1. Introduction

Work motivation manifests itself in the relationship between a person and their work. Within the context of motivation, work can not only be seen as a source of livelihood. It is also an attribute that brings satisfaction from the actual performance of the work, from the working results, from the social status and the prestige of a profession, from the social relationships related to those professional activities and the awards that an employee receives as part of a team [1]. The American, John Adair [2], one of the world’s experts in leadership, says that the motivation means providing a motive or incentive to a person to make this or that. By this activity [3], the behavior of a person is initiated and their interest stimulated. Motivation is an important factor in the performance and efficiency of an enterprise and its managers spend a lot of energy, time and money on it [4]. Of greater significance is the assumption that motivation affects the performance of the Slovak employees. On this basis, for Slovak companies, it is possible to design a uniform motivational program that will suit the majority of their employees. Under specific conditions, the local analyses can be more effective and their results can slightly differ from the general average. It is also possible that the motivational requirements of employees will change if their needs are satisfied. For this reason, according to the possibilities of the enterprise, it is recommended to update the motivational programs continuously.
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2. Objective and methodology

Understanding the causes of motivation, knowing what its possibilities to influence are, and knowledge of the methods by which to regulate motivation, or even change it, is of particular importance for the effective management of people. In practice, motivating employees, professionals and managers can be realized on the basis of three approaches: individual, small-group and complex-group [11, 12 and 13].

In current human resources management, there is a conceptual dissemination and use of outsourcing. Managers of enterprises establish and implement personnel policies and strategies for various human resources activities in collaboration with their HR department. These activities include, for example, the creation and development of an organizations personnel planning and talent management, sourcing and selection, evaluation and pay, and safety and health of workers [14]. Every enterprise is therefore faced with the problem of how to manage this area as efficiently as possible [15]. In the majority of cases, companies respond by creating their own team of specialists to work with human resources. An alternative to this approach is to outsource the management of human resources [16]. The advantage to the enterprise of outsourcing is that it is able to benefit from the latest knowledge and practices in this area in combination with the high standard of work. It can also mean an increase in resource efficiency not only in financial terms, but also in terms of human resources [17]. Earmarking selected activities [18] of business management and handing responsibility for them to a subcontractor leads to a narrowing of the organization, a simplification of the management work of managers and a better use of resources. The organization does not have to expend resources to acquire property and can utilise them elsewhere and for other purposes. In addition, there is no need to invest in the training and retention of specialists because they are available as required. If the requirements for personnel grow or decline, companies are also not under immediate pressure to find a solution for either problem. The obligations and liabilities associated with them, the economic risks and the associated agenda are covered by the provider of the outsourced services. The nature of the outsourcing contract with the provider of outsourcing services is therefore very important.

The introduction and implementation of outsourcing in human resources management is not easy and requires management to take a considerate and sensitive approach. Some personnel activities may be provided by external contractors, personnel agencies or companies acting as service providers in these areas. They can provide specific personnel activities such as: determining specifications per employee; retrieval, search and selection of employees; creation of motivational programs; performance management of staff; career management; knowledge management; motivation and stimulation of employees; evaluation and measurement of work staff training; evaluation of personnel controlling; analysis of return on investment in human resources; social care of staff and improving staff performance [19].

Other activities including personnel planning, personnel policy and strategy, recruitment, orientation and placement of employees, creative management of employees, creation of corporate culture and philosophy, improving working relations, communication in the workplace, and the dismissal and retirement of employees should remain fully within the competence of an organization either in legal terms or in terms of strategy [22].

The decision on whether to outsource human resources management should therefore be based on a thorough analysis of the current situation within an organization and a comparison of how the selected personnel activities are provided in other businesses. This analysis also requires the reasons to be identified that show that it is more advantageous to transfer personnel activities to an outside agency. These reasons [23] may include:

- cost savings - outsourced services are less expensive and the personnel department can be reduced in size;
- HR employees can concentrate on key tasks – they are not distracted from their core tasks which results in quality gains;
- outsourced services are of a higher quality - there is an opportunity to gain know-how and experience that is not available within an enterprise.

3. Methodology of research

The aim of this work was to establish the actual and required level of employee motivation in Slovakia and attempt to identify which areas of employee motivation could be possibly outsourced. The research was conducted in 2015 on a research sample of 6,000 respondents from both the public and private sectors, including manufacturing and non-manufacturing enterprises, and service providers. The selection of respondents was carried out by simple random sampling, whereby each unit of the population had the same probability of being included in the sample. We used the questionnaire method to obtain the values for the motivating factors. This method allowed us to collect a lot of information in a short period of time. The first part of the questionnaire examined the qualifications and socio-demographic characteristics of the workers in the compared companies. This section provided basic data on the respondents’ age, gender, number of years worked in the enterprise, education level and position.

