Effect of Motivation on Employees Performance: Based in Textile Sector of Faisalabad, Pakistan

Muhammad Ehsan
Department of Management Sciences,
National University of Modern Languages Islamabad
H-9 Sector, Islamabad, Pakistan

Maha Gul Qureshi
Department of Management Sciences, National University of Modern Languages Islamabad, H-9 Sector, Islamabad, Pakistan

Abstract
Employee motivation is considered as a force that drives the employees toward attaining specific goals and objectives of the organization. Nowadays, it is one of the sizzling issues in organizations since every wants to make best use of their financial and human resources. Motivation is something that moves the person to action and continues him the cause of action already initiated. Motivation has the role to develop and intensify the desire of every member of the organization to work effectively and efficiently in his position. The motivation for the study was prompted by the low level of concentration on employee motivation. Motivation in Textile sector of Faisalabad is down. The main objectives of the study were, to identify factors that motivate employee’s; to identify determinants of the employee’s performance and to assess the effect of motivation on the employee’s performance in Textile sector of Faisalabad. Questionnaire was used to gather data and analysis was done using Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS). The study has revealed that promotion and opportunity for advancement are the major motivation factors and the study has also revealed that motivation level is high in the area of wages and salaries. Textile organizations appears to be paying lowest wages and salaries in the industry. It is therefore recommended that Textile Sector (management) should consider as a matter of urgency, the need to make upward adjustment in wages and salaries which will go a long way to enhance efficiency and effectiveness.
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INTRODUCTION
1. Background of the Study
The only way to get people to like working hard is to motivate them. Today, people must understand why they're working hard. Every individual in an organization is motivated by some different way. When talking in term of employee motivation, it can be simply defined as “Employee motivation is a reflection of the level of energy, commitment, and creativity that a company's workers bring to their jobs.” The job of a manager in the workplace is to get things done through employees. To do this the manager should be able to motivate employees. But that's easier said than done! Motivation practice and theory are difficult subjects, touching on several disciplines

Employees are the bedrock of every business. To be successful as a business requires the commitment and sacrifice of employees. Employees are particularly important participant in the formulation of the image that customers get in relation to the service outcome. Because of the importance of this interaction with the customer, employees have to communicate effectively the quality standards of their organization to new starters. To successfully market or sell the company services or products, the company must first and foremost target employees. Employees are therefore the first customers of every organization. Once the company is able to identify employee’s needs, then they will be motivated to work effectively to achieve the goals of the organization.

Motivation is one of the most important concepts of psychology and very vital for managers who direct the growth of their subordinates towards worthwhile goals (Adnan, 2005). Managers according to Kesten (1987) rank motivation of employees as the most serious problem that confronts them in the instruction of subordinates. This transfer of control is best supported by an organizational environment that is "organized to encourage and support a continued, increasingly matured and comprehensive acceptance of responsibilities for one's own performance" (Kesten, 1987). Motives according to Horge (2004) are key to human behavior, they play an important role in employee performance and other activities and as such managers should know what motivation is and how employees are motivated towards performance. In spite of all apparent attendant problems of motivation and productivity, organizations seek means of ensuring continuous productivity, which would be geared towards the accomplishment of organizational goals. In most organizations employees do at times go on strike over increment in salaries and other conditions of service. These actions and other comments made by
employees are reported frequently in the dailies and are commented upon by watchers of development in various organizations and institutions (George, 2005). Money is seen as a great motivator of employees. However, there is a general notion that if management can identify other things that can motivate the workforce apart from money, perhaps there will be a dramatic reduction in the demand by workers for pay rise and less time will be spent on the annual ritual of management/workers union negotiation meetings (Badu, 2010).

Performance is an evaluation of the results of a person’s behavior. It involves determining how well or poorly a person has accomplished a task or done a job. Motivation is only one factor among many that contributes to an employee’s job performance. All thing being equal, one would expect a highly motivated officer would deliver high-quality teaching or service than those poorly motivated officer. All things however, are not always equal because so many factors affect performance – factors such as personality, the difficulty of the task, availability of resources and working conditions. To attain high levels of performance as an employee and manager, you must be sure that you and your employees have the ability, motivation and the resources to meet objectives. When performance is not at the standard level or above, you must determine which performance factor needs to be improved and improve it (Lussier, 2005).

Studies on motivation depicts that there are several ways to motivate employees. These are known as theories, which can be divided into two categories. They are the content theories and the process theories. The content theory focus on what motivates employees and it was propounded by eminent writers such as Maslow (1946), McClelland (1988) and Herzberg (1968). Vroom (1969), Adams (1965), Locke and Latham (1990) are the proponents of the content theories and they focus on how motivation occurs. Reis and Pena (2001) question whether motivating people to work in the 21st century with theories conceived during the past 100 years are likely to be infeasible. They conclude that the core message is that managers should reconsider the outdated motivational patterns utilized to maintain role performance in organizations and adopt a fresh motivation formula for the 21st century based on friendship, work and respect. However, Chartered Management Institute (2001) checklist maintains that these theories are still valid today. Even though the two theories are complementary, they are in a way opposite and their differences leads others to conduct further studies on motivation. This led to a number of ways through which employees could be motivated to increase performance. Several writers such as Roche and Mackinnon (1970) and others such as Mayfield et al (1998) suggest that leadership styles and freedom given to employees are significant in motivating employees. Luthans and Stajkovic (2000) and Armstrong and Murlis (2004) held the view that recognition can be used to motivate worker to perform well whilst Oldham and Hackman (2010), Lawler (1969) argued that job design has an important role to play in employees behavior.

The general problems mostly inherent in organizations and institutions are low salaries and wages, irregular promotional structures, lack of recognition of workers achievements and other poor conditions of service. Employees are the first customers of an organization and therefore must be satisfied first before they too can satisfy their customers appropriately.

1.1 Statement of Problem

In the modern competitive world, business organizations are facing ever-growing challenges regarding commitment, engagement, belief, recruitment and retention of their employees. Multiple studies in different countries and across industries show that employees who are passionate about their jobs and the organizations in which they work are in the minority. Motivation is about giving your staff the right mixture of guidance, direction, resources and rewards so that they are inspired and keen to work in the way that you want them to. So, a large portion behind these difficulties can easily be solved by imparting proper motivation. In the fierce era of competition, organizations nowadays are more emphasizing on the management of Human Resources. A manager capable of managing his employee effectively is a successful one. Motivational tools are the most effective in this context. We always have to keep in mind that employees are not motivated solely by money and employee behavior is linked to their attitudes. Therefore, the purpose of the study is to determine the Effect of Motivation on Employees Performance. For finding out more accurate outcomes I conducted my research within textile organizations.

1.2 Scope of the Study

I have conducted my research on different Textile organization of Faisalabad on about 100 employees. The survey was conducted on employees of different levels and on employees with different experience. The research was conducted in Faisalabad region only. I have used closed ended descriptive questionnaire for data collection from the responders.

1.3 General Objective

The general objective of the study is to determine the Impact of Motivation on Employee’s Performance in Textile Sector.
1.4 Specific Objectives

The specific objectives are as follows:
1. To identify factors that motivates employees in Textile sector of Faisalabad.
2. To identify determinants of the employee’s performance in Textile sector of Faisalabad.
3. To assess the effect of motivation on the employee’s performance Textile sector of Faisalabad.

