to be responsible and mature and do not need external controls to motivate them. Employees seek challenges to fulfill their needs. Implementation of theory Y management should involve integration, a term which McGregor used to describe a system in which employees’ needs and the organization’s goals are mutually satisfied.

Characteristics of theory Y management include:

- open communication
  Being open and taking time to talk.
- team work
  Helping the group work together.
- participation in decision making
  Seeking advice and opinions and using the skills and abilities of the members of the group.
- encouragement of initiative
  Delegating, allowing in how work is handled.
- mutual support
  Backing people up and minimizing their frustrations.
- high standards
  Setting a good example and checking on how others are doing.

---

• using objectives

Providing goals and timetables for direction and monitoring how resources are used.

• performance evaluation

Sharing reactions and constructively evaluating performance.

Other management practices that apply and extend theory Y include:

• Flex time

• Job enrichment

• Management by objectives, and

• Participative decision making.
5. Sources of Motivation

(An excerpt paraphrased from Steven Kerr, 1997, pp. 107 - 111.)

"One of the essential, unchanging tasks of leaders is to motivate and guide performance. But motivational tools are changing fast. More and more businesses are doing away with the old and bureaucratic incentives and using entrepreneurial opportunity to attract the best talent. Managers must exercise more leadership even as they watch their bureaucratic power slip away. The reduction in hierarchical levels curtails a manager's ability to promise promotion. New compensation systems that make bonuses and raises dependent on objective performance measures and on team appraisals deprive managers of their role as the sole arbiter of higher pay. As if the loss of carrots and sticks is not enough, many managers can no longer even give their people clear job standards and easily mastered procedural rules. With the old motivational tool kit depleted, leaders need new and more effective incentives to encourage high performance and build commitment. These new tools are:

1. Mission

Helping people believe in the importance of their work is essential, especially when other forms of certainty and security have disappeared. Good leaders can inspire others with the power and excitement of their vision and give people a sense of purpose and pride in their work. Pride is often a better

---

source of motivation than the traditional corporate career ladder and the promotion-based reward system.

2. Agenda control

As career paths lose their certainty and companies' future grow less predictable, people can at least be in-charge of their non-professional lives. More and more professionals are passing up jobs with glamour and prestige in favor of jobs that give them greater control over their own activities and direction.

3. Share of value creation

Entrepreneurial incentives that give teams a piece of the action are highly appropriate in collaborative companies. Because extra rewards are based only on measurable results, this approach also conserves resources. Innovative companies are experimenting with incentives like phantom stock for development of new ventures and others. Individual managers can also ask for a bonus pool for their own areas, contingent on meeting performance goals. And anyone can share the kinds of rewards that are abundant and free - award and recognition.

4. Learning

The chance to learn new skills or apply them in new arenas is an important motivator in a turbulent environment because it is oriented towards securing the future.
5. Reputation

Reputation is key in professional careers and has a high chance of being an outstanding motivator. The professional’s reliance on reputation stands in marked contrast to the bureaucrat’s anonymity. Professionals have to make a name for themselves while traditional corporate managers and employees stayed behind the scenes.

Mobilizing an organization to adapt its behaviors in order to thrive in new business environments is critical. Without such change, any company today would falter. Getting people to do adaptive work is the mark of leadership in a competitive world. Yet for most senior executives, providing leadership and not just authoritative expertise is extremely difficult for two reasons:

1. In order to make change happen, executives have to break a long-standing behavior pattern of their own: providing leadership in the form of solutions. The locus of responsibility for problem solving when a company faces an adaptive challenge must shift to its people. Solutions to adaptive challenges reside not in the executive suite but in the collective intelligence of employees at all levels, who need to use one another as resources, often across boundaries, and learn their way to those solutions.

2. Adaptive change is distressing for the people going through it. They need to take on new roles, new relationships, new values, new behaviors, and new
approaches to work. Many employees are ambivalent about efforts and sacrifices required of them. They often look to the senior executive to take problems off their shoulders. This has to change. Leaders have to ask tough questions. Rather than protecting people from outside threats, leaders should allow them to feel the pinch of reality in order to stimulate them to adapt. Instead of orienting people to their current roles, leaders must disorient them so that new relationships can develop. Instead of quelling conflict, leaders have to draw the issues out. Instead of maintaining norms, leaders have to challenge “the way we do business” and help others distinguish immutable values from historical practices that must go". 
RESEARCH FINDINGS

A total of 350 questionnaires were prepared and issued to the respondents. Out of these, 214 questionnaires equivalent to 61.4% of all questionnaires, were brought back. This was better than the original expectation of 50%. Not all questions were answered (please see the “totals” column in the “data input summary” sheet). Only the answered questions were used to arrive at the statistics observed.

Data are initially presented in table form in an attempt at illustrating the relationships between any two sets of variables. However, with 27 sets of variables (corresponding to the numbers in the questionnaire), there are 351 possible combinations! It is more than adequate to only present a few combinations in table form with a short written explanation. Other combinations are explained in writing only. It is my belief that the data thus presented will help to reassure the serious reader of the thoroughness used in the scrutiny of the data.

