



The Influence of Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation on Employee Engagement

A qualitative study of the perceptions of managers in public and private sector organizations

Authors: Emma Bergström
Melanie García Martínez

Supervisor: Galina Biedenbach

Student
Umeå School of Business and Economics
Spring semester 2016
Degree project, 30 hp

Acknowledgements

We would like to express our gratitude to the participating managers for taking time out of their busy schedules to contribute to our study by partaking in interviews. Their valuable insights have been of fundamental importance in the completion of this thesis.

We would also like to thank our supervisor Dr. Galina Biedenbach for providing valuable assistance and guidance throughout the thesis writing process. We are sincerely grateful for her supervision and knowledge sharing which greatly aided us during this time.

Umeå, Sweden, 2016-05-20.

Emma Bergström & Melanie García Martínez

Abstract

Whereas motivation has portrayed a significant managerial issue for decades, employee engagement has relatively recently been identified as a topic of growing popularity in the world of business and management research. Current research that connects the concepts of employee motivation and engagement has had a focus on quantitative analysis and the employee perspective, investigating what factors are of importance to employees in their engagement at work. As there were no studies exploring the managerial perspective of how different kinds of motivation influence employee engagement, we were able to identify a gap in existing research. The purpose of our study was to develop a deeper understanding of how managers in private and public sector organizations perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement, and in addition, explore whether there is a difference in perceptions between managers working in the public and private sectors.

In order to be able to reach our purpose and fulfill the objectives of our study, we conducted eight semi-structured interviews with eight managers, four from the public sector and four from the private sector, about their perceptions of motivation and engagement. The collected empirical material was then coded into a thematic network where basic, organizing, and global themes were identified. The thematic network was used to organize our subsequent analysis of the material, from which we drew the conclusions of our study.

From the findings of our study we could conclude that managers perceive intrinsic motivation as generally having a larger influence on the psychological aspects of employee engagement. We also found that extrinsic motivation is of importance to employee engagement, albeit to a lesser extent psychologically but rather as a part of the total package that is offered to the employee by the organization and the manager. No differences were found in the perceptions between managers in public and private sector organizations as groups, but rather the differences appeared between the managers as individuals.

The theoretical contributions of this study were made largely in regards to the qualitative and managerial aspects with which it contributes, as there were no prior studies exploring the managerial perspective with the objectives of developing an in-depth understanding within the field. This study can be of use to managers who are struggling with questions of how employee engagement may be enhanced. Finally, based on the limitations of this study, we were able to make suggestions for future research.

Table of Contents

1. Introduction	1
1.1 Problem Background	1
1.2 Theoretical Background	2
1.3 Research Question	7
1.4 Purpose	7
2. Theoretical Framework	8
2.1 Motivation	8
2.1.1 <i>The Concept of Motivation</i>	8
2.1.2 <i>Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation</i>	9
2.1.3 <i>Need Theory</i>	12
2.1.4 <i>Expectancy Theory</i>	14
2.1.5 <i>Equity Theory</i>	16
2.1.6 <i>Organizational Justice Theory</i>	18
2.1.7 <i>Criticism of the Theories</i>	19
2.2 Employee Engagement	20
2.2.1 <i>The Concept of Employee Engagement</i>	20
2.2.2 <i>Engagement Drivers</i>	21
2.2.3 <i>Social Exchange Theory</i>	26
2.2.4 <i>Leader-Member Exchange Theory and Perceived Organizational Support</i> ...28	
2.3 Motivational and Employee Engagement	31
2.3.1 <i>Motivational Factors</i>	31
2.3.2 <i>Managers, Motivation, and Employee Engagement</i>	32
3. Methodology	36
3.1 Choice of Subject.....	36
3.2 Preconceptions	36
3.3 Ontology	37
3.4 Epistemology	38
3.5 Research Approach	39
3.6 Research Design	40
3.7 Literature Search.....	40
3.8 Qualitative Data Collection	42
3.8.1 <i>Choice of Interviewees</i>	42
3.8.2 <i>Qualitative Interviewing</i>	42
3.8.3 <i>Interview Guide</i>	43
3.8.4 <i>Qualitative Data Collection Process</i>	44
3.8.5 <i>Presentation and Analysis of Qualitative Data</i>	45
3.8.6 <i>Ethical Considerations</i>	46
4. Empirical Study	49
4.1 Motivation and Engagement	49
4.2 Intrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement	51
4.2.1 <i>Relationships with Coworkers</i>	51
4.2.2 <i>Relationships with Managers</i>	52
4.2.3 <i>Employee Well-Being</i>	54
4.3 Extrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement.....	55
4.3.1 <i>Work Environment</i>	55
4.3.2 <i>Training and Career Development</i>	57
4.3.3 <i>Compensation</i>	59

4.3.4 <i>Organizational Policies</i>	60
5. Analysis and Discussion	62
5.1 Thematic Network	62
5.2 Intrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement.....	63
5.2.1 <i>Relationships with Coworkers and Relationships with Managers</i>	63
5.2.2 <i>Employee Well-Being</i>	65
5.3 Extrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement.....	67
5.3.1 <i>Work Environment</i>	67
5.3.2 <i>Training and Career Development</i>	68
5.3.3 <i>Compensation</i>	70
5.3.4 <i>Organizational Policies</i>	72
5.4 Key Findings.....	73
6. Conclusion	76
6.1 General Conclusion.....	76
6.2 Theoretical Contributions	77
6.3 Managerial Implications	78
6.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research	79
7. Truth Criteria	81
Reference List	83
Appendix	89
Appendix 1. Interview Guide.....	89

List of Tables

Table 1. Overview of the motivational factors	32
Table 2. Overview of interviews	44
Table 3. Thematic network.....	62
Table 4. Key findings, corresponding to the basic themes of the thematic network.....	73

1. Introduction

In the introductory chapter we aim to introduce and discuss the research topic of this thesis, how managers in private and public sector organizations perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement. Starting with the problem background we will then move on to define and discuss the key topics of the study, motivation and employee engagement. We will outline previous research on the topic and the existing research gap, leading up to our formulated research question and conclude the chapter with our purpose of this study.

1.1 Problem Background

Motivation at work has grown to become one of the central issues that organizations and managers are facing worldwide (Amabile, 1993). Psychologists and behavioral scientists have since the early 20th century been drawn to and interested by the relationship between people and their work, and today the study of motivation at work forms an integral part of vocational and industrial psychology (Wiley, 1995, p. 263). Further, research has shown that the quality of performance can be different when an employee is intrinsically motivated and when an employee is extrinsically motivated (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55), making it an important distinction within work motivation.

Beyond motivation, to achieve success in today's highly competitive environment many organizations have identified the need to engage their workforce. As organizations have realized this requirement, employee engagement has become an increasingly popular topic for researchers and practitioners in recent years (Saks, 2006; Christian et al., 2011; Smith & Macko, 2014; Sinha & Trivedi, 2014). Current studies have demonstrated the positive effects that employee engagement has on the performance of organizations, including aspects such as retention rates, customer satisfaction, profitability, productivity, and overall successful organizational performance (Smith & Macko, 2014; Harter et al., 2002; Paradise, 2008; Wellins et al., 2005). Simultaneously, there have been findings suggesting that employee engagement is declining and ultimately the global workforce is not engaged (Towers Perrin, 2008; Crabtree, 2013; Paradise, 2008).

It has been suggested that a relationship between motivation and employee engagement exists, and, for example that the development of motivational schemes including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors can improve employee engagement within an organization (Silvera, 2013). Whereas there have been studies researching the concepts of employee engagement and motivation separately, the relationship between motivation and employee engagement has not been researched extensively (Putra et al., 2015, p. 2). Many of the studies that have been conducted have been executed by large HR consultancy firms, surveying tens of thousands of employees worldwide with a focus on determining the major drivers behind employee engagement, and currently relatively little empirical material exists (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Robinson et al., 2004).

In these studies the findings have often suggested that managers play a crucial part in the engagement of their employees, and that the relationship between manager and employee can act as one of the major drivers behind it (Towers Perrin, 2008; Scott & McMullen, 2010; Society for Human Resource Management, 2013). The way that managers perceive the influence of different motivational factors and subsequently how they choose to motivate their employees is thus of importance to the employees'

engagement, and ultimately the performance of the organization. In order to develop an understanding of how managers perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement we made the decision to focus on managers in Sweden, as it has been suggested that geography may also influence what engages employees (Towers Perrin, 2008, p. 21-27). Further, while previous research has shown that benefits of engaged employees are generalizable across industries and sectors (Harter et al., 2002) and managers of every kind of company thus should strive to attain employee engagement, there has been a suggested difference in employee motivation between private and public sector employees (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998, Houston, 2000). Therefore, we are including managers from both public and the private sector organizations in our study, in order to explore whether this suggested difference in what motivates and subsequently engages their employees are reflected in their perceptions.

Our study is relevant since research has shown that employee engagement is highly beneficial for organizations (Smith & Macko, 2014; Harter et al., 2002; Paradise, 2008). The previous research that has been conducted on the relationship between motivation and engagement has taken on the perspective of the employees and the factors that act as the major drivers behind their engagement in the workplace. By conducting the study from the perspective of managers, we are putting a new spin on previous research and exploring the relationship from a different point of view. The results of this study can thus advance prior research, exploring whether the perceptions of managers in private and public sector organizations are in line with what employees in existing literature have claimed to engage them at work. In addition, the findings of this study can aid managers in different sectors and provide them with further insight into the importance of the managerial role in employee engagement, as well as guide them in future attempts to enhance employee engagement in their organizations.

1.2 Theoretical Background

Motivation of employees has always been an issue of importance to leaders and managers in organizations (Amabile, 1993, p. 185). Throughout the years, motivation has been defined in many different ways and a myriad of definitions have emerged (George & Jones, 2012, p. 156). Ultimately, motivation refers to when a person is *moved* to do something (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 54). According to Ryan and Deci (2000, p. 54) a person is motivated if he or she feels energized and activated towards something, whereas an unmotivated individual would feel a lack of inspiration and impetus. This definition is a general definition of motivation that can be applied to a lot of different situations, but for this thesis we will specifically look at motivation in the workplace and therefore it is of importance to look at the concept of work motivation.