1.5 Research Questions

This section deals with the formulation of the research question that will help to achieve the objectives of the study. They are:
1. What are the factors that motivate employees in Textile sector of Faisalabad.
2. What determines the employee’s performance in Textile sector of Faisalabad.
3. What is the effect of motivation on the employee’s performance in Textile sector of Faisalabad.
4. In what ways could motivation be improved upon in Textile sector of Faisalabad.

1.6 Significance of Study

The study examines the effect of motivation on employees Performance at Textile sector of Faisalabad. The motivation for the study was prompted by the low level of concentration on employee motivation. The study will therefore serve as a contribution to the body of existing literature related to motivation. This will serve as a guide to researchers and to provide data upon which further studies could be concluded. The research findings and results that will be reported in this study will provide the management with more reliable and scientific way of motivating and evaluating the level of their employee’s performance.

LITERATURE REVIEW

2. INTRODUCTION

This chapter presents the literature review on the study. It is concentrated on the definition of motivation, forms of motivation, theories on motivation, and factors that motivates employees. An attempt was made to discuss performance, the effects of motivation on employee’s performance and monetary motivators versus non-monetary motivators.

Motivation is the most important factor influencing organizational performance. Employee’s motivation is one of the policies of managers to increase effectual job management amongst employees in organizations (Shadare et al., 2009). A motivated employee is responsive of the definite goals and objectives individuals must achieve, therefore individuals direct its efforts in that direction. Organizational facilities will go waste if it lacks motivated people to utilize these facilities efficiently. Employee’s motivation and performance are key factors in moving a business forward. Owners, managers and supervisors know positive motivation leads to better performance and higher productivity but may rely on the wrong tools that will create dissatisfaction among employees and leads to poor performance. Motivation increases the willingness of the workers to work, thus increasing effectiveness of the organization. Organization goal is to develop motivated employees and support their morale regarding their respective works for better performance (Shadare et al., 2009).

Definition of motivation according to Society for Human Resource Management (2010), motivation is generally defined as the psychological forces that determine the direction of a person’s level of effort, as well as a person’s persistence in the face of obstacles. Element in the above definitions are: ‘effort’ - a measure of intensity that maximizes employee’s potential capacity to work in a way that is appropriate to the job; ‘persistence’ - the application of effort work-related tasks employees display over a time period; and ‘direction’ - emphasizes that persistent high level of work-related effort should be channeled in a way that benefits the work environment. Bratton et al. (2007:248) defined it as a cognitive decision making process that influences the persistence and direction of goal directed behavior.

Work motivation can also be defined as the psychological forces within a person that determines the direction of that person’s behavior in an organization (George and Jones, 2008). Denhardt et al. (2008) further stated that motivation is not the same as satisfaction. Satisfaction is past oriented, where as motivation is future oriented.

Motivation, the drive to satisfy a need and to stimulate people and bring out that natural drive to do a good job ultimately comes from within an individual. People are motivated by a variety of things and the two types of motivation are intrinsic or extrinsic. Intrinsic motivated work behavior stems from a person’s ‘internal’ desire to do something, and is therefore usually self-applied e.g. pure interest in a project or a positive recognition from colleagues are examples of intrinsic motivation. Deci (1975) believes intrinsically motivated behaviors are seen when there is no other apparent reward except the activity itself.

Extrinsically motivated behavior on the other hand is behavior that is performed to acquire material or social rewards or to avoid punishment. The source of motivation is the consequence of the behavior not the behavior itself. Deci (1975) stated that extrinsically motivated behaviors as those where the controlling
mechanism is easily seen and Deci and Ryan (1985) stated in their work that extrinsically motivated behaviors are generally done as a consequence of pressure and result in low self-esteem and anxiety. Extrinsic motivated work behavior stems from such tangible rewards such as pay, bonuses, and promotion among others.

Regardless of whether people are intrinsically or extrinsically motivated, they join and are motivated to work in organizations to obtain certain outcomes. An outcome is anything a person gets from a job or organization. Some outcomes such as autonomy, responsibility, feeling of accomplishment and the pleasure of doing interesting or enjoyable work, result intrinsically motivated behavior. Other outcomes such as pay, job security, benefits and vacation time result in extrinsically motivated behavior.

Theories of motivation stress different factors that contribute to job satisfaction. Both intrinsic and extrinsic motivated behavior reflect the various theories that can be adopted in an attempt to understand motivation behavior. Maslow (1946) and Herzberg (1968) are content theorists who stress on the satisfaction of needs. Maslow (1946) and Herzberg (1968) theory focuses on the question of what arouses, sustains and regulates goal directed behavior that is what particular things motivate people.

Vroom (1969), Porter and Lawler (1968) who are process theorists emphasize on the process of motivation and importance of rewards. The process theory on the other hand changes the emphasis from needs as in content theory to the goals and processes by which workers are motivated.

They are group of theories about work motivation that focuses on employees needs as the sources of motivation. A need is a requirement for survival and well-being and motivation of a person depends on the strength of their needs. Maslow (1946) suggested that human needs are arranged in a series of levels, a hierarchy of importance, usually displayed in the form of a pyramid as shown in Figure 2.1

**Figure 2.1: Maslow’s hierarchy of needs**

The lower-level needs (psychological, safety and social) are at first predominant: people’s behavior is directed towards satisfying these needs. Once the lower-level needs are met, people direct their behavior towards satisfying their need for self-esteem and self-actualization (the ultimate motivator). Physiological needs i.e. a person’s needs for food, drink, shelter, sex and other physical requirements. Safety needs i.e. a person’s needs for security and protection from physical and emotional harm, as well as assurance that physical needs will continue to be met. Social needs i.e. a person’s needs for affection, belongingness, acceptance, and friendship. Esteem needs i.e. a person’s needs for internal esteem factors, such as self-respect, autonomy, and external esteem factors, such as status, recognition and attention. Self-actualization i.e. a person’s needs for growth, achieving one’s potential, and self fulfilment; the drive to become what one is capable of becoming. Wahba & Bridwell (1976), found little evidence for the ranking of needs that Maslow described or for the existence of a definite hierarchy at all. In an article by Bennett (2009), he stated that while Maslow’s theory has its uses, most modern management experts and psychologists regard it with some suspicion. One obvious criticism is that the hierarchy doesn’t take into account acts of selflessness, bravery, charity and heroism.
Herzberg (1968) proposed another well-known approach which is also known as motivator-hygiene. This theory implies that there are two different sets of factors, hygiene and motivators or satisfiers, which affect individual motivation and job satisfaction (Ott, 1989). Herzberg (1968), discovered that there were certain factors associated with job satisfaction (motivation factors) which are those factors that are related to the content of one’s job and are necessary to maintain a reasonable level of motivation among employees, such as the nature of the work itself, the possibility for growth, responsibility, advancement, recognition and status. A completely different set of factors are associated with dissatisfaction which are referred to as hygiene or maintenance factors. For instance, inadequate monthly salary to employees could cause dissatisfaction at work when hygiene factors are absent, for example, when good relations with supervisors and peers, good pay and working conditions, job security and among others are absent (Herzberg et al, 1959; Ott, 1989). Herzberg’s (1968) theory has been labelled as the two-factor theory. Moreover, the hygiene factors, if correct, did not cause any dissatisfaction, neither did they motivate workers. However, when they were not right, they led to dissatisfaction and exerted negative impact. Thus, supervisors ought to look for the motivators. When management provides employees with the motivators such as recognition, acceptance and responsibility, job satisfaction is obtained and motivation is high. If such factors are not right, job satisfaction and therefore motivation will be lacking. Hackman and Oldham (1976) noted that the theory does not allow for individual differences, such as particular personality traits, which would affect individuals’ unique responses to motivating or hygiene factors. Mullins (2006) agrees that the motivation-hygiene theory by Herzberg has extended Maslow’s hierarchy of need theory and is more directly applicable to the work situation. Herzberg’s theory suggests that if management is to provide positive motivation then attention must be given not only to hygiene factors, but also to the motivating factors.