In the written explanation, I have attempted in some places to explain the relationship that may exist between the research findings and the conclusions arrived at by the various scholars/authors referred to in the literature review. This is better clarified in the interpretation of the data, discussion, and the conclusions I have arrived at.
1. Summary of data obtained

### Table 2

Data input summary sheet

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>CODE</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>DYWI</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SEX</td>
<td>170</td>
<td>41</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>211</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>AGE</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WIYS</td>
<td>66</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>LIVQ</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>116</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRPF</td>
<td>145</td>
<td>64</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GRPC</td>
<td>87</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>20</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>144</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>FAST</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>94</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>213</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEPE</td>
<td>54</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>214</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>MEAL</td>
<td>99</td>
<td>90</td>
<td>21</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>JOBS</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>91</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>207</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECN</td>
<td>159</td>
<td>51</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>RECH</td>
<td>39</td>
<td>81</td>
<td>33</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>153</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>GOAL</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>17</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>145</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROP</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>144</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>212</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROT</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>68</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>PROF</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>UNSA</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>32</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>121</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>WOCO</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>11</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CADE</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>16</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>206</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CUEM</td>
<td>124</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>28</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>202</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>SUPE</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>50</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DEMA</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>69</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>209</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>DIPE</td>
<td>154</td>
<td>56</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>210</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>CONC</td>
<td>128</td>
<td>23</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>151</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>HAPM</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>INCO</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td></td>
<td>208</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
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Key to the data input codes above as they appear in the questionnaire (see: Appendix)

DYWI – “Department You Work In” refers to the respective department the respondent works in. Numbers 1 to 8 represent the 8 departments at Brookside Dairy Limited; production (1), technical (2), administration (3), quality control (4), extension services (5), transport (6), sales and marketing (7), and accounts (8).

SEX – refers to a respondent being either male (1) or female (2).

AGE – respondents were categorized into three age groups; groups 1 (18 – 30 years of age), 2 (31 – 40 years of age) and 3 (41 – 50 years of age). There was no respondent over 50 years of age.

WIYS – “What Is Your Status” refers to the respondent’s employment status; casual (1), permanent (2), temporary (3), contract (4) or on probation (5).

LIVQ – refers to the respondent’s living quarters; shared quarters (1), 1 room (2), 2 – 4 rooms (3), or 5 rooms and/or more (4). This question sought to find out how well a respondent’s “physiological need” for shelter was satisfied.

GRPF – refers to whether the respondent belongs to any formal group; yes (1) or no (2). This question sought to establish how well the "affiliation need" was met.
GRPC – refers to the type of formal group; SACCO or other social group (1), bible study/religious association or group (2), and/or others (3). A score of "4" was given when the respondent marked/checked more than one offered category. For those who indicated belonging to a social group, this question sought to find out the type of social group that best fulfilled affiliation needs.

FAST – refers to “family status”; married (1), single (2), widowed (3), or divorced (4). This question sought to find out how one’s family status affected one’s achievement goals.

DEPE – refers to the number of dependants the respondent may have; none (1), one (2), two (3), three (4), four (5), five (6), six (7), or seven and more (8). This question sought to find out whether the number of dependants one has affected one’s achievement goals.

MEAL – refers to the number of meals a respondent has in a day; 1 or less (1), 2 (2), or 3 or more (3). This question sought to find out how well one’s physiological need for nourishment was met and whether it affected motivation at work in any way.

JOBS – refers to the respondent’s sense of job security; very poor (1), poor (2), average (3), good (4), or very good (5).
RECN – refers to the respondent’s perception of his/her contribution being recognized at work; yes (1) or no (2).

RECH – refers to the type of recognition given a respondent’s contribution at work; singled out for good performance (1), mentioned in group performance (2), or mentioned in company performance (3). Answers to this question were only accepted if the respondent had indicated that his/her contribution at work is recognized.

GOAL – refers to the respondent’s achievement goals based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs; physiological (1), security (2), love (3), esteem (4), or self-actualization (5) needs.

PROP – refers to whether the respondent owns any property; yes (1) or no (2).

PROT – refers to the type of property the respondent owns; vehicle (1), land (2), permanent house (3), or other (4). A score of “5” was given when the respondent marked/checked more than one offered answers.

PROF – refers to the type of property the respondent would like to own if he/she does not own any property. The first or all were categorized as belonging to the different categories of Maslow’s hierarchy of needs; physiological (1), security (2), love (3), esteem (4), or self-actualization (5) needs.
UNSA – refers to the respondent’s ultimate non-spiritual achievement goals based on Maslow’s hierarchy of needs; physiological (1), security (2), love (3), esteem (4), or self-actualization (5) needs.

WOCO – refers to the respondent’s perception of his/her working conditions; very poor (1), poor (2), average (3), good (4), or very good (5).

CADE – refers to the respondent’s perception of career development or personal growth achieved while at Brookside Dairy Ltd.; very little (1), little (2), average (3), good (4), or very good (5).

CUEM – refers to the respondent’s period of stay in Brookside’s employment; up to 1-year (1), up to 3 years (2), or over 3 years (3).

SUPE – refers to the number of people a respondent supervises directly; none (1), 1 to 5 (2), 6 to 10 (3), 11 to 20 (4), or over 20 (5).

DEMA – refers to the whether or not the respondent is involved in any way in the decision-making process; yes (1) or no (2).

DIPE – refers to whether or not the respondent discusses his/her performance with his/her supervisor.
CONC – refers to whether the respondent’s contributions are ever considered after discussing performance with his/her supervisor; yes (1) or no (2).

HAPP – refers to the respondent’s perception of being happy working at Brookside Dairy; yes (1) or no (2). Happiness was equated to one’s motivational status.