The second part of the questionnaire consisted of various motivational factors through which it was possible to establish information about the characteristics of the working environment, working conditions, application of evaluation and pay systems in the enterprise, personnel work within the enterprise, the system
of social care and employee benefits, as well as on employee (dis)satisfaction, employees value orientations, attitudes to work and enterprise or relationships with colleagues. Our chosen motivational factors were arranged in alphabetical order to avoid influencing the respondent’s responses. Employees could assign the level of importance of each motivational factor on a rating scale of one to five [24]. They were subsequently asked to also score the importance of the required status, as well as the actual status of each motivational factor. The desired status was understood to be the ideal form of motivation for employees, or what would motivate them to increase their performance. Similarly, the actual status was understood to represent the level of employee satisfaction with the current motivational factors within their enterprise.

The research sample consisted of 6,000 respondents from Slovakia. Table 1 shows the structure of the respondents. The questionnaires were evaluated using the program STATISTICA 7 [25]. Descriptive statistics were used to characterize the basic set. Statistical characteristics were calculated for each motivational factor (see Table 2).

These characteristics summarized information about the properties of the studied basic set into a smaller number of numerical characteristics in order to facilitate the mutual comparison of the files. The essential characteristics of each motivational factor were summarily described in terms of their dimensions [26 and 27] and the variability of their quantitative characters - arithmetic average (Equation 1), standard deviation \( s \) and variation coefficient V.

\[
\bar{X} = \frac{x_1 + x_2 + x_3 + \cdots + x_n}{n} = \frac{1}{n} \sum_{i=1}^{n} x_i \tag{1}
\]

whereby:

- \( n \) - is size of the statistical set,
- \( x_i \) - is average value of the i-th statistical unit [23].

In addition to a simple comparison of the values of the descriptive characteristics, we carried out a test correlation of the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the basic sets. In the test, the significance of differences in the arithmetic means and standard deviations of the individual motivational factors of the monitored sets was checked at the selected level of significance. The verification showed that the differences found by the descriptors are not caused by the sample. We used a two-sample T-test to test the correlation averages of the motivational factors. Within the T-test, there were only two cases that were contrary to these findings and which were subject to whether the variances of the compared basic sets were equal or unequal \((\sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2, \sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2)\), or whether the investigated characteristics X1, X2 were dependent or independent. Before calculating the T-test, we used compliance tests of variance (F-test). Based on the results of the F-test, two-sample T-tests were performed for independent samples with equal or different variance. The null hypothesis was tested against the alternative hypothesis (Equation 2).

\[
H_0 : \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2 \quad \text{vs.} \quad H_1 : \sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2 \tag{2}
\]

H0: It is assumed that the arithmetic means of the selected motivational factors (required and actual, in Slovak enterprises) are equal to each other. It is also assumed that the difference between them, if any, is caused by random fluctuations in the results of choice.

H1: It is assumed that the arithmetic means of the selected motivational factors (required and actual, in Slovak enterprises) are not equal to each other. It is also assumed that the difference between them, if any, is not caused by random fluctuations in the results of choice.

The random variable T was used as a testing criterion, resulting in the Student’s t-distribution, as shown in Equations 3 and 4:

\[
\text{when} \quad \sigma_1^2 = \sigma_2^2; X_i \text{ and } X_j \text{ are independent}
\]
| Motivational factor                      | Arithmetic mean | Standard deviation | Number | Difference | Standard deviation of the difference | t     | Confidence interval 95% |
|-----------------------------------------|----------------|-------------------|--------|------------|-------------------------------------|-------|------------------------|
| Workplace atmosphere                    |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S1                                      | 3.35           | 1.01              |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| P1                                      | **4.42**       | 0.78              | 6000   | -1.1       | 1.15                                | -72   | -1.04                  |
| Good team work                          |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S2                                      | 3.49           | 1.00              |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| P1                                      | **4.43**       | 0.75              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.07                                | -68   | -0.91                  |
| Additional financial reward              |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S3                                      | 2.75           | 1.06              |        |            |                                     |       | -1.60                  |
| P3                                      | **4.32**       | 0.82              | 6000   | -1.6       | 1.36                                | -89   | -1.53                  |
| Physical effort                         |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S4                                      | 3.18           | 0.97              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.71                  |
| P4                                      | **4.43**       | 0.93              | 6000   | -0.7       | 1.26                                | -41   | -0.64                  |
| Job security                            |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S5                                      | 3.16           | 1.08              |        |            |                                     |       | -1.32                  |
| P5                                      | **4.45**       | 0.79              | 6000   | -1.3       | 1.26                                | -79   | -1.26                  |
| Workplace communication                 |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S6                                      | 3.28           | 1.02              |        |            |                                     |       | -1.04                  |
| P6                                      | **4.29**       | 0.82              | 6000   | -1.0       | 1.18                                | -66   | -0.98                  |
| Enterprise name                         |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S7                                      | 3.33           | 1.02              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.58                  |
| P7                                      | 3.88           | 1.03              | 6000   | -0.5       | 1.20                                | -35   | -0.52                  |
| Opportunity to apply one's own ability  |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S8                                      | 3.11           | 1.02              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.98                  |
| P8                                      | 4.06           | 0.85              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.18                                | -62   | -0.92                  |
| Workload and type of work               |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S9                                      | 3.29           | 0.98              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.86                  |
| P9                                      | 4.11           | 0.84              | 6000   | -0.8       | 1.14                                | -56   | -0.80                  |
| Information about performance results   |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S10                                     | 3.15           | 0.99              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.88                  |
| P10                                     | 4.00           | 0.90              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.17                                | -56   | -0.82                  |
| Working time                            |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S11                                     | 3.35           | 1.08              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.90                  |
| P11                                     | 4.22           | 0.85              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.25                                | -54   | -0.84                  |
| Work environment                        |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S12                                     | 3.34           | 1.02              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.90                  |
| P12                                     | 4.21           | 0.81              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.17                                | -57   | -0.84                  |
| Work performance                        |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S13                                     | 3.38           | 0.95              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.79                  |
| P13                                     | 4.14           | 0.82              | 6000   | -0.8       | 1.08                                | -55   | -0.73                  |
| Moving up corporate ladder              |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S14                                     | 3.16           | 0.98              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.92                  |
| P14                                     | 4.05           | 0.87              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.19                                | -58   | -0.86                  |
| Competences                             |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S15                                     | 2.91           | 1.00              |        |            |                                     |       | -1.01                  |
| P15                                     | 3.88           | 0.93              | 6000   | -1.0       | 1.28                                | -59   | -0.95                  |
| Prestige                                |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S16                                     | 3.01           | 0.96              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.76                  |
| P16                                     | 3.73           | 1.00              | 6000   | -0.7       | 1.23                                | -46   | -0.69                  |
| Supervisor’s approach                   |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S17                                     | 3.26           | 1.15              |        |            |                                     |       | -1.15                  |
| P17                                     | **4.38**       | 0.83              | 6000   | -1.1       | 1.28                                | -67   | -1.08                  |
| Individual decision making              |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S18                                     | 3.08           | 1.02              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.95                  |
| P18                                     | 3.99           | 0.89              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.21                                | -59   | -0.89                  |
| Self-actualization                      |                |                   |        |            |                                     |       |                        |
| S19                                     | 3.04           | 1.02              |        |            |                                     |       | -0.98                  |
| P19                                     | 3.98           | 0.89              | 6000   | -0.9       | 1.23                                | -59   | -0.91                  |

**Table 2**

Student’s T-test employee motivation level in Slovakia - 2015
status (required level) of Slovak employees motivation (see Table 2). The most important motivational factors are highlighted in bold. The results show that between the required level (P) and the actual level (S) of perceived motivation there are fundamental differences in financial motivational factors (basic salary, additional salary, fair assessment and recognition) and in factors related to interpersonal relationships (workplace atmosphere, workplace communication, access to supervisor, stress, psychological stress). The issue of basic salary was the greatest source of dissatisfaction. All the data are defined at the significance level of 95%.

Each effective motivational program must recognize and evaluate all the factors that affect the work performance of employees. Suitably motivated employees lead to the fulfilment of business objectives and long-term prosperity. Therefore, companies should focus on observing and investigating such motivational aspects which can bring the most satisfaction to their employees. In our research, we defined the motivational factors

$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$

and when $\sigma_1^2 \neq \sigma_2^2$: $X_1$ and $X_2$ are independent

$t = \frac{\bar{x}_1 - \bar{x}_2}{\sqrt{\frac{s_1^2}{n_1} + \frac{s_2^2}{n_2}}}$

At the end of the test we compared $t$ to $t_{\alpha/2}$. Where $t \leq t_{\alpha/2}$ we accepted $H_0$ and the tested difference was not considered as significant. Where this was not the case, we rejected $H_0$ at $\alpha\%$ significant level and accepted the alternative hypothesis $H_1$.