George and Jones (2012, p. 157) define work motivation as “the psychological forces that determine the direction of a person’s behavior in an organization, a person’s level of effort, and a person’s level of persistence in the face of obstacles”. Amabile (1993, p. 185) states that an unmotivated employee is likely to put little effort into work tasks, produce work of lower quality, avoid the workplace, and even exit his or her job if given the opportunity to do so. On the other hand, motivated employees are likely to willingly take on tasks, produce work of high quality, and be creative, persistent, and productive (Amabile, 1993, p. 186). Whereas motivation is sometimes simplified and referred to as a unitary phenomenon that varies only in amounts or levels, it is clear that

employees not only have different levels of motivation but also different kinds (Amabile, 1993; Ryan & Deci, 2000).

Motivation can thus be further dissected by distinguishing between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. The general distinction made between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation is that while intrinsic motivation is driven by forces from within oneself, extrinsic motivation is driven by outside forces (Giancola, 2014, p. 25). In connection to the work environment an employee would be intrinsically motivated by performing a task depending on the extent that the particular task is “interesting, challenging, and has personal meaning based on the satisfaction they receive from performing the activity itself” (Giancola, 2014, p. 25). Amabile (1993) bases her definition of an intrinsically motivated employee on an individual’s perception of a task and the reasons he or she is performing it, and she states “individuals are intrinsically motivated when they seek enjoyment, interest, satisfaction of curiosity, self-expression, or personal challenge in the work” (Amabile, 1993, p. 188). Further, George and Jones (2012, p. 159) mention that employees who are intrinsically motivated state that their work gives them a sense of satisfaction, accomplishment, and achievement.

Extrinsic motivation on the other hand is not linked to the satisfaction the employee gets from performing the task itself, but rather from the external outcomes of the task such as financial rewards or incentives (Giancola, 2014, p. 26). According to George and Jones (2012, p. 146) extrinsically motivated employees are motivated when they get positive appraisal or reinforcers provided by other people, and they are often motivated by factors like their salary at the end of the month or a bonus, raise, or promotion. Similarly, Amabile (1993, p. 188) defines an extrinsically motivated employee as “an individual is extrinsically motivated when they engage in the work in order to obtain some goal that is apart from the work itself”. Another characteristic of extrinsically motivated employees is that they may perform their work in order to avoid punishment, thus the work that they are doing is not being done for the sake of the work but for the sake of its immediate consequences; implying that these consequences can be used to generate extrinsically motivated behavior in employees (George & Jones, 2012, p. 159). Another important aspect of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation it is that they are not mutually exclusive; employees can be intrinsically motivated, extrinsically motivated, or both intrinsically and extrinsically motivated at the same time (Digman, 1990: cited in George & Jones, 2012, p. 159).

In comparison to motivation, the concept of employee engagement is a relatively new one in research, and researchers are not in complete agreement of what the concept entails or how it should be defined (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 3; Saks, 2006, p. 600). Kahn (1990, p. 694) first conceptualized the term of employee engagement and defined it as “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances”. In contrast, he defines being disengaged at work as “the uncoupling of selves from work roles; in disengagement, people withdraw and defend themselves physically, cognitively, or emotionally during role performances” (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). In other words, according to the definitions given by Kahn (1990) employee engagement means being psychologically present when taking on a specific role at work and performing the related work tasks (Saks, 2006, p. 601). This is the definition of employee engagement we will use in this study, but it is useful to review

other definitions to gain a better understanding of what researchers consider employee engagement to be.

Further building on the psychological aspect of employee engagement, there are researchers that define employee engagement by distinguishing it from closely related concepts within organizational behavior such as job involvement and organizational commitment. May et al. (2004, p. 12) argue that compared to job involvement employee engagement relates more to how individuals employ themselves when performing a task at work, and similarly to the definition given by Kahn (1990) engaged employees will actively make use of emotions, behaviors, and cognitions. In contrast, job involvement is more concerned with one's personal psychological *identification* with the job. The concepts are however related and engagement can be thought of as an antecedent to job involvement; employees who are highly engaged in their jobs can come to feel as though the job situation is central to them and to his or her identity (May et al., 2004, p. 12).

Robinson et al. (2004) distinguished the concept of employee engagement from organizational commitment and organizational citizenship behavior, two related constructs within organizational behavior. In short, while there are different kinds of organizational commitment the general term is related to an employee's emotional attachment to the organization they work for, as well as their attitude towards it (Robinson et al., 2004, p. 30). Organizational citizenship behavior revolves around voluntary and informal behavior towards an organization, such as promoting it to the outside world or taking on extra roles (Robinson et al., 2004, p. 43). Engagement is not an attitude; it is the absorption in performance of a role and task. This role refers to the formal role within the organization and does not focus on informal or voluntary behaviors and roles (Saks, 2006, p. 602).

Moving from this psychology based definition, practitioners have commonly adopted more general definitions of employee engagement that overlaps with other constructs within organizational behavior, such as the previously mentioned job involvement and organizational commitment (Saks, 2006, p. 602). The HR consultancy firm Towers Perrin defines employee engagement as "an employee's willingness and ability to contribute to company success. Put another way, engagement is the extent to which employees 'go the extra mile' and put discretionary effort into their work - contributing more of their energy, creativity, and passion to the job" (Towers Perrin, 2008, p. 3). Similarly, the Institute for Employment Studies (IES) that specializes in HR research and consultancy questioned a number of HR professionals on their understanding of the term engagement. The study resulted in a list of behaviors the professionals expected an engaged employee to demonstrate, and ultimately they believed that employee engagement is a two-way relationship; an organization must put effort into engaging employees, and the employees in turn decide on the level of engagement which they offer the organization, working with colleagues to improve job performance for the benefit of the organization (Robinson et al., 2004, p. ix).

No matter of the definition used for employee engagement, the ultimate outcome of an engaged workforce is the contribution to successful organizational performance (Smith & Macko, 2014; Harter et al., 2002; Paradise, 2008; Wellins et al., 2005). There are numerous studies that have demonstrated the importance of employee engagement on

the successful performance of the organization, with one of the most influential studies being one conducted by Harter et al. (2002). Basing their study on nearly 8 000 business units ranging across 36 companies from various sectors they could conclude that employee engagement is highly relevant to successful business outcomes, including customer satisfaction, profitability, productivity, and turnover rates (Harter et al., 2002, p. 275). Additionally, from the findings of their study the researchers could also conclude that these meaningful results are generalizable across companies, i.e. they are applicable to all companies no matter in what industry or sector they operate (Harter et al., 2002, p. 276).

There is an apparent connection between the concepts of employee engagement and motivation (Bhuvanaiah & Raya, 2015, p. 94; Silvera, 2013). However, the relationship between employee engagement and motivation (including both intrinsic and extrinsic motivation) is not an extensively researched area, and the existing research has primarily been conducted by large HR consultancy firms (Giancola, 2014; Saks, 2006). In their 2007-2008 Global Workforce Study Towers Perrin, an HR consultancy firm, conducted an extensive survey that included close to 90 000 employees ranging over several different industries and countries to identify the major drivers of engagement, retention, as well as attraction (Towers Perrin, 2008). The top drivers of employee engagement were of both intrinsic and extrinsic nature, including career advancement opportunities but also enjoying challenging work assignments. In addition, the top drivers often related to the way management acts, such as their interest in employee well-being, how they act to ensure the success of the organization, and their communication with their employees (Towers Perrin, 2008).

Similarly, Sibson Consulting conducted a study measuring the top drivers of employee engagement in the US, basing their study on approximately 2000 employees across various industries (Sibson Consulting, 2010). The findings suggested that measures that relate to affiliation, such as organizational support, organizational reputation, and trust in management has the highest correlation with engagement, followed by work content factors including job responsibility, supervisor concern, and feedback from the job (Sibson Consulting, 2010, p. 4). Scott and McMullen (2010) studied the impact of reward programs on employee engagement for the HR consultancy firm WorldatWork. Including small and large companies from around the world, the findings of the study suggested that financial rewards including base pay and benefits had the weakest relationship with employee engagement, and that quality leadership and intangible rewards were of higher importance to employees and their engagement (Scott & McMullen, 2010, p. 9). The Society for Human Resource Management (SHRM) is the world's largest HRM association, and in their 2013 annual employee survey they aimed to identify the top factors that influence employee engagement. The main findings of the survey was that employees find intrinsic drivers such as the work itself and their contribution to the organization's goal to be the most important, and also among the top five drivers were the relationships with both coworkers and supervisors (Society for Human Resource Management, 2013, p. 5).

Robinson et al. (2004) working for an HR consultancy and research institute conducted a study on the drivers of employee engagement under the categories of motivation, well-being, and retention. With regards to previous studies they developed a number of engagement statements which they then tested on over 10 000 employees (Robinson et

al., 2004, p. 14). The results of the study showed that while employees experience that both extrinsic and intrinsic motivational factors play a part in their engagement, intrinsic factors such as feeling valued and involved in their work is more important than any extrinsic reward. The study also showed that intrinsic and extrinsic factors can be related to an extent, for example that performance appraisals can contribute to an employee's inner satisfaction and feeling valued at work (Robinson et al., 2004, p. 20-21). Additionally, the study showed that the manager plays a vital part in the engagement of their employees and that work engagement is of a two-way nature; managers must nurture and maintain the engagement of their employees. While these studies are just a few of the many survey based studies that have been conducted by large HR consultancy and research firms, most of the studies show very similar results; factors relating to intrinsic motivation are generally of higher importance to employee engagement (according to employees), and it is also evident that management plays a highly important role in the engagement of employees.

Assuming managers has an interest in the success of their organization they will act accordingly to how they believe this motive can be achieved. As is visible from many of the surveys conducted by HR firms (Robinson et al., 2004; Scott & McMullen, 2010; Towers Perrin, 2008) managers have great influence over the engagement of their employees. Managers are commonly the ones to give formal rewards such as pay raises and performance appraisals, but also provide employees with intrinsic motivation such as challenging and varying work tasks. Previous studies connecting management and employee engagement has had its focus on strategies and approaches to performance management, and as observed by Jenkins and Delbridge (2013, p. 2672) current literature is about the capability of managers to deliver engaged employees with the ultimate goal of organizational benefit.