INCO – refers to the respondent’s monthly income bracket; up to Kshs.3, 000 (1), Kshs.3, 001 - 6,000 (2), Kshs.6, 001 - 9,000 (3), Kshs.9, 001 - 12,000 (4), Kshs.12, 001 - 20,000 (5), Kshs.20, 001 - 30,000 (6), or Kshs.30, 000 and above (7).
2. Data analysis

Table 3

Distribution of income based on department

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income KShs.</th>
<th>1 Prodn.</th>
<th>2 Tech.</th>
<th>3 Admin.</th>
<th>4 Quality Control</th>
<th>5 Extrem. Servcs.</th>
<th>6 Transp.</th>
<th>7 Sales</th>
<th>8 Accts.</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 6,000</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>112</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>4.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>208</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>13.0</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100</td>
<td>0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The income pattern exhibited a pyramidal presentation as expected. The first category (up to KShs 3,000.00) had a work force equivalent to 35.1% of the total workforce. Categories 2, 3, 4, 5, 6 and 7 had 28.4%, 13.5%, 6.7%, 6.3%, 5.8% and 4.3% respectively. The last category earns over KShs 30,000.00 per month.
Table 4

Distribution of income based on sex

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income KShs.</th>
<th>1 male</th>
<th>2 female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 6,000</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 12,000</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001- 20,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>166</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to sex, 71.7% of males were employed in income categories 1 and 2, while categories 6 and 7 had only 7.2% of the males. Females had 28.2% in categories 1 and 2, and 23.0% in categories 6 and 7. In the middle categories 3, 4 and 5, males had 21.0% against 56.8% of the females. It appears that females were generally better paid than males.
Table 5

Distribution of income based on age group

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income KShs.</th>
<th>18 - 30 years</th>
<th>31 - 40 years</th>
<th>41 - 50 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>35.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 6,000</td>
<td>46</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>27.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 12,000</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>155</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age did not appear to be significant in income distribution. All ages had similar proportions represented in all income groups with the majority in the age group 18 – 30 years. This did not however apply to the highest income group, which had the majority in age group 31 – 40 years.
### Table 6

Distribution of income based on achievement goals (Maslow's hierarchy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income KShs.</th>
<th>1 physiological</th>
<th>2 security</th>
<th>3 affiliation</th>
<th>4 esteem</th>
<th>5 self-actualization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>32</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>52</td>
<td>36.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 5,000</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>26.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>11.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 12,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001-20,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>7.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>69</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>16</strong></td>
<td><strong>143</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>48.3</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td>18.2</td>
<td>11.2</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The *hierarchy of needs* resulting from comparing achievement goals with income seems to suggest a significant relationship. The pattern exhibited seems to suggest the following order:

- Physiological needs
- Security/safety needs
- Esteem/ego needs
- Social/affiliation needs
- Self-actualization.
The numbers of each of the income groups 3 to 7 that responded to the question on achievement goals were 16, 12, 11, 6 and 6 respectively. Income groups 1 and 2 had 52 and 40 members respectively.

In the income group 6,001 – 9,000 above, it is indicated that no one responded positively to esteem needs. This may be a mistake. The desire to own a permanent house was interpreted to imply a physiological need for shelter when it could easily have been an esteem need.

**Table 7**

Distribution of income based on **ultimate** achievement goals (Maslow’s hierarchy)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income KShs.</th>
<th>1. physiological</th>
<th>2. security</th>
<th>3. affiliation</th>
<th>4. esteem</th>
<th>5. self-actualization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>31.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 – 6,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>27.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 – 9,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 – 12,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001 – 20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 – 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>21</strong></td>
<td><strong>31</strong></td>
<td><strong>119</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td><strong>9.2</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>23.5</strong></td>
<td><strong>17.6</strong></td>
<td><strong>26.1</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The respondents who answered the question on **ultimate achievement goals** were 119, a drop of 24 (or 16.8%) from the 143 that responded to the question on **achievement goals**. From this, I am tempted to assume that this question was confusing for some respondents, especially those whose “current” needs were not adequately fulfilled. They found it difficult to visualize the “ultimate” when the “immediate” was not adequately taken care of. This finding supports (in a negative sense) the statement, “Individuals are motivated by the need to satisfy these needs … When a need is sufficiently satisfied, a higher level of needs will satisfy an individual”.

When comparing the sets of data presented in the two tables 6 and 7, the first income group (up to KShs 3,000) appears to remain stuck at “security” needs. However, income group 3,001 – 6,000 appears to shift goals from “security” to “affiliation” needs. The majority of the members (56.3%) of the third income group (6,001 – 9,000) appear to shift goals from “security” needs to “self-actualization” (35.7%). In this same group, 28.6% remained in the “affiliation” needs category. The fourth income group (9,001 – 12,000) has a majority recorded in “esteem” needs. The majority of those of the fifth income group (12,001 – 20,000) seem to have reverted to “affiliation” needs from “esteem” needs. The majority (33.3%) of the income group 20,001 – 30,000 initially indicated as requiring “affiliation” needs. The answers to the question on ultimate achievement goals however resulted in a seemingly confusing scenario. Other than “physiological” needs the number of those who chose all the other
needs as ultimate achievement goals were equally distributed at 33.3%.

Interestingly however, “self-actualization” remained the answer for the majority for both questions for the highest income group (over KShs 30,000 per month). It seems that self-actualization is actually the ultimate achievement goal.