Alderfer (1972) reorganizes Maslow’s needs hierarchy into three levels: Existence (Physiological and safety), Relatedness (social) and Growth (esteem and self-actualization). Alderfer (1972) maintains the higher and the lower order needs who agree with Maslow (1946) that satisfied needs motivate individuals. Therefore, based on Maslow (1946) work managers or leaders are expected to meet the lower-level needs of their employees so that they will not dominate the employee’s motivational process. Management should get to know the people’s needs and to meet them as a means of increasing performance. Unlike Maslow (1946) theory, the results of Alderfer (1972) work suggest that lower-level needs do not have to be satisfied before a higher-level need emerges as a motivating influence. Existence, Relatedness, and Growth Theory states that an individual is motivated to satisfy one or more basic sets of needs. Therefore if a person’s needs at a particular level are blocked then attention should be focused on the satisfaction of needs at the other levels (Mullins, 2006).

They are group of theories about work motivation that attempt to identify the relationships among the dynamic variables which make up motivation and actions required to influence behavior and actions. The three known theories are: equity, expectancy and goal-setting theory.

Adams (1965) formulated the equity approach as an appropriate way to effective supervision and the equity approach is another important means of ensuring motivation of workers. Workers tend to believe in it if the organizational reward system is fair. This theory assumes that people want to be treated fairly and they tend to compare contributions and rewards to those received by others. The equity theory states that people need to perceive equal outcomes for perceived equal circumstances (Ott, 1989). The principles for this theory are that if workers discover that the company does not properly reward them, they will feel dissatisfied and their morale will be lower. The outcome is that they will not work hard anymore or they may choose to depart from the current company. If the workers believe that they are adequately rewarded for what they do, they will maintain the same level of output and performance. On the other hand, if workers perceive the rewards as more than they consider fair, then they will most likely work even harder in the organization.

Victor Vroom (1969) in Ott (1989) came out with expectancy theory, which states that an employee will be motivated to exert a high level of effort when he/she believes that effort will lead to a good performance appraisal, and followed by organization rewards such as, bonus, salary increment or promotion which later satisfy personal goals. Simply put, it means that people are motivated by calculating how much they can get from something, how likely their actions will cause them to get it and how much others in similar circumstances have received (Ott, 1989). Porter and Lawler (1968) in Huczynski and Buchanan (2001) have developed Vroom’s expectancy theory into a more comprehensive theory of work motivation. According to their theory, the effort expended on task will depend on the value of rewards for performing the job well and the expectation that the rewards will follow. In this model, what Vroom called “instrumentality” is simply labelled “the expectations that performance will lead to rewards”.

Locke (1968) introduced the goal setting approach and believes that the intentions to work towards a goal are major sources of work motivation. Basically, the specific goals increase work performance and that is to say that the specific hard goals produce a higher level of output than does the generalized goal of just “do the best”. The specific goal itself acts as an internal stimulus and hence provides the motivation force to people. Employees will do better when they get feedback on how well they are progressing toward their goals because
feedback helps to identify any discrepancies between what they have done and what they want to do. Thus, feedback acts to guide behavior, therefore, the goal setting theory presupposes that an individual is committed to the goal, and is determined not to lower or abandon the goal. On goal-setting theory application, management by objectives (MBO) is one way of doing it (Huczynski and Buchanan, 2001).

The reinforcement theories by Skinner (1953) are actually the antithesis of cognitive theories in the sense that the theories do not relate with human thought process. According to Skinner (1953) reinforcement theory, our behavior can be explained by consequences in the environment, and therefore, it is not necessary to look for cognitive explanations. Instead, the theory relies heavily on a concept called the law of effect that states behaviors having pleasant or positive consequences are more likely to be repeated and behaviors having unpleasant or negative consequences are less likely to be repeated. Cole (2003) argue that, under strict reinforcement theory, an individual’s own understandings, emotions, needs and expectations do not enter into motivation, which is purely about the consequences of behavior. However, modification of the theory (e.g. social learning theory) do allow for the effect of individuals’ perceptions of the rewards/punishments obtained by others as a contributor to motivation.

Motivating employees for better performance encompasses several critical factors: employee engagement, organizational vision and values, management acknowledgment and appreciation of work well done, overall authenticity of leadership, financial reward, and career advancement among others. Employees are expected to come to the workplace with the intrinsic motivation and desire to be successful, be value-added and contribute to the attainment of an employer’s vision. Conversely, it is incumbent upon the employer to provide resources, opportunities, recognition and a cohesive work environment for employees to be successful” (SHRM, 2010). Engagement influences motivation and it is reflected in the extent to which employees commit, how hard they work and how long they stay. People join organizations for different reasons, motivated by intrinsic and extrinsic rewards. Intrinsic rewards are reflected in actions believed to be important. Examples include an employee who wants to help people by providing excellent customer service or a senior manager who gains a sense of accomplishment from overseeing a large corporation. Intrinsic outcomes include responsibility, autonomy, feelings of accomplishment and the pleasure of doing interesting work. Extrinsic motivated behavior includes actions performed with the goal to have material or social rewards, with outcomes such as job security, benefits, vacation time and public recognition. It is the responsibility of managers to motivate employees, with the goal for employees to contribute to the organization. Managers can best motivate employees by offering rewards that are meaningful to them (Daniel & Metcalf, 2005 cited in SHRM, 2010). Perry (2006) did emphasize that employees who participate in their organization’s decision-making processes and who feel that they have a voice in the company have a higher job satisfaction.

Employees are often motivated differently and to develop a work environment that promotes motivation, organizations need to know what is important to their employees and then to emphasize these factors. In fact, some companies and researchers are beginning to look at “work spirituality” - not in a religious sense, but in a sense that what an employee does aligns with his or her greater sense of life and purpose. Aside from monetary gain, work provides people with fulfillment on various levels, from earning a living and “doing good work” to aspiring to a vision and ultimately having an impact on the quality of life. Good organizations are always trying to structure the work so as to match the nature of the work with the nature of the employee and to make the work as interesting and enjoyable as possible (Brian, 2013).