While Harter et al. (2002, p. 276) concluded that business performance outcomes as a consequence of employee engagement ultimately is not contingent on within what sector or industry the organization operates, there have been findings suggesting that the sector within which an employee works affects what motivates them (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998, Houston, 2000). Buelens & Van den Broeck (2007) studied the motivation of employees within the private and public sectors, and the findings of the study suggested that employees within the public sector are more intrinsically motivated compared to employees in the private sector. Similarly, Jurkiewicz et al. (1998) compared motivational factors in the private and public sector, concluding that there are certain differences; employees within the private sector value extrinsic rewards such as salary higher than those employed in the public sector, who generally value more intrinsic rewards such as stability and security in their job (Jurkiewicz et al., 1998, p. 242). Again, this aspect of motivation is something that has been previously researched by surveying employees. By interviewing managers from both sectors in our study we aim to explore whether the perceptions of managers support these previous findings, and develop a deeper understanding of the issue.

Current research that connects the concepts of employee engagement and motivation has predominantly been done from the perspective of the employee, aiming to identify the drivers that employees value the most in their engagement. We can also see that managers clearly play a large role in the engagement of their employees, and a significant amount of employees mention management and work relationships as one of

the main drivers behind their engagement at work (Towers Perrin, 2008; Scott & McMullen, 2010; Society for Human Resource Management, 2013). Therefore, in order to advance prior research, it should be explored how managers perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement. This study gives insight into how managers within the public and private sectors perceive their own abilities to influence employees' engagement through extrinsic and intrinsic motivational factors, and will complement the existing literature in this field which is largely based on the employee perspective. Additionally, the studies that have been conducted have been of quantitative nature, surveying employees of organizations to uncover the drivers behind engagement. This study aims to provide more in-depth information and develop a deeper understanding of managers' perceptions and following actions, and whether or not they are in line with what employees have claimed to engage them, which leads us to our formulated research question.

1.3 Research Question

How do managers in private and public sector organizations perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement?

1.4 Purpose

The purpose of this thesis is to develop a deeper understanding of how managers perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement. In addition, we aim to explore whether managers in private and public sector organizations perceive these influences differently, as previous research has suggested that employees in the two sectors differ in what motivates them. The study will be conducted in Sweden and will include managers from different industries within both the public and private sectors in order to develop an understanding of managers' perceptions and simultaneously explore whether there is a difference in perceptions between the two. The results of this study can contribute with empirical evidence and advance the research that exists today, as current research regarding this topic has a focus on how employees feel about what factors drive their engagement. Further, by conducting a qualitative study in a field that is largely dominated by quantitative data, we aim to gather more in-depth information that can extend current research and contribute to developing a better understanding of the perceptions of managers in private and public sector organizations regarding our chosen topic.

2. Theoretical Framework

In this chapter we will review and present previous literature on the key concepts of this study. We will introduce the concepts and the theories that are relevant to our research, starting with motivation and then moving on to employee engagement. We will then finish the chapter by connecting the concepts of motivation and employee engagement.

2.1 Motivation

2.1.1 The Concept of Motivation

Motivation refers to the reasons underlying behavior (Parashar, 2016, p. 8). According to Rokeach (1973) motivation is one of the most important factors for understanding and managing organizational behavior, because it explains why employees behave or act in a particular way (Rokeach, 1973: cited in George & Jones, 2012, p. 156). Motivation is the energy that moves employees forward towards performing a certain action; motivation will strengthen the willingness of employees to work, and in turn it will increase the organization's effectiveness and competence (Parashar, 2016, p. 8). When looking at motivation, managers want to assure that the direction of their employees' behaviors goes hand in hand with the organization, meaning that they come to work on time, are independent when performing their tasks, are innovative and come up with creative ideas, as well as help others in the organization (George & Jones, 2012, p. 157). Employees that are motivated are more ambitious, innovative, creative, and are more persistent to achieve desired goals, which in turn implies that a motivated workforce will work more efficiently (Parashar, 2016, p. 8).

As mentioned previously, many definitions of motivation have been formulated throughout the years. The definition we will use in this study is the one provided by George and Jones (2012, p. 157), who define work motivation as "the psychological forces that determine the direction of a person's behavior in an organization, a person's level of effort, and a person's level of persistence in the face of obstacles". Wiley (1995, p. 263) writes about work motivation as "motivation that is inferred from a systematic analysis of how personal, task, and environmental characteristics influence behavior and performance". All in all, work motivation defines a process where employees are stimulated in an organization to achieve organizational goals (Parashar, 2016, p. 9). Since motivation is arguably one of the major problems facing many organizations (Amabile, 2001, p. 185), it is an important aspect in order to attract and retain employees inside organizations, acting as the connection between individuals and the organizational objectives, leading employees to be creative and innovative and go beyond limitations of a job (Parashar, 2016, p. 9).

Motivation and performance are sometimes used interchangeably. This is a consequence of motivation explaining what employees do, and how hard and far they are willing to go to do something, and therefore it is commonly confused with an employee's job performance (George & Jones, 2012, p. 158). Because of this, we are going to give a brief description of performance and the difference between job performance and motivation. George and Jones (2012, p. 158) state that performance is the evaluation of the results of an employee's behavior, by evaluating how well or poorly an employee has performed a task or job, whereas motivation is a factor that contributes to performance. Cerasoli et al. (2014, p. 980) further state that motivation is a basic component of any credible model of human performance. However, because motivation

is only one of several factors that affect employee performance, a high level of motivation does not necessarily imply a high level of performance and vice versa (George & Jones, 2012, p. 159). Often the ability to perform the imminent job or task also plays a part in determining performance levels (George & Jones, 2012, p. 159). Occasionally it may also be the case that employees are not motivated to perform at high levels because they do not believe that performing at a higher level will generate desired outcomes, which in turn leads to that when employees think high performance goes unrecognized, their motivation to perform at that level tends to be low (George & Jones, 2012, p. 166).

2.1.2 Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivation

Two broad classes of motivation, extrinsic and intrinsic motivation, have been defined and researched across a range of contexts throughout the years (Lin, 2007; Amabile, 1993; Ryan & Deci, 2000). Motivation is defined in these two ways for practical purposes, guiding the direction, the intensity, and the persistence of performance behaviors (Cerasoli et al., 2014, p. 980). One of the basic distinctions that can be made between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation is that while extrinsic motivation is driven by forces that are external to an individual, intrinsic motivation is driven by forces that are internal and within that individual (Giancola, 2014, p. 25). Further, extrinsic motivation is defined as mainly focusing on factors that are goal driven, such as the rewards and benefits of performing a certain task, whereas intrinsic motivation is usually referred to as meaning the pleasure and satisfaction that an employee gets when performing an activity (Lin, 2007, p. 137). Generally speaking, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation influence employee intentions regarding activities and behaviors (Lin, 2007, p. 137). Even though a number of theories have been proposed to explain individual motivation to perform work related tasks (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012, p. 169), little is known about the underlying factors influencing intrinsic and extrinsic motivation (Lin, 2007, p. 136).

Intrinsic motivation is defined as the performance of an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable outcome, reflecting the natural disposition in humans to assimilate and learn (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 54-56). It refers to when employees engage in an activity out of interest, for the sake of the activity, and for the satisfaction that the experience of engaging in that activity will bring to them (Lin, 2007, p. 137). Behaviors that are intrinsically motivated are thus engaged in for their own sake, and not for any other outcome (Cerasoli et al., 2014, p. 980). Prior research have indicated that increased intrinsic motivation can be related to employee willingness to create a positive mood, in turn leading to increased learning and knowledge sharing (Lin, 2007, p. 136). Employees are intrinsically motivated for some activities and not for others, and it has been observed that not everyone is motivated by the same activities (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 56). Many researchers and theories confirm that intrinsic motivators can be more effective than extrinsic ones in motivating employees (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012, p. 169; Giancola, 2014, p. 25). Some previous research that has suggested that intrinsic rewards are superior to extrinsic ones has done so with the reasoning that employees perceive them as a more certain outcome of performing a task than extrinsic outcomes (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012, p. 171).

Because intrinsic motivation exists in the connection between an employee and a task, some researchers have defined intrinsic motivation in terms of the task that is performed by the employee, while others have defined intrinsic motivation in terms of the

satisfaction an employee gains from performing the task (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 56). An example of intrinsic motivation is how self-fulfilled an employee feels as a result of performing a task well (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012, p. 169). Renko et al. (2012, p. 681) write that an employee who looks to learn and grow as a person while working, due to the work itself, is motivated by intrinsic rewards. Research on altruism has showed that people enjoy helping others, and that intrinsic motivators play an important role in explaining human behavior (Lin, 2007, p. 137). Cerasoli et al. (2014, p. 984) further state that when extrinsic motives are weak or absent, intrinsic motivation will become the only functional driver of performance. It has also been suggested that an efficient staff can be obtained by recruiting proactive employees, with high self-esteem and that are intrinsically motivated (Lin, 2007, p. 145).

In contrast to intrinsic motivation, extrinsic motivation on the other hand pertains whenever an activity is performed in order to obtain some separable outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). There are varied types of extrinsic motivation, some represent active states in employees while others represent impoverished forms of motivation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 55). Extrinsic motivation can vary depending on how autonomous it is; an employee may perform a task because of fear of being punished or fired, or the employee can perform an activity because this activity will lead to a promotion, bonus, or raise in the future (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). Both activities include external instrumentalities but vary in autonomy; the first one involves more of an obligation to an external control, whereas the second one also involves personal endorsement and the employee's choice (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). From the perspective of extrinsic motivation, employee behavior is driven by the perceived benefits of the action that he or she will perform, or the anticipation of instrumental gain or loss (Lin, 2007, p. 139; Cerasoli et al., 2014, p. 980). However, it has also been argued that extrinsic motivation varies considerably and can reflect external control or true self-regulation (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 54).

The main goal of behaviors from employees who are extrinsically motivated is thus to receive organizational rewards or benefits from the achievement of an organizational goal or task (Lin, 2007, p. 139). Extrinsic outcomes are the rewards that are distributed by some external agent in the organization, where an example could be the monetary reward that an employee receives for putting in extra effort at work, job security, and promotions (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012, p. 169; Lin, 2007, p. 139). This implies that organizational rewards are useful for employees who are extrinsically motivated in order for them to perform desired behaviors (Lin, 2007, p. 139). However, previous research has suggested that extrinsic rewards only secure temporary compliance (Lin, 2007, p. 145). Further, research has also suggested that when both intrinsic motivation and extrinsic rewards exist, the reason for the employee to engage in a certain activity will be over-justified and in this situation the extrinsic rewards are likely to replace the intrinsic motivation as the main purpose for engaging in the activity, because the extrinsic rewards will be the more salient of the two motivators (Urduan, 2003, p. 313).