**Table 8**

**Relationship between income and being happy at work.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income KShs.</th>
<th>1 “yes”</th>
<th>2 “no”</th>
<th>3 “undecided”</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>60</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>73</td>
<td>35.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 6,000</td>
<td>47</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>59</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 12,000</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30,000</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>4.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>140</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>38</td>
<td><strong>206</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Income does not seem to influence the feeling of being happy at work. 68% of all workers said that they were happy at work, 89.9% of who were in the three lowest income categories.
Table 9

Distribution of income based on “job security”

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Income KShs.</th>
<th>1 very poor</th>
<th>2 poor</th>
<th>3 average</th>
<th>4 good</th>
<th>5 very good</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Up to 3,000</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>70</td>
<td>34.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3,001 - 6,000</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>58</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6,001 - 9,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>14</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9,001 - 12,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>6.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12,001 - 20,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>20,001 - 30,000</td>
<td>5</td>
<td></td>
<td>6</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Above 30,000</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td></td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>19</strong></td>
<td><strong>91</strong></td>
<td><strong>54</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

% of Total 13.8 9.4 44.8 26.6 5.4

There does not seem to be a direct relationship between the levels of income and the different perceptions of job security. The majority (37.9% - 76.9%) in all income groups indicated having an average sense of job security.
Table 10

Indication of “happy” status by department employed.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness Status</th>
<th>1</th>
<th>2</th>
<th>3</th>
<th>4</th>
<th>5</th>
<th>6</th>
<th>7</th>
<th>8</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>142</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>65</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>10</td>
<td><strong>208</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>31.3</td>
<td>3.4</td>
<td>7.7</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>26.4</td>
<td>5.3</td>
<td>12.5</td>
<td>4.8</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

With reference to being happy at work, 63.3% of the respondents said that they were happy, 13.5% said they were not, and 18.3% were undecided. In all departments, the majority claimed to be happy at work. When looking at individual departments, the “Extension Services Department” was the “happiest” at 80%, and the “least happy” was the “Accounts Department” at 50%. When this is looked at together with other parameters, it becomes quite instructive:

1. Most (85.7%) of the respondents from the Extension Services Department indicated having being involved in the decision-making process by their supervisors, compared to 60% in the Accounts Department.

2. Most (96.4%) of the respondents from the Extension Services Department indicated having discussed their performance with their supervisors, compared to 50% in the Accounts Department.
3. Most (82.1%) of the respondents from the Extension Services Department indicated feeling that their contribution at work was recognized, compared to 44.4% in the Accounts Department.

The majority (44%) in all categories indicated job security as being average, 29% as being poor, 27.5% as being good, 9.2% as being poor, and 5.3% as being very good.

The majority (47.1%) in all categories indicated working conditions as being average, 33.7% as being good, 9.1% as being poor, 5.3% as being very good, and 4.8% as being very poor.

The job status did not seem to affect the “happy” perception. The “happiest” department, the Extension Services Department had 64.3% casual employees, 32.1% permanent employees, and a total of 3.6% in the two categories “temporary” and “on probation”. The “least happy” department, the Accounts Department had 60% of their employees as permanent, 30% as on probation, and 10% as casual.

The above observations compare favorably with Frederick Herzberg’s “Motivator-Hygiene Theory”. Some examples of motivating factors he gave include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, career development, and personal growth. Motivating factors bring about positive satisfaction.
(happiness). If motivator factors are absent from a job, the employee will experience real dissatisfaction. Some examples of hygiene factors given included company policy and administration, working conditions, salary and benefits, job status, and job security. Even when the hygiene factors are provided for, they will not in themselves bring about job satisfaction.

The (above) factors also apply to McGregor's theories on management. Characteristics of theory Y management include open communication, team work, participation in decision-making, encouragement of initiative, mutual support, high standards, using objectives, and performance evaluation.

**Table 11**

*Indication of "happy" status by sex.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 male</th>
<th>2 female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>121</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>36</td>
<td>17.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>165</strong></td>
<td><strong>40</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>% of Total</strong></td>
<td>80.5</td>
<td>19.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
In males, 73.3% claimed to be happy at work, while only 50% of the females claimed the same. Amongst the males, 10.3% were unhappy while 16.4% were undecided about being happy at work. In females, 27.5% were unhappy and 22.5% were undecided about being happy at work. This is despite the observation that females were better paid than males. Please refer to table 4 and the comments appended thereto.

**Table 12**

*Indication of “happy” status by age grouping.*

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>18 – 30 years</th>
<th>31 – 40 years</th>
<th>41 – 50 years</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>108</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>65.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>6</td>
<td></td>
<td>27</td>
<td>13.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>27</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>156</td>
<td>40</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>204</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>76.5</td>
<td>19.6</td>
<td>3.9</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Age did not seem to significantly influence the perception of being happy at work. In age group 1 (18 to 30 years), 69.2% said they were happy. In age group 2 (31 to 40 years) it was 67.5% and 50.0% in age group 3 (41 to 50 years).