How employees are treated is a strong determinant of employee motivation and performance. Lawler (2003) emphasizes that “treating people right is fundamental to creating organizational effectiveness and success. It is also easier said than done.” According to Lawler (2003), this includes “a highly complex set of actions on the part of both organizations and employees. Organizations must develop ways to treat their employees so that they are motivated and satisfied; employees must behave in ways to help their organizations become effective and high-performing.” This winning combination for performance requires a partnership between the organization and the employees. Lawler (2003) states: “One can’t succeed without the other. To provide people with meaningful work and rewards, organizations need to be successful. And to be successful, organizations need high-performing individuals. The challenge is to design organizations that perform at high levels and treat people in ways that are rewarding and satisfying.” To describe this mutually beneficial relationship, he uses the term virtuous spiral, a relationship that occurs when the organization values its employees, and in return, workers are committed to high performance. Performance is carefully noted at all levels of the organization. No matter an individual’s title, everyone has the opportunity to lead in some capacity and have a positive impact on performance. Understanding the value that can be achieved through different roles is one way of providing motivation, performance and thus leadership skills. Workers have better results when they can identify with those they serve. Specifically, face-to-face interactions and task significance are key drivers for motivation and performance. Making human connections is critical for motivation, leadership and high job performance. Motivation and performance increase simply by an employee’s awareness of the impact of his or her job on others.
Llopis (2012) also stated that trust is a powerful motivational tool and those leaders that are more transparent with their employees will find surprising results and new types of opportunities to develop talent. Llopis (2012) stated that everyone wants to be noticed and recognized for their work, therefore employees are motivated to achieve to remain relevant and as such, employees are in search of new ways to learn, improve their skills and invest in themselves.

According to Aguinis (2009), performance is about behavior or what employees do, and not what employees produce or the outcomes of their work. Performance is an effort along with the ability to put efforts supported with the organizational policies in order to achieve certain objectives. Campbell (1990) also defines performance as behavior. It is something done by the employee. This concept differentiates performance from outcomes. Outcomes are the result of an individual's performance, but they are also the result of other influences. There are several variables that determine performance. These variables could be classified as general determinants of performance. For instance, one’s qualification can go a long way to enhance performance. The longer the number of years experience, the higher the level of performance all other things being equal. Again, quality and style of supervision is a key factor. The use of democratic and autocratic styles of supervision will have varying degree of results given different behaviors of employees; the working environment is another determinant that could pose serious threat to performance. For example, if the working environment is hazardous, it could endanger the lives of employees. The use of protective gadgets and clean working environment could reduce the hazards employees are exposed to at the workplace; the single most important determinant of performance is compensation package. In the absence of compensation, performance levels would be very low compensation could be financial or non-financial may have different levels of motivation and consequently its influence on performance; factors such as tools and equipment can enhance one’s performance. Imagine the use of computers, combine harvesters, irrigation system and teaching aids in the production system. Technology has made it possible to have certain tools and equipment that enhance productive activities; and other determinants of performance include support from other colleagues, production materials, health condition of employees, job security, and retirement and other benefits, age, loyalty or commitment (Aguinis, 2009).

The motivation theorists such as Maslow (1946), Herzberg (1968), Alderfer (1972) and McClelland (1988) have suggested specific things that managers can do to help their subordinates become self-actualized, because such employees are likely to work at their maximum creative potential when their needs are met. They agree that by promoting a healthy workforce, providing financial security, providing opportunities to socialize and recognizing employees’ accomplishments help to satisfy the employees’ physiological needs which in turn also increase their performance. These authors (Koch, 1990; Stuart, 1992) all stated that recognition of a job well done or full appreciation for work done is often among the top motivators of employee performance and involves feedback. Positive feedback follows the principles advocated in Reinforcement Theory, which states that behavior is contingent on reinforcement. Examples of positive reinforcement in this context may include workplace visits by top executives to high-performance employees, personal handwritten notes of thanks accompanying paychecks, and telephone calls by top executives to employees at home (Knippen and Green, 1990). Theories such as equity has some important implications for ways of motivating people by not underpay, overpay and presenting information about outcomes in a thorough and socially sensitive manner. It states that, companies that attempt to save money by reducing employees’ salaries may find that employees respond in many different ways to even the score; those that overpay some employees as a useful motivational technique to increase performance may later realized that when you overpay one employee, you are underpaying all the others. When the majority of the employees feel underpaid, they will lower their performance, resulting in a net decrease in productivity and widespread dissatisfaction. Hence, the conclusion is that managers should strive to treat all employees equitably; and This suggestion follows from research showing that people’s assessments of fairness on the job go beyond merely what their outcomes and inputs are to their knowledge of how these were determined, that is, to their sense of procedural justice (perceptions of the fairness of the procedures used to determine outcomes). Osei (2011), also agrees with the equity theory that, one of the fundamental issues that is sensitive and critical which can make or unmake any organization is wage or salary determination. Justice, fairness and equity in salary determination, to a large extent, put to rest all the traumas any individual or any organization may experience, and that is highly motivational enough to assess the optimal usage of time and energy.

According to Ballentine et al. (2009), managers are constantly searching for ways to create a motivational environment where employees to work at their optimal levels to accomplish company objectives. Workplace motivators include both monetary and non-monetary incentives and the purpose of monetary incentives is to reward employees for excellent job performance through money. Monetary incentives include profit sharing, project bonuses, stock options and warrants, scheduled bonuses (e.g., Christmas and performance-linked), and
additional paid vacation time. Traditionally, these have helped maintain a positive motivational environment for employees (Kepner, 2001).

The purpose of non-monetary incentives is to reward employees for excellent job performance through opportunities and non-monetary incentives include flexible work hours, training, pleasant work environment, and sabbaticals. Industrial and Commercial Training (1975) also in their review of money as a motivator wrote that hard cash as a motivational influence in the work situation took a nasty knock from the behavioral scientists in the 1960s. It was Herzberg (1968), who advanced the doctrine that money is not a motivational factor: increased wages could produce more commitment to production but their effect was declared to be short-lived but commitment and involvement were to come from other factors - the motivational factors, such as the opportunity for personal growth, challenge in the job and, more recently, opportunities to join in the decision-making process.

Kohn (1993) argues that monetary incentives encourage compliance rather than risk-taking because most rewards are based only on performance. As a result, employees are discouraged from being creative in the workplace. Another argument Kohn (1993) presents is that monetary incentives may be used to circumvent problems in the workplace. For example, incentives to boost sales can be used to compensate for poor management. Employers also may use monetary incentives as an extrinsic rather than an intrinsic motivator. In other words, employees are driven to do things just for the monetary reward versus doing something because it is the right thing to do. This can disrupt or terminate good relationships between employees because they are transformed from co-workers to competitors, which can quickly disrupt the workplace environment (Kohn, 1993). Monetary and non-monetary incentives vary in their roles, effectiveness, and appropriateness, depending on the type of incentive. (Kohn, 1993) Stated that a balance between monetary and non-monetary incentives should be used to satisfy the diverse needs and interests of employees. Therefore, performance variables such as employee’s qualification, experience, job security, working environment, age, health conditions among others will be used to draw conclusion on the study.

METHODOLOGY

3. INTRODUCTION

This chapter is organized as follows; research model, research methodology, research design, research strategy, sources of data, population and sampling, research instrument, data collection procedure and analyses of data.