In our study we are including managers from both public and private sector organizations, thus exploring how managers within both sectors perceive the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors on employee engagement. Therefore, it is also necessary to consider what previous research has indicated regarding differences in motivation in the private and public sector. Much of the literature conducted on the

topic of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and how it differs in the private and public sectors has suggested that extrinsic motivation is valued higher by employees in the private sector than those in the public sector, and motivational factors of intrinsic nature are valued higher by employees in the public sector than those in the private sector (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Houston, 2000).

Research has suggested that privately employed individuals are motivated by advancement opportunities, autonomy, high monetary rewards, and status, and are less concerned with the importance and contribution with their work (Jurkiewicz et al., 1998, p. 231). For public employees on the other hand, research has suggested that motivation is mainly found in job stability, job security, teamwork, and their contribution to society (Jurkiewicz et al., 1998, p. 231). In the comparative study conducted by Jurkiewicz et al. (1998) on what motivates public and private sector employees some of the proposed differences were supported and some were challenged. While it was found that monetary rewards were of higher importance in the motivation of private sector employees, and that job security was of higher importance in the motivation of public sector employees, it was also found that employees equally valued the desire for teamwork, contribution to society, and advancement opportunities (Jurkiewicz et al., 1998, p. 244).

Buelens and Van den Broeck (2007) conducted their research from a similar framework of previous research; private sector employees value extrinsic rewards higher, and public sector employees value intrinsic rewards higher in the light of motivation. The results of this study also confirmed some of previous research but contradicted other; while it was clear that private sector employees were motivated by monetary rewards to a greater degree, it was also showed that private sector employees valued the intrinsic motivational variables more than the public sector employees contrary to what was hypothesized in the study (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007, p. 67). Thus, some researchers have argued that the differences that exist between private and public sector employees in their motivation have been exaggerated by researchers (Gabris & Simo, 1995; cited in Houston, 2000, p. 717).

Houston (2000, p. 713-714) in his study explains the phenomenon of public-service motivation, that individuals who are employed in the public sector are motivated by a sense of public service that is not found among privately employed individuals; an ethic that values intrinsic motivation over extrinsic motivation. With this Houston (2000, p. 714) argues that the concept of public-service motivation exists, and that employees within this sector are motivated by a general concern for the community and a desire to contribute to the public interest; portraying the public sector itself as a sense of duty or a calling rather than a job for these employees. While the findings of his study supported that private sector employees value monetary rewards more than those working in the public sector, and that public employees value shorter working hours to a greater extent as hypothesized, the findings also showed that public and private employees had similar attitudes concerning job security, chances of promotion, and meaningfulness of the work (Houston, 2000, p. 720).

In conclusion, previous research has suggested that there are some differences in what motivates employees that are employed by the private sector and those that are employed by the public sector. This is an important consideration as we are including

managers from both public and private sector organizations, with the result that they might perceive the influence of certain motivational factors differently.

2.1.3 Need Theory

Since work motivation has become increasingly relevant over the years, many theories have been developed in order to explain and define it. These theories provide answers by explaining why employees behave in certain ways in given organizations (George & Jones, 2012, p. 160). Some of the older and more fundamental theories of motivation are Maslow's hierarchy of needs and Alderfer's ERG theory; two theories based on the idea of need theory which will be explained in this section in order to understand the basis on which many of the more recent theories are constructed.

Much of the research conducted on motivation has had its focus on need theories, because these theories represent a relatively simple way of understanding motivation (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 697). The basic suggestion of need theory is that what motivates employees to increase their performance at work are their individual desires to satisfy certain needs, and thus identifying what these employee needs are and how they may be satisfied can provide an understanding as to how work related behaviors can increase performance at work (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 697). George and Jones (2012, p. 160) portrays need theory as a flowchart that involves three factors: inputs, performance, and outcomes, where inputs lead to performance and performance leads to outcomes. Inputs involve factors such as effort, time, education, experience, skills, knowledge and job behavior, performance involves quantity and quality of work and level of customer service, and outcomes involve pay, job security, benefits, vacation, job satisfaction, feeling of accomplishment, and pleasure of doing interesting work (George & Jones, 2012, p. 160). Thus, the main focus of need theory is that employees have needs that motivate them to work in order for them to satisfy these needs, and the organization or managers must identify these needs to gain insight as to what need each employee is striving to satisfy and further control the outcomes that satisfy these needs (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 697). As mentioned, two of the most well-known need based theories are Maslow's hierarchy of needs, and Alderfer's ERG theory (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 697).

Maslow considered the man to be a "wanting animal" (Parashar, 2016, p. 9). In his well-known study of motivation he proposed that human beings have five needs that they always seek to satisfy: physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness needs, esteem needs and self actualization needs (Maslow, 1943). He also stated that these needs can be arranged in a hierarchy of importance with the most basic needs at the base, meaning that these needs must be satisfied before any other need with a higher ranking can be satisfied (Maslow, 1943, p. 375). Another important detail of the hierarchy is that once a need is satisfied, it will no longer be a source of motivation, and as one need is significantly gratified, the next order need becomes dominant (Maslow, 1943, p. 375). This implies that unsatisfied needs are the primary source of motivation and, as already mentioned, needs on a low level of the hierarchy have to be satisfied before the needs of the higher levels of the hierarchy (Maslow, 1943, p. 375). Maslow's hierarchy of needs is frequently related to the workplace, where it explains that at a certain point in time only one need will motivate an employee, and it is not possible for an employee to skip levels of the hierarchy (George & Jones, 2012, p. 162). This means that once an employee satisfies a set of needs he or she will then work to satisfy the next level of

needs of the hierarchy, making this level the new focus of employee motivation (George & Jones, 2012, p. 162).

As mentioned, Maslow's hierarchy of needs includes the following needs from the lowest-level needs, which are the most basic, to the highest level needs; physiological needs, safety needs, belongingness needs, esteem needs, and self-actualization needs (Maslow, 1943). Physiological needs are explained as the starting point of motivation, and are needs that every individual has, such as food, water, and shelter, and should be satisfied in order for any individual to survive (Maslow, 1943, p. 372). Linked to the workplace, these needs can be satisfied by receiving sufficient pay to provide oneself with the basic life necessities. Safety needs are described as the needs an individual has for security, stability, and a safe environment, which in the context of the work environment can translate to job security, medical benefits, and safe working conditions and equipment (George & Jones, 2012, p. 161).

Belongingness needs are the social needs of an individual. These needs include social interactions, friendship, affection and love, which in a work context can be translated to having good relations with coworkers and supervisors, being a member of an efficient team, and being able to participate in social events like organization gatherings and holiday parties (George & Jones, 2012, p. 161). Esteem needs are personal needs. These needs include to feel good about oneself and one's capabilities, be respected by others, and receive recognition and appreciation; in the context of the workplace applying both to the individual employee and their work (George & Jones, 2012, p. 161). Esteem needs can be satisfied by receiving a job promotion and by being properly recognized and acknowledged for accomplishments at work (George & Jones, 2012, p. 161). The need in the highest level of the hierarchy is the self-actualization need, defined by Maslow (1943, p. 382) as "the desire for self-fulfillment, namely, to the tendency for him to become actualized in what he is potentially". This need thus refers to being able to realize one's full potential as a human, and is in the workplace usually satisfied by an employee being able to use his or her skills and abilities to the fullest potential, and striving to achieve all that he or she can achieve on a job (George & Jones, 2012, p. 161).

Alderfer's ERG theory is another theory of motivation that is based on needs, a theory that builds on Maslow's hierarchy of needs but aligns the needs hierarchy with empirical research to address its shortcomings (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698). Originally called existence-relatedness-growth theory (ERG), the theory is a motivational construct concerned with understanding the factors that contribute to individual human behavior and may be used to explain and/or predict issues related to the workplace, relationship paradigms, and choices in personal development (Caulton, 2012, p. 2). Alderfer's theory is thus to some extent based on Maslow's hierarchy of needs, but suggests that a man is motivated by three main groups of needs; as is suggested by the name of the theory these groups are, from lowest level needs to highest level needs, existence, relatedness, and growth (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698).

Existence needs represent the basic human needs that are necessary for existence, the physiological and safety needs that Maslow used in his hierarchy such as food, water, shelter, and a safe environment (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698). The relatedness needs explain individuals' needs to create and maintain interpersonal relationships that

are important to them, desires relating to a person's social, status, acceptance, and belongingness needs. The last group of needs is the growth needs, referring to an individual's desire for self-actualization, self-fulfillment, and personal development (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698). Again, these categories of needs can be linked to the workplace in a similar fashion as was explained when introducing the needs in Maslow's hierarchy. However, one of the argued shortcomings of Maslow's hierarchy is that the theory is a general one of human development and by addressing this, the ERG theory has been regarded as a more valid theory in work motivation (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698). The ERG theory has a focus that is job-specific in nature; in Alderfer's work, specific references are made to benefits, employees' relatedness needs to colleagues and superiors, and satisfaction at work (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698).

Another difference made by Alderfer in his theory is that a higher-level need can act as a motivator even if a lower level need is not completely satisfied, meaning that needs at different levels can act as simultaneous motivators (George & Jones, 2012, p. 162). The ERG theory thus enables an individual to seek fulfillment of higher level demands before lower level demands are satisfied, contrary to Maslow's hierarchy which suggests that if a lower level need is satisfied it will stop being a source of motivation, Alderfer proposes that when individuals desire to satisfy a high-level need but are not able to do so, their motivation to satisfy a lower-level need will increase (George & Jones, 2012, p. 162). It has also been suggested that the fulfillment of a need moderates importance and satisfaction, or in other words, the importance of a particular need is based on the manner of its fulfillment (Caulton, 2012, p. 2).