There is however, a general trend that happiness proportion decreased with increasing age.
Table 13

Indication of “happy” status by family status.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 married</th>
<th>2 single</th>
<th>3 widowed</th>
<th>4 divorced</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>76</td>
<td>65</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>113</td>
<td>92</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>54.6</td>
<td>44.4</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>0.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One's family status did not seem to significantly influence the perception of being happy at work. Amongst the married, 67.3% indicated being happy at work, 11.5% as being unhappy and 21.2% as being undecided. This compares well with the singles category with 70.7% happy, 15.2% unhappy and 14.1% undecided.
### Table 14

**Indication of “happy” status by job status.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 casual</th>
<th>2 permanent</th>
<th>3 temporary</th>
<th>4 probation</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>72</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>64</strong></td>
<td><strong>124</strong></td>
<td><strong>5</strong></td>
<td><strong>14</strong></td>
<td><strong>207</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

One's job status did not seem to significantly influence the perception of being happy at work. The majority in all categories indicated being happy at work.

### Table 15

**Indication of “happy” status by “recognising contribution at work”.**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 yes</th>
<th>2 no</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>123</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>154</strong></td>
<td><strong>51</strong></td>
<td><strong>205</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>% of Total</th>
<th>75.1</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>24.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
A majority of 79% of those who felt that their contribution at work was recognized said they were happy at work. This is particularly significant when one compares this with those who did not feel that their contribution at work was recognized. Only 33.3% of this latter group claimed to be happy. Most (39.2%) said they were undecided about being happy at work.

**Table 16**

Indication of “happy” status by “discussing performance”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 yes</th>
<th>2 no</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>120</td>
<td>21</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>152</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>207</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A majority of 78.9% of those who discussed their performance said they were happy at work. This is also particularly significant when one compares this with those who had not discussed their performance with their supervisors. Only 38.2% of this latter group claimed to be happy. Most (47.3%) said they were undecided about being happy at work.
Table 17

Indication of "happy" status by "whether contributions are considered after discussing performance".

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 yes</th>
<th>2 no</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>105</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>118</td>
<td>78.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>13.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>8.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>127</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>150</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>84.7</td>
<td>15.3</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of "whether contributions are considered after discussing performance" also seems to be significant for the perception of being happy at work. Of those who responded positively (yes), 82.7% indicated being happy at work while 8.7% indicated being undecided and not being happy respectively. Of those who responded negatively (no), only 56.5% indicated being happy at work, 39.1% as being unhappy and 4.4% as being undecided.
Table 18

Indication of “happy” status by “involvement in decision making”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 yes</th>
<th>2 no</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>104</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>141</td>
<td>68.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>20</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>139</td>
<td>67</td>
<td>206</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>67.5</td>
<td>32.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The issue of “involvement in decision making” seems to be significant for the perception of being happy at work. Of those who responded positively (yes), 74.8% indicated being happy at work while 10.8% indicated not being happy and 14.4% being undecided. Of those who responded negatively (no), only 55.2% indicated being happy at work, 19.4% as being unhappy and 25.4% as being undecided.
Table 19

Indication of “happy” status by “working condition”.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Happiness status</th>
<th>1 very poor</th>
<th>2 good</th>
<th>3 average</th>
<th>4 good</th>
<th>5 very good</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 yes</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>57</td>
<td>64</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>140</td>
<td>68.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 no</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>28</td>
<td>13.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 undecided</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>24</td>
<td>4</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>37</td>
<td>18.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>97</td>
<td>69</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>205</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>4.4</td>
<td>9.3</td>
<td>47.3</td>
<td>33.7</td>
<td>5.4</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Working conditions seem to have a strong influence on the happy feeling. Of those who said that their working conditions were very poor, only 22.2% were happy. Those who said that working conditions were poor, 31.6% said that they were happy, those who said they were average, 58.8% said they were happy, those who said they were good, 92.8% were happy, while those who said they were very good, 100% said they were happy.
Table 20

Relationship between supervisory responsibilities and job security

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number supervising</th>
<th>1 very poor</th>
<th>2 good</th>
<th>3 average</th>
<th>4 good</th>
<th>5 very good</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 none</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>34</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>115</td>
<td>57.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 to 5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>24.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 6 to 10</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>13</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>8.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11 to 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td></td>
<td>4</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>4.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 over 20</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>88</td>
<td>55</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>201</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>14.4</td>
<td>9.0</td>
<td>43.8</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td>5.5</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The relationship between supervisory responsibilities and the perception of job security is not an obvious one.
Table 21

Relationship between achievement and supervisory responsibilities

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number supervising</th>
<th>1 physiological</th>
<th>2 security</th>
<th>3 social</th>
<th>4 esteem</th>
<th>5 self actualization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 none</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>43</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>78</td>
<td>55.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 to 5</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>35</td>
<td>25</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 6 to 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>7.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11 to 20</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>5.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 over 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>6.4</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>68</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>25</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>140</td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

| % of Total          | 10.7            | 48.6       | 10.7    | 17.9    | 12.1               |       | 100.0      |

The relationship between achievement goals and supervisory responsibilities (Table 21 above) is also not such an obvious one. The majority indicated “security” as an achievement goal except for those supervising 6 – 10 people. These were distributed equally throughout the spectrum of achievement goals provided. A similar observation may be made on the relationship between ultimate achievement goals and supervisory responsibilities (see Table 22 below) except for those two groups supervising over 11 people. The majority in these groups indicated “self-actualization” as being the ultimate goal – quite in conformity with Maslow’s hierarchy of needs.
### Table 22