4. Results

To define the basic levels of motivation, we compared the average actual status (actual perceived level) and average required status (required level) of Slovak employees motivation (see Table 2). The most important motivational factors are highlighted in bold.

The results show that between the required level (P) and the actual level (S) of perceived motivation there are fundamental differences in financial motivational factors (basic salary, additional salary, fair assessment and recognition) and in factors related to interpersonal relationships (workplace atmosphere, workplace communication, access to supervisor, stress, psychological stress). The issue of basic salary was the greatest source of dissatisfaction. All the data are defined at the significance level of 95%.

Each effective motivational program must recognize and evaluate all the factors that affect the work performance of employees. Suitably motivated employees lead to the fulfillment of business objectives and long-term prosperity. Therefore, companies should focus on observing and investigating such motivational aspects which can bring the most satisfaction to their employees. In our research, we defined the motivational factors

| Motivational factor | Arithmetic mean | Standard deviation | Number | Difference | Standard deviation of the difference | t | Confidence interval 95% |
|---------------------|-----------------|--------------------|--------|------------|-------------------------------------|---|------------------------|
| Social benefits     |                 |                    |        |            |                                     |   |                        |
| P20                 | 4.18            | 0.88               | 6000   | -1.2       | 1.34                                | -70| -1.17                  |
| P21                 | 4.41            | 0.83               | 6000   | -1.4       | 1.31                                | -83| -1.36                  |
| P22                 | 4.10            | 0.92               | 6000   | -1.2       | 1.34                                | -69| -1.16                  |
| P23                 | 4.02            | 0.93               | 6000   | -1.1       | 1.34                                | -62| -1.04                  |
| P24                 | 3.89            | 0.97               | 6000   | -0.8       | 1.22                                | -52| -0.79                  |
| P25                 | 3.82            | 1.04               | 6000   | -1.0       | 1.37                                | -57| -0.97                  |
| P26                 | 4.06            | 0.91               | 6000   | -1.1       | 1.26                                | -68| -1.08                  |
| P27                 | 3.94            | 1.00               | 6000   | -0.7       | 1.23                                | -45| -0.69                  |
| P28                 | 4.12            | 0.92               | 6000   | -1.0       | 1.29                                | -62| -1.01                  |
| P29                 | 2.96            | 1.04               | 6000   | -1.2       | 1.30                                | -72| -1.18                  |
| P30                 | 4.55            | 0.77               | 6000   | -1.9       | 1.41                                | -103| -1.84                |

Note: The important motivational factors are highlighted in bold. $S =$ actual status, $P =$ required status. Source: authors
of Slovak employees in 2015, divided according to required and actual factors. Based on the results, we can generally determine the needs of Slovak employees and define problem areas with regards to their motivation. On the basis of these results, we would suggest that managers concentrate on the motivational factors identified when creating their motivational programs.

5. Conclusion

On the basis of the results we can conclude that employees are fully aware of the importance of motivational factors (despite the recession) such as job security and of the factors related to human relations. Employees also realize that their employers are not always in a position to provide the required increase in financial remuneration. At present, employers should focus on the process of motivation through motivational factors based on interpersonal relationships and on job security. A more detailed analysis of the individual motivational factors would allow more attractive measures to be adopted that would be more readily accepted by employees, thereby reducing the number of factors which employees deem to be neutral in their work. During the economic crises, many companies do not consider the development and education of their employees as important. This approach is subsequently reflected in the overall future performance levels of enterprises [28 - 30]. For companies, it is important to consider the costs of ongoing education in comparison to the costs of employing someone new in the business. Failure to respect the described results could lead to a significant decline in work performance [29 - 31], a decline in receipts and a rise in business costs.

Creating an appropriate motivational program is a difficult and expensive activity for every business [30 - 32]. Developing such programs requires a thorough and targeted analysis of the motivational requirements of employees. On the basis of our analysis, we can draw the following conclusions. Despite the diversity of employees, for Slovak enterprises, it is possible to design the highly uniform motivational programs that suit the majority of employees. In specific terms, it is possible to carry out a local analysis, the results of which will only differ slightly from the general average. It is also possible that meeting the motivational requirements of employees can initiate their change. For this reason, the motivational programs are to be updated continuously [33 - 35].
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