3.1 Research Model

Independent Variable                                                                  Dependent Variable

Employee’s Motivation                                                                  Employee’s Performance

3.2 Research Methodology

The process used to collect information and data for the purpose of making decision on the study.

3.2.1 Research design

The descriptive survey was chosen considering the purpose of the study, the research questions and the magnitude of the target population. Descriptive survey according to Saunders et al., (2007) is a research for which the purpose is to produce an accurate representation of persons, events or situations. It has an advantage of producing good amount of responses from a wide range of people, and it can also be used with greater confidence with regards to particular questions of special interest or values to a researcher. However, the method has some weaknesses such as time consuming to ensure that sample is representative, designing and piloting data collection instrument and trying to ensure a good response rate. Also, there is a limit to the number of questions that any questionnaire can contain for respondents. In spite of these weaknesses, the descriptive survey design was considered the most appropriate for the study.

3.2.2 Research strategy

The research strategy is the way in which the research objectives are questioned (Saunders et al., 2007). Quantitative strategy was chosen in this research. According to Bryman and Bell (2011), quantitative research is a research strategy that emphasizes quantification in the collection and analysis of data.

3.3 Sources of Data

Both primary and secondary data were used in conducting the research

3.3.1 Primary Sources

According to Blaxter (2001), primary data is defined as consisting of materials that one has gathered by himself through systematic observation, information archives, the results of questionnaires and interviews and case study which one has compiled. The method used in this primary data collection was questionnaire.
3.3.2 Secondary Sources
Saunders et al., (2007) defined secondary data as data used for a project that were originally collected for some other purpose. The secondary sources of information that I have used in the study included books, internet search, articles, and journals among others. These secondary sources did help me to identify how others have defined and measured key concepts, and how this research project is related to the work of others.

3.4 Population
The target population was the employees of Textile Sector of Faisalabad. The population of study consisted of employees of various departments of different textile organization and this included HR, Finance, Marketing etc.

3.5 Sample size
The sample size was 100 personals of different textile organizations.

3.6 Sampling technique
Convenience sampling a type of non-prob!ability sampling was used in order to select sample and gather data. This technique is simple and comparatively economical in terms of time, labor and money.

3.7 Research Instrument
Research instrument used in this study is questionnaire (close-ended questions).

3.7.1 Questionnaire development
A questionnaire is a type of survey method that utilizes a standardized set or list of questions given to individuals or groups, the results of which can be consistently compared and contrasted (Trochim, 2006). It can be used to reach large number of respondents, lower costs than interviewing, reduced interviewer bias and among others are advantages associated with questionnaire. It drawbacks are low response rates, clarity issues, possible language and literacy issues, et cetera. The questionnaire was in four section, the first section requested general personal information about the respondents. The second section requested for respondents opinion on factors that motivates employees in the Textile sector. The questions address the key dimensions of factors of motivation identified in the literature. The third section requested details about factors that determine employee’s performance and the last section requested for respondents opinion on the effects of motivation on the employee performance.

3.8 Analysis of data
At the end of the entire data collection process Quantitative method was employed in the analysis of the data. Microsoft Excel was used for coding of answers of 100 questionnaires. Quantitative analysis is the use of Tables or diagrams that show the frequency of occurrence and using statistics such as indices to enable comparisons, through establishing statistical relationships between variables to complex statistical modelling (Saunders et al, 2007). Microsoft Excel was used for coding of answers of 100 questionnaires. The results were then analyzed and converted into Tables and percentages. Data for the various research questions were analyzed using percentages obtained to show the distribution of opinions and perceptions of respondents. The statistical summaries of the result were presented in the form of percentage and Tables using computer data analysis package such as the statistical package for social science (SPSS) and other relevant software to help interpret results.

DATA ANALYSIS AND RESULTS
4. INTRODUCTION
This chapter presents the information on data collected from the respondents on the impact of motivation on employee’s performance in Textile sector of Faisalabad. The chapter contains quantitative data analysis and findings. The quantitative analysis involves the use of a variety of statistical procedures including basic descriptive statistics (e.g. Tables and percentages). The survey was conducted on a total 100 employees. SPSS was employed for analyzing the data. The findings were presented in Tables.

Frequencies:
Table shows the result of single variable and its results by the respondents which are shown as follow;

4.1 BACKGROUND OF RESPONDENTS
This section shows the gender of the respondents, age bracket, and experience of respondent in textile sector.
4.2.1 Gender of respondents

Table 4.1 Gender

| Gender | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| MALE   | 89        | 89.0    | 89.0          | 89.0               |
| FEMALE | 11        | 11.0    | 11.0          | 100.0              |
| Total  | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

From Table 4.1 above, it can be noted that the male employees form the majority by 89% while female are represented by 11%. This implies that Textile sector of Faisalabad is not biased in its employment but rather male dominating over their female counterparts.

4.2.2 Age Bracket of Respondents

Table 4.2 Age

| Age Group          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 18 TO 30 YEARS     | 51        | 51.0    | 51.0          | 51.0               |
| 31 TO 40 YEARS     | 36        | 36.0    | 36.0          | 87.0               |
| 41 TO 50 YEARS     | 13        | 13.0    | 13.0          | 100.0              |
| Total              | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

From Table 4.2, 51% of the respondents are within the age group of 18-30 years followed by those in the age group of 31-40 years at 36% follow by 41-50 years 13%. This means that the Textile sector is having young and energetic people in the service and are ready to serve for long time provided they are motivated enough to stay.

4.2.3 Experience

Table 4.3 Experience

| Experience          | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| 0 TO 3 YEARS        | 44        | 44.0    | 44.0          | 44.0               |
| 4 TO 6 YEARS        | 28        | 28.0    | 28.0          | 72.0               |
| 7 TO 9 YEARS        | 28        | 28.0    | 28.0          | 100.0              |
| Total               | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

The research revealed that 44% had work with the service between 0-3 years, 22% between 4-6 years and 28% been the least between 7-9 years as indicated by the Table 4.4 below. It indicates that most of respondents are young. Moreover it indicates that higher proportion of employees had spent much time with the service and had acquired enough experience to deliver quality services.

4.2 Factors that Motivate Employees

The respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement to the motivational factors and indicate how each motivates employees in the textile sector.

4.2.1 Nature of work

Table 4.4 Nature of work

| Nature of work       | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE       | 41        | 41.0    | 41.0          | 41.0               |
| AGREE                | 46        | 46.0    | 46.0          | 87.0               |
| UNCERTAIN            | 13        | 13.0    | 13.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

Table 4.4 shows that 41% of the respondents strongly agree that nature of work motivates them, 46% also agree and 13% are uncertain. From the analysis, it is clear that the majority respondents agree with the statement and thus seems to suggest that textile workers enjoy the work they do.

4.2.2 Promotion in the organization

Table 4.5 Promotion in the organization

| Promotion in the organization | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE                 | 35        | 35.0    | 35.0          | 35.0               |
| AGREE                          | 40        | 40.0    | 40.0          | 75.0               |
| UNCERTAIN                      | 25        | 25.0    | 25.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                          | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

The Table 4.5 reveals that 35% of the respondents strongly agree that promotion motivates them, 40% also agree and 25% are uncertain. From the analysis, the majority of 75% agrees with the statement. This therefore
means that, if organizations want to motivates it employees, they must use promotions as a major tool because employees are of the view that promotion is a strong factor that motivates them and should be promoted which then leads to good performance.