2.1.4 Expectancy theory

The expectancy theory, in contrary to need theory, is a process related theory that focuses on different employee perceptions and thoughts and concerns how employees choose among alternative behaviors and levels of effort (Purvis et al., 2015, p. 4; George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). The theory puts particular focus on employees' personal assessments of the environment and actions as a consequence of their expectations (Purvis et al., 2015, p. 4). The theory proposes two fundamental issues; the first is that regardless of the different available outcomes, an employee will only be motivated to contribute his or her inputs to the organization if they believe that the result will achieve a particular level of performance (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). In other words, if employees do not believe that they are able to perform at a certain level, the motivation to perform the given task will not be there (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). The second issue is that employees will only be motivated to perform at a certain level, if performing at this level will lead to desired outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). Schedlitzki and Edwards (2014, p. 87) link the path-goal theory to the assumptions of the expectancy theory and state that employees are more likely to perform well if they are confident that they are capable of executing a task, that they will achieve the outcome that is expected and that they will receive the outcome that is most valued by them. The expectancy theory explains that an employee will only be motivated to contribute and put effort into a task when the outcome of the two key factors is positive (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). This implies that the more positive outcomes are perceived to be linked with a particular action, the more willing an employee will be to perform this particular action (Vroom, 1964; cited in Lin, 2007, p. 136).

Expectancy theory defines three main factors that determine the work motivation of an employee: valence, instrumentality, and expectancy (Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). The first factor, valence, refers to the value that a particular outcome has to an employee, and the desire to attain it (Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). An outcome is positively valent to an employee if they prefer attaining the particular outcome over not attaining it, whereas an employee would prefer to avoid an outcome that is negatively valent (Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). Vroom (1964; cited in Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3) defines valence as a function of an employee's needs, values, goals, and sources of motivation. According to Purvis et al. (2015, p. 4), valence can be described as the degree of personal attractiveness of the rewards that follow the achievement of some organizational goals. An important distinction made is that valence is not the satisfaction of an outcome, but rather the anticipated satisfaction of a future outcome, acting as a motivator toward future action in expectancy theory (Vroom, 1964; cited in Burns et al., 2015, p. 3932). Valence can thus be a positive or negative outcome, and it may also vary in magnitude and size (George & Jones, 2012, p. 164). The magnitude of the valence concerns how desirable or undesirable the outcome is for the employee, and as explained in need theory, employees will prefer and thus consider valent outcomes that satisfy their needs (George & Jones, 2012, p. 164). Issues related to valence can occur because some outcomes that are highly valent are not available to employees (George & Jones, 2012, p. 164).

Expectancy theory further proposes that outcomes should be linked to desired organizational behaviors or to levels of job performance (George & Jones, 2012, p. 165). This related to instrumentality, the second factor of expectancy theory, which is the employee's perception and belief that first level outcomes will lead to second level outcomes (Vroom, 1964; Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). Instrumentality can also be described as an employee's perception of the probability of performing successfully if they provide their effort, development, and implement creativity and innovation in their work (Purvis et al., 2015, p. 4). Like valence, instrumentality is thus oriented towards higher-order outcomes, and describes the degree to which a first level outcome will lead the way to a desired second level outcome (Burns et al., 2015, p. 3932; Parashar, 2016, p. 11). In other words, an employee will put high valence on performing at a high level when the employee believes that this high performance is instrumental in obtaining other rewarding outcomes (e.g. increase in wage), or if this high performance is instrumental in the avoidance of outcomes that the employee wants to avoid (Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). Just like with valence, instrumentality can be positive or negative, as well as vary in size and magnitude (George & Jones, 2012, p. 165). Instrumentality is likely to be low when an employee perceives that valued rewards follow all levels of performance (Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). Instrumentalities that are high, where the employee believes that with a certain level of performance the desired outcome will be obtained, are effective in motivating employees (George & Jones, 2012, p. 166).

Occasionally, despite that an employee perceives that a highly valent outcome will result directly from job performance, this employee can remain unmotivated to perform at high levels (George & Jones, 2012, p. 166). This is where the third factor of the expectancy theory, expectancy, needs to be considered. Expectancy may be defined as "the momentary belief concerning the likelihood that a particular act will be followed by a particular outcome" (Vroom, 1964; cited in Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). This belief is commonly rooted in the individual employee's past experiences, self efficacy,

and how difficult the performance standard or goal is perceived to be (Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3). Expectancy helps understand why motivation can be low even when different instrumentalities and valences are high, and is thus the perceived likelihood that an action, or personal effort, will lead to the intended outcome (Parashar, 2016, p. 11). Expectancy thus explains that employees will be motivated to perform at desired levels only if they believe that they are able to do so, meaning that if employees believe that they will perform at a high level when they work hard, their expectancy will be high (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). It does not matter how valent or high instrumentality other factors are, if the employee believes that he or she cannot perform at a certain level, he or she will not be motivated to do so (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). This goes into the previously mentioned subject of self efficacy, which explains that employees are not always certain that their efforts will result in a given level of performance (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167).

Understanding the three factors in expectancy theory; valence, instrumentality, and expectancy, provides an insight into the nature and cause of employee participation in pursuing desired organizational outcomes (Purvis et al., 2015, p. 4). Whereas the three perceptions can influence an employee's motivation individually, these perceptions can have a powerful effect on motivation if they are combined (Estes and Polnick, 2012, p. 3). Vroom (1964; cited in Estes & Polnick, 2012, p. 3) suggests that the three factors interact psychologically in the beliefs of an employee, which establishes a motivational force that ultimately impacts behavior. George and Jones (2012, p. 167) further mention that in order for an employee to be motivated to perform at a high level, three conditions should be met. The first condition is that valence must be high; employees must desire the outcomes that the organization has to offer (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). The second condition is that instrumentality must be high, meaning that the employee perceives that he or she must perform at a high level in order to obtain the outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). The third condition is that expectancy must be high, implying that employees have to think that trying hard and putting in the effort will lead to high level performance (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). Expectancy theory thus suggests that if only one of these three conditions is not met, motivation will not be there (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). In summary, employees must believe that performing certain behaviors at a high level will result in obtaining outcomes, positive instrumentality, he or she must also perceive that the desired outcomes will be received, positively valent outcomes, and that he or she can actually perform at high levels if he or she works hard and puts in the effort, which leads to high expectancy (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167).

2.1.5 Equity Theory

Equity theory is a compatible framework for understanding work motivation, and a widespread theory of distributive justice (Nasri & Charfeddine, 2012, p. 170). In its basic form, equity theory takes into consideration four components; the nature of inputs and outputs, the nature of the social comparison process, the conditions leading to equity and inequity, and the possible effects and responses to inequity (Pritchard, 1969, p. 176). Equity theory in a work environment is based on the assumption that an employee perceives the relationship between inputs and outcomes; where inputs represent all factors that an employee perceive to be of relevance for getting a return on personal investment, and outcomes represent the factors that are perceived as bringing value or utility as a return to the employee (Pritchard, 1969, p. 177). Inputs may be

factors such as effort and education, where the main point is that it is perceived by the employee as something that brings value to the organization (Pritchard, 1969, p. 177). Outcomes on the other hand may be of a financial nature or what the organization gives back to the employee. The input and output together form a ratio, where the inputs and outputs are weighed individually based on their perceived value to determine the final value of an employee's ratio (Pritchard, 1969, p. 177).

Unlike expectancy theory, the level of outcomes and inputs is not what is important in determining work motivation, but the way an employee perceives his or her outcome-input ratio compared to the ratio of another employee, or the referent (George & Jones, 2012, p. 168). This is what Pritchard (1969, p. 176-177) in his article referred to as the nature of the social comparison process, that employees consciously or unconsciously will compare their ratios to those of other employees. In other words, equity theory suggests that employees adopt a social assessment by comparing their work and subsequent rewards with those of related others (Parashar, 2016, p. 11). When developing the equity theory Adams defined the referent as another employee perceived similar to oneself, oneself but at a different point in time, or one's expectations (George & Jones, 2012, p. 168). However, the referent is not necessarily one individual but may also be composed out of a broader group of individuals that the employee perceived to be relevant for comparison (Pritchard, 1969, p. 177). The discernment of employees regarding the equality of their rewards in comparison to others will affect the individual level of motivation (Parashar, 2016, p. 11). Equity is thus of high importance when creating incentive schemes because if these are seen as unfair by the employees, it will affect the climate and the coordination and control will be weakened (Burton et al., 2015, p. 205). No matter what referent is chosen by a given employee, it is the employee's perception of the inputs and outcomes that the referent produces that are compared, not the actual inputs and outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 168). It is further suggested that employees will have an idea of what input levels will result in particular level of outcomes from observation of others or from past experience (George & Jones, 2012, p. 168).

According to equity theory, equity occurs when the outcome-input ratio of the employee is equal to the outcome-input ratio of the referent (Pritchard, 1969, p. 177). The comparison of the ratios determines if there is or is not an absence of equity and, because of this, equity can exist even if the referent receives more than the employee who is making the comparison (George & Jones, 2012, p. 168). This social comparison is the determination that employees will make as to whether or not their outcome is equitable to the referent's inputs and outcomes (Bell & Martin, 2012, p. 109). When employees perceive the outcome-input ratios of themselves and the referent to be similar or equal, they will be motivated to maintain or increase the inputs in order to receive more outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 168). In contrast, inequity occurs when the employee perceives that his or her outcome-input ratio is not equal to that of the referent (Pritchard, 1969, p. 177). The inequity in ratios can be seen in two main types; overpaid inequity or underpaid inequity (Greenberg, 1990, p. 400). The first type exists when an employee perceives that his or her outcome-input ratio is greater than that of the referent, resulting in that an employee might restrict his or her inputs to a level they believe is consistent with the outcomes they receive (Bell & Martin, 2012, p. 107). The latter exists when an employee that his or her outcome-input ratio is lower than the referent's ratio, which may cause anger in an employee and just like with

overpaid inequity, the underpaid employee is likely to adjust their inputs in order to change the perceived inequitable state (Greenberg, 1990, p. 400). According to equity theory, individuals are motivated to decrease any perceived inequity between themselves and the referent, as equal ratios are suggested to yield feelings of satisfaction (Greenberg, 1990, p. 400). The employee might in case of inequity meet with their supervisors to verbally negotiate a better deal, struggling to find a balance between the work they put in and the reward (Bell & Martin, 2012, p. 107).