**Relationship between supervisory responsibilities and ultimate achievement goals**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number supervising</th>
<th>1 physiological</th>
<th>2 security</th>
<th>3 social</th>
<th>4 esteem</th>
<th>5 self actualization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 none</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>17</td>
<td>61</td>
<td>52.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 to 5</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>11</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>31</td>
<td>26.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 6 to 10</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>10.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11 to 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>5.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 over 20</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>6.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>11</strong></td>
<td><strong>26</strong></td>
<td><strong>28</strong></td>
<td><strong>20</strong></td>
<td><strong>32</strong></td>
<td><strong>117</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>9.4</td>
<td>22.2</td>
<td>23.9</td>
<td>17.1</td>
<td>27.4</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

### Table 23

**Distribution of supervisory responsibilities by sex**

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Number supervising</th>
<th>1 male</th>
<th>2 female</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1 none</td>
<td>98</td>
<td>19</td>
<td>117</td>
<td>57.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2 1 to 5</td>
<td>38</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>23.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3 6 to 10</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>18</td>
<td>8.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4 11 to 20</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>3.8</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5 over 20</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>5.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td><strong>164</strong></td>
<td><strong>39</strong></td>
<td><strong>203</strong></td>
<td><strong>100.0</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>80.8</td>
<td>19.2</td>
<td></td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
There does not seem to be any obvious relationship between an individual's sex and the awarding of supervisory responsibilities. There is a general conformity in proportions when comparing the ratio of males to females of the general respondent population with those of the sexes of the various supervisory categories.

Table 24

Relationship between achievement goals and ultimate achievement goals

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>GOALS</th>
<th>UNSA</th>
<th>1 physiological</th>
<th>2 security</th>
<th>3 social</th>
<th>4 esteem</th>
<th>5 self-actualization</th>
<th>Total</th>
<th>% of Total</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>physiological</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>11.7</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>security</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>41</td>
<td>39.8</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>social</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>12.6</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>esteem</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>6</td>
<td>22</td>
<td>21.4</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>self-actualization</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>14.6</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>9</td>
<td>26</td>
<td>23</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>29</td>
<td>103</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>% of Total</td>
<td>8.7</td>
<td>25.2</td>
<td>22.3</td>
<td>15.5</td>
<td>28.2</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The above data seems to clearly bring out Maslow's hierarchy of needs as elucidated below:

1. The majority (50%) of those whose initial goals were physiological needs indicated that their ultimate achievement goals were security needs.
2. The majority of those whose initial goals were security needs indicated in almost equal proportions that their ultimate achievement goals were security needs (34.1%) and social needs (31.7%). This may be indicative of the first group (the 34.1%) not having their category needs adequately catered for, and the second group (the 31.7%) having their category needs well catered for and looking to taking care of their next category of needs.

3. Those who had indicated their initial goal as being social needs were a small group of 13 people. Three (23.1%) indicated requiring esteem needs, and four (30.8%) indicated requiring self-actualization needs. This gives a majority of 53.9% as requiring a higher level of needs.

4. Those who had indicated their initial goal as being esteem needs formed a group of 22 people. Ten (45.5%) indicated requiring esteem needs, and six (27.3%) indicated requiring self-actualization needs. A similar explanation as in ‘2’ above may be forwarded; that this may be indicative of the first group (the 45.5%) not having their category needs adequately catered for, and the second group (the 27.3%) having their category needs well catered for, and looking to taking care of their next category of needs.

5. The ultimate achievement goals of those who had initially indicated their goals as being self-actualization remained self-actualization.

The number of meals one has in a day does not seem to be influenced by the level of income. In a different type of research, it would be interesting to find out whether income determines the quality and quantity of food taken. In all
categories except income group seven (KShs 30,000 and above per month), the majority did not own any property.

70.1% of all respondents belonged to one formal grouping or another. In all categories, the majority belonged to a formal grouping.

Of those who responded to the question on career development, only 33.3% of those who experienced "very little career development" claimed to be happy at work. Compare this with 60.4% for those who experienced a little career development, 75.4% for those who experienced average career development, 81.4% for those who experienced good career development, and 81.3% for those who experienced very good career development.
3. **Interpretation of results and discussion**

**Hierarchy of needs**

From an initial observation of the data and the results obtained, it was suggestive that the "hierarchy of needs" was a slight modification of that of Maslow’s.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Maslow’s hierarchy</th>
<th>Observed hierarchy</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Physiological needs</td>
<td>1. Physiological needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Esteem/ego needs</td>
<td>3. Social/love needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. Social/love needs</td>
<td>4. Esteem/ego needs</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Self-actualization</td>
<td>5. Self-actualization</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

However, when seeking to relate (immediate) achievement goals with the ultimate achievement goals (refer to table 24 and the comments appended thereto), the hierarchy of needs that emerges does not appear to be any different from that of Maslow’s. Presented from the most basic to the highest level, the hierarchy is as follows:

1. Physiological needs
2. Security/safety needs
3. Esteem/ego needs
4. Social/love/affiliation needs
5. Self-actualization
One may then conclude that the hierarchy of needs in Kenya as observed at Brookside Dairy is the same or similar to that Maslow observed in the United States of America. This is despite the fact that the per capita income in Kenya is less than US$ 300 compared to over US$ 21,000 in the United States of America.⁵⁶

Motivator-hygiene factors

Factors looked into in the study included job status, job security, working condition, supervision, salary/income, achievement, recognition, responsibility, career development and personal growth.

It came out quite clearly that income could not be a motivating factor. The population average for being happy at work was 68%. Of all those who indicated being happy at work, 89.9% were in the three lowest income groups leaving only 10.1% in the four remaining (higher) income groups (refer to table 8 and the appended comment).