4.2.3 Opportunity for Advancement

Table 4.6 Opportunity for Advancement

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE | 33 | 33.0 | 33.0 | 33.0 |
| AGREE | 52 | 52.0 | 52.0 | 85.0 |
| UNCERTAIN | 15 | 15.0 | 15.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

From Table 4.8 above, it reveals that 52% of the respondents agree that the service provide opportunity for advancement such as study leave with or without pay to study which motivates them, 33% also strongly agree and 15% are uncertain. The fact that greater number of workers cherishes opportunity for advancement means that they want to fulfill their higher-level needs in the Maslow's (1946) hierarchy of needs and Locke (1968) goal setting theory which believes that the intentions to work towards a goal are major sources of work motivation.

4.2.4 Responsibility

Table 4.7 Responsibility

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE | 19 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 19.0 |
| AGREE | 55 | 55.0 | 55.0 | 74.0 |
| UNCERTAIN | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 83.0 |
| DISAGREE | 17 | 17.0 | 17.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 4.7 above shows that 55% of the respondents agree that they are motivated when given a sense of responsibility at the work place, 19 % are strongly agree with this, only 17% disagree with the statement while 9% uncertain who doesn’t see responsibility to be anything that will motivate them at the workplace. This is in agreement with Frederick Herzberg (1968) motivator-hygiene theory which postulates that responsibility at work motivates employees.

4.2.5 Appreciation for work done

Table 4.8 Appreciation for work done

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE | 31 | 31.0 | 31.0 | 31.0 |
| AGREE | 42 | 42.0 | 42.0 | 73.0 |
| UNCERTAIN | 11 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 84.0 |
| DISAGREE | 9 | 9.0 | 9.0 | 93.0 |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE | 7 | 7.0 | 7.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

Table 4.8 shows that the majority of respondents representing 73% are motivated when their work is appreciated whilst 16% disagree that they are not motivated merely by appreciating their work with 11% unsure of what motivates them. This suggest recognizes non-monetary incentives like appreciation of work and authorities must continue to use this motivational factor which agrees with Llopes (2012) statement that everyone wants to be noticed and recognized for their work.

4.2.6 Salary

Table 4.9 Salary

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE | 41 | 41.0 | 41.0 | 41.0 |
| AGREE | 29 | 29.0 | 29.0 | 70.0 |
| UNCERTAIN | 19 | 19.0 | 19.0 | 89.0 |
| DISAGREE | 11 | 11.0 | 11.0 | 100.0 |
| Total | 100 | 100.0 | 100.0 |

From the Table 4.9, 70% of the respondents are in agreement that salary motivates them and minority of respondents representing 11% disagree that the salary doesn’t motivate them whilst 19% are uncertain. This indicates that most of textile worker get motivated with their salary.
4.2.7 Working Condition

Table 4.10 Working Condition

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE| 40        | 40.0    | 40.0          | 40.0               |
| AGREE         | 33        | 33.0    | 33.0          | 73.0               |
| VALID         | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

From the Table 4.10, as much as 73% of the respondents were in agreement that working condition motivates them, another 14% of the respondents disagree which call for management to take a look at working conditions of its workers to ensure that there is improvement whilst 13% are uncertain. The kind of working conditions that employee’s works affect their performance.

4.2.8 Relationship with Superior

Table 4.11 Relationship with Superior

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE| 19        | 19.0    | 19.0          | 19.0               |
| AGREE         | 22        | 22.0    | 22.0          | 41.0               |
| VALID         | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

The study reveals in Table 4.11 that 41% of the respondents agrees that they relate well with their superiors which serves as motivation but 42% disagree with the statement that their superiors don’t treat them well which affect the delivery of quality work. This means that the service should find solution to this problem by reducing the power distance between the superiors and their subordinates.

4.2.9 Relationship with peers

Table 4.12 Relationship with peers

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE| 28        | 28.0    | 28.0          | 28.0               |
| AGREE         | 47        | 47.0    | 47.0          | 75.0               |
| VALID         | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

The field survey shows that 75% of the respondents agrees that they relate well with their peers which serves as motivation but only 8% of the respondents disagree with the statement that they don’t relate well with their peers to motivate them with 17% been neutral as shown in Table 4.12. This is very encouraging and should be maintain for the good of the service as it satisfy the social needs of the individual as proposed by the content theorist like Maslow, Herzberg, Alderfer and others.

4.3 Determinants of employee’s performance

The respondents were asked to indicate their level of agreement or disagreement to determine the employee’s performance in textile sector of Faisalabad.

4.3.1 Qualification of employees

Table 4.13 Qualification of employees

|               | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|---------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE| 42        | 42.0    | 42.0          | 42.0               |
| AGREE         | 49        | 49.0    | 49.0          | 91.0               |
| VALID         | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

On the qualification of employees, it became clear from Table 4.13 that the majority of the respondents representing 91% agree that their qualification determines their performance. While 9% is uncertain. The responses show that one’s qualification can go a long way to enhance his/her performance. When one goes through education, development and training to acquire a certain level of qualification, it will enhance his working ability all other things being equal. This in conformity with Campbell (1990) and Aguinis (2009) who suggested that individual differences on performance are a function of three main determinants: declarative
knowledge, procedural knowledge, and motivation.

### 4.3.2 Experience of employees

| Table 4.14 Experience of employees | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE                | 44        | 44.0    | 44.0          | 44.0               |
| AGREE                         | 41        | 41.0    | 41.0          | 85.0               |
| DISAGREE                      | 15        | 15.0    | 15.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                         | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

When respondents were asked about how long they have been teaching, they answered that once they have acquire enough experience, it will help them to perform better at workplace as shown in Table 4.14 with 85%. However, 15% of respondents disagree acquired on accounting for their performance but rather than other factors. The responses show that experience is a great asset that can improve an employee’s performance. The longer the number of years of experience, the higher the level of performance all other things being equal.

### 4.3.3 Working Environment

| Table 4.15 Working Environment | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE                 | 35        | 35.0    | 35.0          | 35.0               |
| AGREE                          | 38        | 38.0    | 38.0          | 73.0               |
| DISAGREE                       | 27        | 27.0    | 27.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                          | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

The working environment is another determinant that could pose serious threat to performance. For example, if the working environment is hazardous, it could endanger the lives of employees. From Table 4.15, the responses show that majority of the respondents representing 73% believes that their working environment determines their performance and 27% disagree with the statement that their performance are not determines by their working environment.

### 4.3.4 Compensation package (financial and non-financial)

| Table 4.16 Compensation package | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|--------------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE                 | 27        | 27.0    | 27.0          | 27.0               |
| AGREE                          | 29        | 29.0    | 29.0          | 56.0               |
| UNCERTAIN                      | 18        | 18.0    | 18.0          | 74.0               |
| DISAGREE                       | 18        | 18.0    | 18.0          | 92.0               |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE              | 7         | 7.0     | 7.0           | 100.0              |
| Total                          | 99        | 99.0    | 100.0         |                    |
| Missing System                 | 1         | 1.0     |               |                    |
| Total                          | 100       | 100.0   |               |                    |

From the field survey, the result shows that 57% of the respondents believe that the kind of compensation package (financial and non-financial) determines their performance. But like every human institution, 25% of the respondents don’t see it that way and 18% neither agree nor disagree as shown in Table 4.16. It seems to suggest that workers performances are enhanced by the kind of compensation package they receive and if inadequate, might contributed to frequent industrial strike for better and adequate salary.