2.1.6 Organizational Justice Theory

Related to equity theory is organizational justice, an employee's perceptions of the overall fairness in his or her organization, which is increasingly being recognized as a basic requirement for personal satisfaction in employees and overall functioning organizations (Greenberg, 1990, p. 399). Organizational justice theory can be described as a collection of different theories that focus on the nature, determinants, and the consequences of organizational justice (George & Jones, 2012, p. 170). There are four main forms of organizational justice; distributive justice, procedural justice, interpersonal justice, and informational justice (Colquitt, 2001, p. 389). Organizational justice theory proposes that employees will not be motivated to contribute with their inputs to an organization if they do not believe that the outcomes of doing so will be distributed fairly, or that managers will provide them treatment that is fair (George & Jones, 2012, p. 179). Employees determine the fairness of the treatment by how managers assess input levels, determine the level of performance achieved, and distribute the outcomes, and if any of these procedures or processes is perceived as unfair by the employee, his or her motivation will be negatively influenced (George & Jones, 2012, p. 170).

Distributive justice is the perceived fairness of the distribution of outcomes in an organization, the extent to which the allocation of outcomes are consistent with goals, and is an important contributor to more general perceptions of organizational justice (Colquitt, 2001, p. 389). It is the form of organizational justice that is related to equity theory, in that employees expect resources to be distributed according to contributions (Colquitt, 2001, p. 389). Interpersonal justice refers to the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment employees receive from decision makers, the managers, including expressions such as courtesy, respect, and timely feedback (Greenberg, 1990, p. 411). The informational justice concerns employee perceptions of the extent to which managers explain their decisions and the processes used to arrive at them to employees, including how managers explain to employees how they evaluate inputs, appraise performance, and subsequently distribute outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 173).

The last form of organizational justice is procedural justice, and it concerns the justice of the processes that lead to making the decision about the distribution of outcomes (Colquitt, 2001, p. 386). The decisions regarding procedural justice include how performance levels are evaluated by managers, how disputes and misunderstandings are managed, and how outcomes are distributed (George & Jones, 2012, p. 171). In procedural justice, employees' perceptions are very important, and their reactions to procedures depend on how fair they perceive the procedures to be rather than how fair they actually are (George & Jones, 2012, p. 171). Procedural justice explains that employees are going to be more motivated to perform at high levels when they perceive that the procedures used to make decisions about the distribution of outcomes are fair,

and they will be more motivated if they believe that their performance will be accurately evaluated (George & Jones, 2012, p. 171). High procedural justice will be perceived by employees when they have a say in the procedures used to distribute outcomes, when they feel able to express their personal views and opinions, when they perceive that procedures are used consistently across employees, and when procedures are not biased (George & Jones, 2012, p. 171-172).

Organizational justice can have a variety of consequences for organizations. A way to recognize the consequences of organizational justice is by considering the implications of procedural justice for the previously introduced expectancy theory and equity theory (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174). Expectancy theory, as mentioned before, explains how employees are motivated to work when they believe that their efforts will help them reach the level of performance required, and when they believe that their performance will lead to desired outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174). If an organization has issues with procedural justice, and employees believe that for example performance appraisal systems are biased, even if employees are aware of that they have the ability to perform at a high level (high expectancy), they will not be motivated to put in the effort because their performance will not be fairly and accurately assessed and they will not receive the deserved outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174). Just like with the expectancy and equity theories, motivation will suffer when employees perceive that procedural justice is low (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174). When this is the case, employees will not be motivated to contribute with their inputs because they do not have any guarantee that they will receive the outcomes they believe they deserve (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174). Research has suggested that perceptions of procedural justice are particularly important when outcomes have a tendency to be low, because employees will only view low outcome levels as equitable if the procedures used to distribute them are transparent and fair (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174). On the other hand, when outcomes are high, employees tend to view them as fair even if the procedures to attain these outcomes are not fair or transparent (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174).

2.1.7 Criticism of the theories

The need theories by Maslow and Alderfer were the first theories to be introduced about work motivation, which is why these theories have gained popularity and received a large amount of attention from researchers (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). Despite their popularity, they have not been exempt from criticism throughout the years as some researchers believe that it is unreasonable to describe all humans with a short set of needs, and even more unrealistic to expect that all people will be motivated following the order of needs as arranged by the need theories (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163).

Due to the important implications expectancy theory provides for organizations, it has also grown to be one of the most popular theories regarding work motivation (George & Jones, 2012, p. 164). As mentioned previously, expectancy theory assumes that employees seek pleasure, meaning that they are motivated to receive positive outcomes and try to avoid negative ones. The theory suggests that employees are rational and use the information they have about their jobs, abilities, and desires to decide what they will do on the job and how hard they will work (George & Jones, 2012, p. 164). Expectancy theory has also received attention from researchers, and even though some studies do not support the theory, expectancy theory has been largely supported (George & Jones,

2012, p. 167). Equity theory is another theory that has received extensive research attention, and similar to expectancy theory, most of the research supports the key ideas of the theory (George & Jones, 2012, p. 170).

Having reviewed the relevant literature and theories of work motivation, we now move on to introduce the concept of employee engagement and the relevant theories, before connecting the two concepts.

2.2 Employee Engagement

2.2.1 The Concept of Employee Engagement

Employee engagement is a relatively new concept in academic research. Whereas its importance was mostly marketed by HR consultancy firms in the past, it has in more recent years gained popularity among researchers (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 3; Saks, 2006, p. 600). Employee engagement is an ambiguous one, and a myriad of different definitions of employee engagement can be derived from current research and practice driven literature (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 4). Macey and Schneider (2008, p. 3) write that casual observation suggests that the organizational management interest in the concept of employee engagement can be attributed to the proposed improvements it can bring to organizational performance, as has been suggested from the findings of many studies (Smith & Macko, 2014; Harter et al., 2002; Paradise, 2008; Wellins et al., 2005). For this reason many of the given definitions are based around the contribution employee engagement makes to organizational performance, particularly those given by practitioners and HR consultancy firms as they tend to focus on these presumed positive consequences (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 4; Shuck, 2011, p. 305). This focus on organizational performance has not only influenced the definitions that are given, but has also directed the focus of current research. Jenkins and Delbridge (2013, p. 2672) observed that much of current literature is about the capability of managers to deliver engaged employees with the ultimate goal of organizational benefit. Although this approach demonstrates an important aspect of employee engagement, it often overlaps engagement with other constructs within organizational behavior such as commitment and satisfaction (Shuck, 2011, p. 305).

Researchers and academics generally go beyond this performance driven definition of employee engagement, focusing on defining and validating the fundamentally psychological concept of employee engagement (Shuck, 2011, p. 305). This research has thus had more of a micro level focus, with the goal of developing a more comprehensive understanding of employee engagement antecedents and what factors influence its development (Shuck, 2011, p. 305). Kahn (1990) is commonly credited as being the first researcher applying engagement theory to the context of the workplace (Shuck, 2011, p. 307; May et al., 2004, p. 11; Sinha & Trivedi, 2014, p. 22), and many important contributions made to the employee engagement field has based their studies on his work; including the multi-dimensional approach to employee engagement provided by Saks (2006) and the empirical testing of Kahn's model by May et al. (2004).

In addition to practitioners and researchers, more definitions can be accredited to common folk theory; a general belief that individuals, in this case particularly organizational leaders, have about work motivation (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 4).

Generally these definitions consider work engagement as a concept that is “a desirable condition, has an organizational purpose, and connotes involvement, commitment, passion, enthusiasm, focused effort, and energy, so it has both attitudinal and behavioral components” (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 4). Further, Macey and Schneider (2008, p. 4) explain that the conditions under which employees work are the antecedents of those attitudinal and behavioral components, and the consequences of the employee engagement they lead to are commonly thought of as organizational effectiveness.

Because Kahn (1990) was the one to conceptualize the term of employee engagement, and many researchers that incorporate the concept of employee engagement in their studies have utilized it, it is the definition of employee engagement that we will use in our study; “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances” (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). In addition to being one of the more widely accepted definitions of employee engagement, this psychology based definition is suitable for our study as we aim to explore and develop a deeper understanding of managers’ perceptions of how various motivational factors influence employee engagement. We thus argue that the definition provided by Kahn (1990) is more relevant to our study than for example the ones that have been developed by HR consultancy firms which generally tend to be more general and have a focus on the organizational performance aspect (Macey & Schneider, 2008, p. 4).

2.2.2 Engagement Drivers

As mentioned in the above paragraph, the definition of employee engagement that we are using in this study is the definition provided by Kahn (1990). In his study, Kahn (1990) set out to develop some theoretical framework to understand the psychological conditions of engagement and disengagement at work; why people bring themselves into or remove themselves from specific role behavior. Aiming to find general psychological conditions of engagement that were powerful enough to go beyond individual differences of employees, the researcher found three psychological factors that were related to employee engagement; meaningfulness, safety, and availability (Kahn, 1990, p. 703).

Psychological meaningfulness is an employee’s feeling that he or she is receiving a return on his or her work for the organization in form of physical, cognitive, or emotional energy, often experienced when an employee feels valuable and useful to the organization (Kahn, 1990, p. 704). In the study it was shown that psychological meaningfulness was specifically related to task characteristics, role characteristics, and work interactions; meaning employees feel higher levels of meaningfulness when they are faced with challenging, varied, and creative tasks, when their work roles were in line with how they saw or wanted to see themselves and the roles included an amount of status and influence, and when they partake in meaningful interaction with coworkers and clients and build relationships (Kahn, 1990, p. 704).

Psychological safety is defined by Kahn (1990, p. 708) as “feeling able to show and employ one’s self without fear of negative consequences to self-image, status, or career”. In other words, employees felt psychological safety in situations where they felt as though they would not suffer negative consequences for their engagement; that they had trusting relationships where they felt comfortable with expressing themselves

(Kahn, 1990, p. 708). The findings of the study suggested that employees felt a higher degree of psychological safety when they had trusting and supportive interpersonal relationships at work, good group and intergroup dynamics, management that was supportive, flexible, and clear, and role performances that were in line with the organizational norms (Kahn, 1990, p. 708).

The last factor found in the study that was related to employee engagement was psychological availability. In the study it is defined as “the sense of having the physical, emotional, or psychological resources to personally engage at a particular moment. It measures how ready people are to engage, given the distractions they experience as members of social systems” (Kahn, 1990, p. 714). Thus, an employee was able to engage his or herself in work depending on how this employee coped with the varying demands of work and personal life. Physical and emotional energy highly influenced psychological availability, as well as an employee’s personal security or insecurity in particular work roles, and finally employees’ personal lives outside of work (Kahn, 1990, p. 714). It was argued that collectively the three conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability determine how employees inhabit their work roles; their psychological presence or absence (Kahn, 1990, p. 703).