Job status also came out as a poor motivator. Only 58.1% of the permanent employees indicated being happy at work. Compare this with 85.9% of the casuals, 80% of the temporary employees and 71.4% of those on probation who indicated being happy at work.

On the other hand, those who indicated that their job security and working conditions were very good, 100% indicated being happy at work. Only 42.1% of those who indicated that their working conditions were poor, and 40.7% of those who indicated that their job security was very poor indicated being happy at work. This compares well with such other variables as discussing one's performance with a supervisor, career development, and being involved in the decision-making process. Herzberg had listed some hygiene factors as including:

- Company policy and administration,
- Supervision,
- Working conditions,
- Salary and benefits,
- Job status, and
- Job security.

Examples of motivating factors stated by Herzberg included:

- Achievement,
- Recognition,
- Work itself,
- Responsibility,
- Career development, and
- Personal growth.
The research findings seem to concur with Herzberg's conclusions except for an anomaly that seems to imply that such factors as working conditions and job security should also be included amongst the motivating factors. The anomaly comes about because indications on working conditions and job security were as per the subjective perceptions of the respondents. The answers obtained on working conditions and job security were based on one's psychological state at the time of responding to the respective question. It may have been more accurate to obtain answers to working conditions and job security indirectly. It may have been more accurate if the assessment of working conditions (for example) would have been made from such parameters as working hours, and (measurable) workloads. To illustrate this further, job status is independent of individual perceptions or the individual's psychological state. One is a permanent employee, or a casual employee, or any other category of employee. The results obtained on job status were therefore more objective, being based on an actual situation and not on a subjective psychological state.
Management style

It can be inferred that a theory Y management style elicits positive responses from people. Characteristics of theory Y management include open communication, teamwork, participation in decision-making, encouragement of initiative, mutual support, high standards, using objectives and performance evaluation. From the research conducted, it came out clearly that such issues as discussing one's performance with a supervisor (performance evaluation), encouragement of initiative (recognition), and participation in decision-making were motivating to the respondents (employees). The theory Y manager believes that work is natural for people, people desire self-control and self-direction, people not only accept but also seek responsibility, and that external controls are not needed to motivate people.

4. Conclusions

The **first objective** of this research was to identify the different motivation systems in place within the organization. This objective was achieved. Those workers who felt that their contribution at work was recognized, or those who discussed performance with their supervisors, or those who experienced positive career developments were “happy” at work. Internal motivation occurs when an individual is “turned on” to one’s work because of the positive internal feelings that are generated by doing well. The individual must perceive his/her work as worthwhile or important by some system of value he/she accepts.

The **second objective** of the study was to determine whether the different cadres of employees in the organization are motivated differently. What came out clearly was that all cadres of employees respond positively to such motivating factors as recognition and obtaining feedback on their performance in the organization. The major difference was however in the goals in life. The lowest income group sought to satisfy security needs while the highest income group sought to satisfy self-actualization needs. It can be presumed that such lower level needs as physiological, security, social and esteem needs were generally adequately catered for in the highest income group. What this brings out is that as the individual climbs up the income ladder, the targets in life change. The hierarchy of needs (as described by Maslow) seemed to change with increasing income levels. The motivating factors (as described by Herzberg)
applied to all cadres of employees, and so did the management style (as described by McGregor).

The third objective to rank the different motivating factors was only partially fulfilled. The hierarchy of needs that emerged was similar to that described by Maslow. Motivating factors as described by Herzberg can be ranked as:

1. Working conditions
2. Career development
3. Recognizing one's contribution at work
4. Discussing one's performance with a supervisor. This ranked higher (number 2) when coupled to considering one's opinion after such discussion.
5. Involvement in the decision-making process.

No attempts were made to rank factors that contributed to showing a preference for a theory Y management style to a theory X management style as described by Douglas McGregor.

The fourth objective was to determine the organizational structure, the reporting structure and how productivity compares to the number of people employed. The organizational structure was generally pyramidal. The majority of the respondents (57.3%) with no supervisory responsibilities formed the base of the pyramid, 24.3% supervised 1 – 5 people, 8.7% supervised 6 – 10 people,
3.9% supervised 11 – 20 people, and 5.8% supervised more than 20 people. Brookside Dairy has expanded rapidly from processing 500 liters a day in March 1993, to a processing capacity of 160,000 liters per day in 1999. This full capacity is to be fully utilized within three years' time. The number of employees has consequently increased with increasing production levels. When processing 500 liters per day, the number of employees was only 37 people. This increased to 380 employees by July 1996. Productivity therefore increased from 13.5 liters per employee in 1993 to about 263 liters per permanent employee in July 1999. This exhibits a dramatic increase in productivity and illustrates a basic principle of economies of scale.

The fifth objective was to quantify the staff turnover rate and its possible relationship to productivity levels. This objective could not be achieved. The researcher could not access records at Brookside Dairy indicating the staff turnover rates.

The results of this study give reason to reject the hypothesis that there are significant differences between the existing theories on staff motivation and the actual situation in Kenya. This was not expected because of the lower level of development in Kenya compared to the United States of America where the original studies were conducted. In 1990, America with a population of 250
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million people had a gross domestic product of US$ 21,790 per person.\textsuperscript{59} Kenya with a population estimated at about 30 million has a gross per capita income equivalent to less than US$ 300 per person.