### 4.3.5 Job security

| Table 4.17 Job security | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE          | 53        | 53.0    | 53.0          | 53.0               |
| AGREE                   | 10        | 10.0    | 10.0          | 63.0               |
| UNCERTAIN               | 11        | 11.0    | 11.0          | 74.0               |
| DISAGREE                | 9         | 9.0     | 9.0           | 83.0               |
| STRONGLY DISAGREE       | 17        | 17.0    | 17.0          | 100.0              |
| Total                   | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

On job security, one can see from Table 4.17 that the majority of the respondents agree with safety needs of Maslow’s work, 63% believes that their job security determines their performance because as long as there is no threat to their work and 26% don’t performance tied to job security whilst 11% are uncertain.
4.3.6 Support for other colleagues
Table 4.18 Support for other colleagues

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE | 22        | 22.0    | 22.0          | 22.0               |
| AGREE          | 51        | 51.0    | 51.0          | 73.0               |
| DISAGREE       | 27        | 27.0    | 27.0          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

From the field survey, the results show that 73% of the respondents believe that the support received from other colleagues determines their performance and 27% of the respondents also indicate that the support received from other colleagues has nothing to do with their performance. The result reveals that people need each other’s help as proposed by Abraham Maslow’s (1946) hierarchy of needs i.e. a person’s needs for affection, belongingness, acceptance, and friendship. When there is cordial relation among workers, it enhances their performance and an individual feels comfortable to interact, and seek help when needed.

4.3.7 Age and health condition of employees
Table 4.19 Age and health condition of employee

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| STRONGLY AGREE | 46        | 46.0    | 46.0          | 46.0               |
| AGREE          | 27        | 27.0    | 27.0          | 73.0               |
| UNCERTAIN      | 7         | 7.0     | 7.0           | 80.0               |
| DISAGREE       | 20        | 20.0    | 20.0          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

From Table 4.19, 73% of the respondents believe that their age and health condition determines their performance followed by those who disagree of 20% and 7% sitting on the fence.

4.4 Effects of motivation on the Employee Performance
The respondents were asked to indicate how these motivational factors influence their level of performance in the textile sector

4.4.1 Nature of work
Table 4.20 Nature of work

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH      | 37        | 37.0    | 37.0          | 37.0               |
| HIGH           | 22        | 22.0    | 22.0          | 59.0               |
| UNCERTAIN      | 30        | 30.0    | 30.0          | 89.0               |
| LOW            | 11        | 11.0    | 11.0          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

The results from field shows that 59% of the respondents believe that nature of work highly influences their level of performance and 11% of the respondents also indicate that nature of work lowly influences their level of performance whilst 30% been neutral as shown in Table 4.20. This seems to suggest that when workers enjoy the kind of work they do, it has effect on their performance.

4.4.2 Promotion in the organization
Table 4.21 Promotion in the organization

|                | Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|----------------|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH      | 34        | 34.0    | 34.0          | 34.0               |
| HIGH           | 48        | 48.0    | 48.0          | 82.0               |
| UNCERTAIN      | 18        | 18.0    | 18.0          | 100.0              |
| Total          | 100       | 100.0   | 100.0         |                    |

From the field survey, the results show that 82% majority of the respondents believe that promotion in the organization highly influences their level of performance but 18% neither agree nor disagree as shown in Table 4.21. This implies that the management must ensure that promotions in the organization are done fairly to encourage employees who have consistently performed.
4.4.3 Opportunity for advancement

Table 4.22 Opportunity for advancement

| Frequency   | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH   | 47      | 47.0          | 47.0               |
| HIGH        | 14      | 14.0          | 61.0               |
| Valid       | UNCERTAIN | 9          | 9.0               | 70.0               |
| LOW         | 30      | 30.0          | 100.0              |
| Total       | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

The survey above shows that 61% of the respondents believe that opportunity for advancement highly influences their level of performance and only 30% of the respondents don’t consider the opportunity for advancement such as study leave with or without pay to study to reach their personal aspirations has any influences on their performance whilst 9% been neutral as shown in Table 4.22. This conforms to Llopis (2012) statement that, everyone wants to be noticed and recognized for their work, therefore employees are motivated to achieve to remain relevant and as such, employees are in search of new ways to learn, improves their skills and invests in themselves.

4.4.4 Responsibility

Table 4.23 Responsibility

| Frequency   | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH   | 34      | 34.0          | 34.0               |
| HIGH        | 40      | 40.0          | 74.0               |
| Valid       | UNCERTAIN | 9          | 9.0               | 83.0               |
| LOW         | 17      | 17.0          | 100.0              |
| Total       | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

The respondents were asked to indicate how responsibility influences their level of performance in the textile sector. Table 4.32 shows that 74% of the respondents believe that when they are given responsibility, influences their level of performance. Only 17% disagree and 9% decided to be neutral.

4.4.5 Appreciation for work done

Table 4.24 Appreciation for work done

| Frequency   | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH   | 32      | 32.0          | 32.0               |
| HIGH        | 37      | 37.0          | 69.0               |
| Valid       | UNCERTAIN | 8          | 8.0               | 77.0               |
| LOW         | 23      | 23.0          | 100.0              |
| Total       | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

From the field survey, the results shows that 69% majority of the respondents believes that when they are appreciated for work done, it highly influences their level of performance and 23% of the respondents doesn’t believes that appreciating work done alone influences their level of performance. 8% of the respondents are unsure of their stand as shown in Table 4.24

4.4.6 Salary

Table 4.25 Salary

| Frequency   | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-------------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH   | 31      | 31.0          | 31.0               |
| HIGH        | 36      | 36.0          | 67.0               |
| Valid       | UNCERTAIN | 21          | 21.0               | 88.0               |
| LOW         | 12      | 12.0          | 100.0              |
| Total       | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

The results from field shows that 67% vast majority of the respondents believes that salary highly influences their level of performance and 12% of the respondents also indicates that salary cannot influences their level of performance whilst 21% been neutral as shown in Table 4.25. Salary as monetary incentive is the highest motivational factor and plays an important role in performance.
4.4.7 Working Conditions

Table 4.26 Working Conditions

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH| 36      | 36.0          | 36.0               |
| HIGH     | 23      | 23.0          | 23.0               | 59.0   |
| UNCERTAIN| 7       | 7.0           | 7.0                | 66.0   |
| LOW      | 34      | 34.0          | 34.0               | 100.0  |
| Total    | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

The respondents were asked to indicate how salary influences their level of performance in the textile sector. From Table 4.26, it can be noted that 59% of the respondents believes that working conditions can greatly influence the performance of the individuals while only 34% of the respondents doesn’t think so and 7% are not sure. Going with the majority, it can be concluded that the employees believe that better working conditions can help them to improve on the level of their performance. Management should endeavor to improve on the working conditions of employees for better performance.