May et al. (2004) based their study on the ethnographic work of Kahn (1990) and tested the theoretical framework he developed, researching the relationship between engagement at work and the psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability. The results of the study showed that all three psychological conditions had a significant relationship with employee engagement. May et al. (2004, p. 33) further argue that managers must take into consideration these relationships and attempt to foster the psychological conditions among their employees. Managers can enhance psychological meaningfulness through learning more about the personal aspirations of their employees, and subsequently provide them with appropriate work roles and job design (May et al., 2004, p. 33). The employees’ perceptions of psychological safety can be achieved through building trusting, supportive relationships, for example through letting them participate in decision making, develop new skills, use open communication, fair treatment, and be consistent in their actions (May et al., 2004, p. 33). Lastly, May et al. (2004, p. 33) state that managers must design jobs that “minimize the cognitive, emotional, and physical strain experienced by employees”. In other words, managers should avoid overloading their employees with work related demands in order to improve employees’ perceptions of psychological availability.

Just as there is no ultimate definition of employee engagement, there are no definite answers to what exactly drives engagement. However, several studies have measured the impact of different drivers of employee engagement and how employees perceive their influence, and these studies have indicated similar things. By reviewing relevant studies, including the largest and most influential surveys that have been conducted by HR consultancy and research firms, we aim to identify what has been found to be the main drivers of employee engagement in current research in order to use them in our study.

In her study, Anitha (2013) aimed to consolidate several factors that contributed to the development of Kahn’s three psychological factors of employee engagement by looking and drawing from what previous studies had indicated. In the study, seven factors that

facilitate the psychological factors were identified, empirically tested, and found to be relevant determinants of engagement among employees (Anitha, 2013, p. 310). The significant determining factors were work environment, leadership, team and co-worker relationships, training and career development, compensation or remuneration, organizational policies and procedures, and workplace wellbeing (Anitha, 2013, p. 311).

Towers Perrin (2008) conducted their survey of what drives employee engagement of 90 000 employees globally. While they could conclude that drivers behind employee engagement vary between countries, as well as other demographic factors like age, they were able to compile a list of the top employee engagement drivers globally (Towers Perrin, 2008, p. 9). The fundamental findings of the survey were that employee engagement is largely influenced by the work environment and the nature of the work experience; effective leaders will over time create unique intangibles within an organization by treating employees well, but also by expressing interest in delivering value to customers, communities, and other stakeholders (Towers Perrin, 2008, p. 9). The top five global factors that employees find drives their engagement were management interest in employee well being, opportunities to improve skills and capabilities, the organization's reputation, an employee's ability to input into decision making, and ability to provide consumer satisfaction (Towers Perrin, 2008, p. 9).

The Society for Human Resource Management (2013) surveyed employees on the conditions of engagement, focusing on the conditions in the workplace that promote employee engagement. Again there were some demographic differences that could be observed, but the general results suggested that employees consider their engagement to mainly be influenced by the relationships with coworkers, opportunities to use skills and abilities, the relationship with their supervisor, the work itself, the contribution of their work, and the variety of work (Society for Human Resource Management, 2013, p. 28). The authors also conclude that compensation and pay generally is a top priority for employees and their engagement, but that the relationships they establish in the workplace can play a bigger role (Society for Human Resource Management, 2013, p. 33).

Robinson et al. (2004) also conducted an extensive survey with the aim of distinguishing the main drivers behind employee engagement. The most significant driver of employee engagement was identified as a feeling of being valued and involved at work (Robinson et al., 2004, p. 21). In turn, the authors identified several factors that strongly contributed to this feeling, including the perceived concern for employees' well being in the organization, employees' involvement in decision making, opportunities for career development, work relationships, and performance and appraisal (Robinson et al., 2004, p. 21-22).

Wellins et al. (2005, p. 7) working for DDI which is another HR consultancy and research firm that has been doing research for over more than three decades with the goal of understanding employee engagement. During this time they have been able to distinguish five key elements of the workplace which are of particular relevance to employee engagement (Wellins et al., 2005, p. 13). The first aspect is aligning effort with strategy; making sure that an employee has a clear job description and a suitable job design that aligns personal goals with that of the organization. Second, Wellins et al. (2005, p. 13) mention empowerment; an employee's feeling that he or she has the

ability of influence decisions. The third factor is teamwork and collaboration, which emphasizes the supportive, cooperative relationships that an employee creates with coworkers (Wellins et al., 2005, p. 14). The next factor stated by Wellins et al. (2005, p. 14) is growth and development, which relates to the opportunities an employee has to improve skills and capabilities within an organization. The final driver of employee engagement in the workplace mentioned in the study is support and recognition, which in the study by Wellins et al. (2005, p. 15) primarily refers to the manager-employee relationship and the formal and informal rewards that an employee is given for his or her efforts.

As we can see from the introduced surveys that have been conducted on the drivers of employee engagement, they have a lot in common. It is important to consider that the definition of employee engagement that a particular study has chosen to use may influence the drivers that are identified (i.e. if it is more performance or psychology based); however, because the studies have showed similar results and indicated similar drivers of employee engagement it does not appear to have a large impact on the outcomes of a study. The drivers we have chosen to include in our model are similar to those included in the study conducted by Anitha (2013) who based her study around the three psychological conditions of employee engagement as defined by Kahn (1990), psychological meaningfulness, safety, and availability, and consolidated the different factors that contributed to them. Because the definition we have chosen to use for employee engagement in this study is the one given by Kahn, we argue that it is the most relevant and in line with our research.

The first driver of employee engagement that we have chosen to include in this study is work environment. The work environment has come to play an important role in employee engagement, as it can be argued that all work experiences of an employee are embedded in the work environment and thus an employee cannot be viewed in isolation from it (Kumar & Sia, 2012, p. 34). In their study of the relationship between employee engagement and the work environment, Kumar and Sia (2012) found significant relationships between several aspects of the work environment and employee engagement. Harter et al. (2002) and May et al. (2004) also show in their studies that the level of employee engagement is influenced by various dimensions of the workplace and work environment, for example support, relationships, autonomy, involvement in decision making, and job design (Kumar & Sia, 2012; Harter et al., 2002; May et al., 2004).

The second and third drivers that we will include in our study relates to an employee's relationships at the workplace. The relationships that an employee has at his or her workplace can be divided into the relationship the employee has with coworkers, and the relationship the employee has with the manager. The importance of the relationships that an employee has at work has been emphasized in many studies of employee engagement, such as Robinson et al. (2004), Sibson Consulting (2010), and the Society for Human Resource Management (2013). Further, Kahn (1990, p. 708) outlines in his study that interpersonal relationships that are trusting and supportive, including both the relationships that an employee has in groups, teams, and with the manager, promotes employee engagement. Therefore we chose to include relationships with coworkers and relationships with managers as two drivers of employee engagement. Additionally, interpersonal interactions and communication in the workplace are of relevance to these

two drivers as they enable these relationships, particularly meaningful interactions that contribute to employees feeling valued by both managers and coworkers (Kahn, 1990, p. 707-708).

Training and career development is the fourth driver that we will include in our study. Robinson et al. (2004) emphasized the importance of career planning and development in their study, linking personal development plans and performance appraisals to employee engagement. Similarly, Towers Perrin (2008, p. 18) in their extensive employee engagement survey mention career advancement opportunities as one of the main drivers. As for training, in the study conducted by Paradise (2008) learning's effect on employee engagement was investigated. The quality of training and learning opportunities, the frequency of these opportunities, as well as leaders' training in performance appraisal were some of the highest ranked by respondents in what aspects of learning had the most influence on their work engagement (Paradise, 2008, p. 57).

The next driver of employee engagement that we have chosen to include is compensation, or remuneration. Compensation such as financial rewards has been included as a relevant driver of employee engagement in many of the surveys conducted by HR firms, and as was mentioned by the Society for Human Resource Management (2013, p. 33) compensation is typically a top priority for employees. Similarly, Paradise (2008, p. 54) mention it as one of the workplace factors that encourages engagement. In a study conducted by Saks (2006), the findings showed that rewards and recognition can be one of the antecedents of employee engagement as it can work as a return on investment for employees.

Organizational policies, including organizational structures and systems, is another driver we have chosen to include in our study. Anitha (2014, p. 312) mention that these policies include things such as fairness in recruitment and selection, fairness in promotional policies, and work-life balance aid. Wellins et al. (2005, p. 10) mention organizational systems and strategies as one of the main drivers behind employee engagement, and that it is one of the tools that organizations have the ability to alter to create a more engaging work environment. As an example, they mention the hiring process to be particularly important to employee engagement (Wellins et al., 2005, p. 7). Kahn (1990, p. 712) also emphasizes the importance of organizational systems as well as norms, as he observed that they will influence the way employees perform their roles, their level of psychological safety, and consequently their levels of engagement.

The last driver we have chosen to include in our study is employee well-being. This factor was particularly emphasized in the study conducted by Towers Perrin (2008, p. 18) as being the most valued by employees in their engagement globally. Well-being can be defined as "all the things that are important to how we think about and experience our lives" (Rath & Harter, 2010 p. 142; cited in Anitha, 2014, p. 312), and therefore becomes an important influence that an organization has on an employee. Again, as described by Kahn (1990), this factor can be influenced by the work-life balance and physical and emotional energy of an employee, and the importance of not overwhelming them with demands.

The drivers can to some extent overlap each other as some drivers are related and can contribute to other drivers, for example good relationships with management and

coworkers can contribute to an employee's more positive overall perception of the workplace (Kumar & Sia, 2012, p. 38). Further, in their employee engagement value proposition Wellins et al. (2005, p. 10) suggests that engagement drivers such as organizational policies and systems, as well as leadership and management, will contribute to the work environment.

Having reviewed the concept of employee engagement and identified the drivers we are using in this study, we now move on to introduce the theories that relate to employee engagement and are of relevance to this study.