The conclusion of this study is that the conclusions arrived at by Abraham Maslow, Frederick Herzberg and Douglas McGregor duly apply to the Kenyan context as observed at Brookside Dairy Limited. With this in mind, I am inclined to suggest that organizations adapt modern management practices and not take the workforce for granted. The employee has come a long way from being considered in terms of such basics as bread and butter to the fine details of (human) staff motivation. Brookside Dairy, where I worked for three years before conducting this study, has already made attempts at modernizing the way they “do things”. All the employees, the Managing Director included, had to undertake a three-day course on “Total Quality Management (TQM)”. The management also put in place performance-based bonus schemes as another way to stimulate increased productivity, sustainability and profitability. The idea behind this was to motivate workers to produce more efficiently, and for them to realize that their welfare is intimately linked to that of the company. Other organizations have to change the way they do things. Directing (a key function of management) has to change to that of leadership. Steven Kerr better explains this in his book, \textit{Ultimate Rewards}. An excerpt titled “Sources of Motivation” from this book can be found towards the end of the literature review of this paper.

\textsuperscript{59} Schaefer, 1990, p.83.
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APPENDIX

1. The letter

June 17, 1999.

Dear Respondent,

REF: RESEARCH QUESTIONNAIRE

Kindly fill the attached questionnaire as completely, as truthfully, and as accurately as possible. The answers you will give in the questionnaire will be used to arrive at some conclusion on staff motivation and psychology at work affecting job performance and productivity. The conclusions arrived at will be published in an academic set-up and may be used as a reference for those seeking to improve staff motivation, organisational performance, productivity and profitability, and the general wellbeing of the worker. Any information obtained will be treated in the strictest confidentiality possible. Kindly return the completed form to the undersigned within one week.

Thanking you in advance for your co-operation.

Yours sincerely,

Abdallah Said Twahir
Researcher
2. The questionnaire: Please tick or fill in the blanks as appropriate

1. What department do you work in?  
   Data input code  
   DYWI
   1 ☐ production  4 ☐ quality control  7 ☐ sales and marketing
   2 ☐ technical  5 ☐ extension services  8 ☐ accounts
   3 ☐ administration  6 ☐ transport

2. Sex  
   1 ☐ male  2 ☐ female  
   SEX

3. Age  
   _______________ years  
   AGE

4. What is your job status?  
   1 ☐ casual  3 ☐ temporary  5 ☐ on probation
   2 ☐ permanent  4 ☐ contract
   WIYS

5. What type of living quarters do you have/ live in?  
   1 ☐ shared quarters  2 ☐ 1 room  3 ☐ 2 - 4 rooms
   4 ☐ 5 rooms (2 bedrooms) or more  
   LIVQ

6. Do you belong to any formal grouping?  
   1 ☐ yes  2 ☐ no  
   GRPF

7. If yes, what category best describes it?  
   1 ☐ SACCO or other social group
   2 ☐ bible study/ religious association or group
   3 ☐ others  
   GRPC

8. Family status  
   1 ☐ married  2 ☐ single  3 ☐ widowed  4 ☐ divorced  
   FAST

9. Number of dependants  
   __________ spouses  __________ children  __________ others  
   DEPE

10. Number of meals in a day (does not include office tea)  
    1 ☐ 1 or less,  2 ☐ 2,  3 ☐ 3 or more  
    MEAL
11. How secure is your job? 
If very poor, you can lose your job easily, and if very good, it is difficult to lose your job.

☐ 1 very poor  ☐ 2 poor  ☐ 3 average
☐ 4 good  ☐ 5 very good

12. Do you feel that your contribution at work is recognised?

1 ☐ yes  2 ☐ no

13. If yes, how?

1 ☐ singled out for good performance  2 ☐ mentioned in group performance  3 ☐ mentioned in company performance

14. What is your achievement goal?

________________________________________

15. Do you own property?

1 ☐ yes  2 ☐ no

16. If yes, what?

1 ☐ vehicle  3 ☐ permanent house
2 ☐ land  4 ☐ other

17. If no, what would you like to own? Name three in order of priority in the space provided:

________________________________________  ____________________________________

18. What would you consider your ultimate (non-spiritual) achievement in life? Mention one:

________________________________________
19. How comfortable are your working conditions?

- 1 □ very poor
- 2 □ poor
- 3 □ average
- 4 □ good
- 5 □ very good

20. In your assessment, how much career development and/or personal growth have you achieved in your current employment?

- 1 □ very little
- 2 □ little
- 3 □ average
- 4 □ good
- 5 □ very good

21. How long have you stayed in your current employment?

- 1 □ upto 1 year
- 2 □ upto 3 years
- 3 □ over 3 years

22. How many people do you supervise directly?

- 1 □ none
- 2 □ 1 to 5
- 3 □ 6 to 10
- 4 □ 11 to 20
- 5 □ over 20

23. Do your supervisors involve you in decision-making?

- 1 □ yes
- 2 □ no

24. Do you discuss your performance with your supervisor?

- 1 □ yes
- 2 □ no

25. If yes to (24), are your contributions ever considered?

- 1 □ yes
- 2 □ no

26. Are you happy at work?

- 1 □ yes
- 2 □ no
- 3 □ undecided

27. Monthly income bracket

- 1 □ up to Kshs.3,000
- 2 □ Kshs.3,001 - 6,000
- 3 □ Kshs.6,001 - 9,000
- 4 □ Kshs.9,001 - 12,000
- 5 □ Kshs.12,001 - 20,000
- 6 □ Kshs.20,001 - 30,000
- 7 □ Kshs.30,000 and above