4.4.8 Relationships with superior

Table 4.27 Relationships with superior

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH| 38      | 38.0          | 38.0               |
| HIGH     | 37      | 37.0          | 37.0               | 75.0   |
| UNCERTAIN| 1       | 1.0           | 1.0                | 76.0   |
| LOW      | 24      | 24.0          | 24.0               | 100.0  |
| Total    | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

Table 4.27 shows that 75% of the respondents believes that relationships with superior can greatly influence the performance of the individuals while only 24% of the respondents doesn’t think so and 1% are not sure.

4.4.9 Relationships with peers

Table 4.28 Relationships with peers

| Frequency | Percent | Valid Percent | Cumulative Percent |
|-----------|---------|---------------|--------------------|
| VERY HIGH| 19      | 19.0          | 19.0               |
| HIGH     | 49      | 49.0          | 49.0               | 68.0   |
| UNCERTAIN| 22      | 22.0          | 22.0               | 90.0   |
| LOW      | 10      | 10.0          | 10.0               | 100.0  |
| Total    | 100     | 100.0         | 100.0              |

From the field survey, the results shows that 68% majority of the respondents believes that relationships with peers highly influences their level of performance and 10% of the respondents doesn’t believes that relationships with peers alone influences their level of performance whilst 22% of the respondents are unsure of their stand as shown in Table 4.28.

4.5 Reliability Test.

Table 4.29 Reliability Statistics

| Cronbach's Alpha | N of Items |
|------------------|------------|
| .932             | 28         |

As the value of the test is more than .7 that is .932 that means that my questionnaire items are excellent in internal consistency. As alpha test describe the internal consistency among the items of a questionnaire.

4.6 Regression Analysis

Regression is a technique of determining the dependency of one of the variables (dependents variable) on the basis of other variables (independent Variable). The regression calculation shows that 57% of the employee’s performance is dependent on employee’s motivation and 43% on other variables.

Table 4.30 Model Summary

| Model | R   | R Square | Adjusted R Square | Std. Error of the Estimate |
|-------|-----|----------|-------------------|----------------------------|
| 1     | .756| .571     | .567              | .45842                     |

4.7 Correlation

Correlation is a technique in which we relate the variable and study their impact on each other it might be
positive or negative. In statistics, the Pearson correlation co-efficient a measure of the linear correlation between two variables X and Y, giving a value between +1 and −1 inclusive, where 1 is total positive correlation, 0 is no correlation, and −1 is total negative correlation. When the Pearson’s r is close to 1, then there is a strong relationship between your two variables, this means that changes in one variable are strongly correlated with changes in the second variable. When the Pearson’s r is close to zero then there is the weak relationship between two variables, this means change in one variable is not correlated with the change in second variable.

### Table 4.31 Correlations

|                  | Motivation | Performance |
|------------------|------------|-------------|
| Motivation       | Pearson Correlation | 1 | .756 ** |
|                  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | 100 |
| Performance      | Pearson Correlation | .756 ** | 1 |
|                  | Sig. (2-tailed) | .000 | 100 |
|                  | N           | 100 | 100 |

**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

Based on the results we can state the following.
- **Motivation and employee’s performance have significant linear relationship. (p<0.05).**
- The direction of the relationship is positive (i.e. Motivation and employee’s performance are positively correlated), meaning that these variables tend to increase together.

### SUMMARY, CONCLUSION AND RECOMMENDATIONS

#### 5. Introduction
This chapter presents the summary of the findings of the study, draws conclusion from the study and also makes recommendations for the study.

#### 5.1 Summary of findings
The summary of findings is organized around the questionnaire which was based on the research objectives of the study.

##### 5.1.1 Background information of respondents
From the study, it can be noted that the male employees form the majority by 89% while female are represented by 11%. This implies that Textile Sector of Faisalabad is not biased in its employment but majority is of Male. The study also reveals that 51% of the respondents are within the age group of 18-30 years followed by those in the age group of 31-40 years at 36% follow by 41-50 years 13%. This means that the Textile sector of Faisalabad is having young and energetic people in the service with less people nearing the retiring age. Again, the research revealed that respondents who have work with the service for more than seven (7) years is 28% and 72% spending below seven (7) years. It further indicates that higher proportion of people have less experience but are energetic.

##### 5.1.2 Factors that motivate employees
On the factors that motivate employees, majority of the respondents agrees that nature of work that they do motivates them and at the same time promotion in the organization is a major source of motivation. This therefore means that promotion in Textile sector of Faisalabad should be done fairly to continue to motivate its employees. Another finding is that, greater majority were in favor of opportunity for advancement as motivator and sense of responsibility at work place factor that motivates them. Also, appreciation for work done and salary were another source of motivation for them. Most of the respondents were in agreement that working condition motivates them and greater majority indicating that relationship with their colleagues motivates them but their relationship with superiors are demotivation.

##### 5.1.3 Determinants of employee performance
The study reveals under the determinants of employee performance that their qualification determines their performance, implying that when one goes through education, development and training to acquire a certain level of qualification, it will enhance his working ability all other things being equal. Also, the study shows that experience is a great asset that can improve an employee’s performance and the longer the number of years of experience, the higher the level of performance. The working environment is another determinant of performance and the kind of compensation package (financial and non-financial) given to employee determines their performance according to the study findings. Job security determines performance when employees are aware that there is no threat against their job; support receive from other colleagues; age and health condition.

##### 5.1.4 Effects of motivation on the employee performance
The study reveals that employees believes that nature of work and promotion in the organization highly influences their level of performance This implies that the management must ensure that promotions in the
organization are done fairly to encourage employees who have consistently performed. A further finding reveals that opportunity for advancement and sense of responsibility has effect on performance. Appreciated for work done, salary, working conditions, how well superiors relate with subordinates and relationships with peers has greater effects on employee’s performance.

5.2 Conclusion
From the study findings and base on the objectives of the study, it can be concluded that opportunity for advancement, appreciation for work done, salary, promotions and other factors were the main source of motivation for them. This is due to the service having greater percentage of well-educated young and energetic people in the service with less people nearing the retiring age who seek ways to improve their lot. Again, it can be concluded that, performance determinants such one’s qualification, experience, working environment, compensation package, job security among others combine with favorable motivational factors have effects on performance and vice versa. Therefore, there is relationship between motivation and performance, and motivation does have effect on employee’s performance.

5.3 Recommendations
The following recommendations are made base on the research findings that:

1. The study has revealed that promotion and opportunity for advancement are the major motivation factors. It is therefore recommended that Textile sector of Faisalabad come out with revised and improved guidelines on how promotions and opportunity for advancement are done in place to encourage employees who have consistently performed or served in the service.

2. The study has also revealed that motivation level increases with adequate salary raise. It is therefore recommended that Textile sector of Faisalabad (management) should consider as a matter of urgency, the need to make upward adjustment in wages and salaries which will go a long way to enhance performance of employees.

3. It was found out from the study that the relationship between supervisors and their subordinates are not the best for quality service. It is therefore recommended that Management educate their heads of institutions on human relations to reducing the power distance between the superiors and their subordinates to ensure that good atmosphere for quality service takes place.
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