2.2.3 Social Exchange Theory

As established earlier, research suggests that employee engagement is a key contributor to successful organizational performance (Smith & Macko, 2014; Harter et al., 2002; Paradise, 2008; Wellins et al., 2005). However, it is the responsibility of the organization to create conditions in the workplace that best foster engagement among employees (Sinha & Trivedi, 2014, p. 24). Social exchange theory (SET) has for a long time acted as one of the main theories for explaining and understanding the motivational basis behind behaviors in the workplace, connecting concepts of social psychology, sociology, and anthropology (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 219; Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 874; Slack et al., 2014, p. 539).

Whereas many different views of SET exist, theorists generally agree that social exchange involves "a series of social interactions that generate obligations... Within SET, these interactions are usually seen as interdependent and contingent on the actions of another person" (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 874). Wayne et al. (1997, p. 82) further write that social exchanges includes obligations that are not specified; when an individual conducts a favor for another, it creates an expectation of some future return that is often unclear in terms of in what form it will be returned as well as at what point in time. Not only does it create an expectation from the party that did a favor for another, but it can also create a sense of indebtedness for the receiving party (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 219). This indebtedness will be reduced once the receiving party reciprocates and repays the favor (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 219).

Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005, p. 875) mention that one of the fundamental ideas of SET is that these kinds of interactions between parties can lead to relationships that evolve over time into mutual commitments that are trusting and loyal. However, for this relationship to emerge it is of importance that the individuals partaking in the exchange abide by certain rules and norms that act as the guidelines of exchange (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 875). There are different sets of rules and norms, and the set that a researcher chooses to rely on will determine how SET is used in a particular study. The most well-known type, and also the type that is most frequently used in management research, is rules of reciprocity (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 875).

Gouldner (1960) is one of the first and most influential researchers to discuss the rules and norms of reciprocity in connection to SET, contributing to research when he considered three aspects of reciprocity; reciprocity as a transactional pattern of interdependent exchanges, reciprocity as a folk belief, and reciprocity as a moral norm. Reciprocity is also sometimes referred to as repayment in kind, and Gouldner (1960, p. 164) described the concept as "a mutually contingent exchange of benefits between two

or more units". He continues to state that the exchange of benefits are not necessarily always equal, and that it is not uncommon that individuals who received benefits from another party repay with more or less than what they received (Gouldner, 1960, p. 165).

Reciprocity is of an interdependent nature, meaning its outcomes are based on efforts of multiple parties; it is neither dependent nor independent and a key characteristic of social exchange (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 876). Reciprocal interdependence in particular emphasizes contingency in transactions, where the action of one individual will lead to a response by another individual; when an individual provides a benefit, the receiving individual should repay this benefit in kind (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 876). Because of the contingency aspect, when an individual supplies a benefit and another reciprocates this starts another social exchange process, making it into the transactional pattern of interdependent exchanges. Cropanzano and Mitchell (2005, p. 876) further state that this pattern is likely to create a continuous cycle between the parties as reciprocity can act as motivation for further exchange, for example between an employee and manager or organization. Wayne et al. (1997, p. 82) supports this by stating that in a work environment employees often take on a long-term approach to social exchange and subsequently relationships, letting a pattern of reciprocity establish the balance of the social exchange over time.

When Gouldner (1960, p. 170) writes about reciprocity as a folk belief, he refers to specific cultural expectations that individuals will receive what they deserve. In other words, the belief that in the end exchanges will reach equilibrium because those who are helpful will get rewarded and those who are not will be punished (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 876). Bies and Tripp (1996; cited in Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 877) give an example of reciprocity in folk beliefs, which is the concept of karma; individuals who share this belief do for example not seek revenge on a perpetrator because they believe in the end people will get what they deserve. In a similar vein, reciprocity as a moral norm explains that people *should* behave a certain way; in this case those who follow the norm are obligated to behave reciprocally (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 877). Despite the argued universal acceptance of the reciprocity norm, there is likely to be some cultural and individual differences in the application of the principle (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 878).

Going beyond the rules of reciprocity, many other rules have been developed and researched. The second most popular set of rules in SET is the negotiated rules; rules that are commonly explicit and understood with the purpose of achieving beneficial agreements (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 878). These rules are usually connected to the negotiated economic transactions; for example, when an individual accepts a job offer he or she is likely to negotiate the level of pay (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 878). It can thus be argued that these rules are more relevant to the economic exchanges within an organization. Other examples of rules that have been developed are rules of altruism, rationality, group gain, competition, and status consistency (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 879).

Connecting SET and the underlying rules of reciprocity with the workplace and the context of this study, Slack et al. (2014, p. 538) mention that within organizations there are two main forms of exchanges; economic and social. The economic exchange between an organization and employees refers to the negotiated, generally explicit and

defined exchange of economic gains. The social exchange between an organization and its employees, the exchange that SET is more commonly used to explain, refers to “the non-monetary aspects of employment, especially those rooted in social exchange concepts” (Deckop et al., 2003, p. 102). The findings of previous research that links SET to the workplace generally suggests that beneficial and positive actions by organizations or managers directed towards employees contribute to the creation of exchange relationships between the two, in turn creating obligations for employees to reciprocate these actions in a way that is also beneficial and positive (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 219). Thus, SET is used to explain the motivational fundamentals behind employee behavior that is voluntary, not formally rewarded, and not enforced by contract (Slack et al., 2014, p. 539).

The most relevant aspect of reciprocity as an underlying rule for SET in this study is reciprocity as a pattern of interdependent exchanges. As we can see from the above paragraph, in the organizational context this implies that when organizations or managers supply benefits or resources to an employee, the organization or manager will expect benefits in return and the employee will feel obligated to repay the organization in kind. This creates a continuous cycle of social exchanges between them. It can also be argued that negotiated rules and economic exchanges have certain importance to employee engagement, as we could see when we discussed the drivers behind employee engagement and when we later connect the concepts of motivation and engagement.

One way that employees can repay their organizations and fulfill their obligations is to put more effort into their role and task performances (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 220). Further, Saks (2006, p. 603) argues that SET can provide a theoretical explanation as to why employees are more or less engaged in their work and their organization. When employees receive resources from their organization, whether they are of economical or socio-emotional nature, they will feel the need to reciprocate and repay their organization. This repayment can be through a greater level of engagement in their work, or as is in line with the definition of engagement provided by Kahn (1990), employees will feel obliged to go deeper into their role performances at work (Saks, 2006, p. 603). If the organization does not provide their employees with the resources the employees will not feel the obligation to repay the organization with high levels of engagement, and are likely to become disengaged. Saks (2006, p. 603) concludes in line with Kahn (1990) that “the amount of cognitive, emotional, and physical resources that an individual is prepared to devote in the performance of one’s work roles is contingent on the economic and socio-emotional resources received from the organization”.

2.2.4 Leader-Member Exchange Theory and Perceived Organizational Support

Going further, the two main ways that management literature has conceptualized social exchange is distinguishing between the exchange relationship that exists between the employee and the organization, and the exchange relationship that exists between an employee and his or her leader (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 220; Wayne et al., 1997, p. 82). The social exchange between the leader (supervisor or manager) and the employee is explained by the leader-member exchange theory (LMX), while the exchange relationship between the employee and the organization is explained using the theory perceived organizational support (POS) (Wayne et al., 1997, p. 82).

Settoon et al. (1996, p. 220) write that employees form global beliefs about the level of which an organization cares about their well being and value their contributions to the organization. These global beliefs are referred to as perceived organizational support (POS), and similar to SET, when an employee perceives a high level of organizational support it is likely to create obligations on employees to repay their organizations (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 220). These perceptions and expectations are built on the fact that employees have a tendency to assign characteristics to their organization that are humanlike, much like a personification of the organization (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 698). This personification happens as an organization has legal, moral, and financial responsibility over the actions of its members through the norms, policies, and culture that exists within the particular organization and that assign role behaviors and supply continuity, as well as the power that agents (managers and supervisors) of the organization may exert over employees (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 698).

Organizations today require management that not only is effective in aligning goals and visions with the surrounding environment, but that also has a focus on the day to day interaction between managers and employees as these interactions may develop a relationship that is supportive and provides employees with higher levels of satisfaction within an organization (Choy et al., 2015, p. 104). Leader-member exchange theory (LMX) may be defined as “the quality of the dyadic, work-related, interpersonal relationships between employees and their immediate supervisor” (Sinha & Trivedi, 2014, p. 24). Connected to leadership, Choy et al. (2015, p. 105) further explain that “dyadic leadership emphasizes the relational process of engagement and depends on the nature and level of social exchange between a leader and a follower in the long run”. In conclusion, LMX suggests that members (or followers) establish unique relationships with their leaders over time through daily interactions and social exchanges, and this will in turn influence that member’s work behaviors and attitudes (Breevaart et al., 2013, p. 754-755).

POS and LMX are to some extent related (Settoon et al., 1996; Wayne et al., 1997; Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002). This is because leaders such as supervisors and managers act as agents on the behalf of the organization, and their behaviors and treatment of the employees should thus contribute to how they view the organization that they work for (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002, p. 698). Wayne et al. (1997) also observed that employees build relationships with both organizations as well as immediate supervisors, and in their study tried to integrate literature on LMX with the literature on the theory of POS. Similarly, Settoon et al. (1996, p. 224) researched the relationship between POS, LMX and different organizational behaviors, concluding that desired work behaviors, both those that are contracted and those that are voluntary or go beyond what is in the employment contract, have a stronger relationship to the nature of the relationship an employee has with his or her leader rather than with the organization. The study also showed that the extent to which exchanges and relationships are based on mutual trust, loyalty, and respect, the better the performance of the employee and the more “extra” voluntary behaviors can be expected (Settoon et al., 1996, p. 224).

Additionally, Settoon et al. (1996, p. 224-225) found that while there was a significant relationship between in-role behavior (i.e. effort and consumption in a role when performing at work) and LMX and thus that employees are more consumed in their roles when they have a good relationship with their supervisors or managers, the

hypothesized relationship between POS and in-role behavior was not significant. It can be argued that this in-role behavior which Settoon et al. (1996, p. 220) describe as “extra effort in performing required duties” can be likened with the definition of employee engagement we have adopted in this study; “the harnessing of organization members’ selves to their work roles; in engagement, people employ and express themselves physically, cognitively, and emotionally during role performances” (Kahn, 1990, p. 694). In short this means that the exchange relationship that an employee has with his or her manager (LMX) is more significant to their level of work engagement than the exchange relationship that employee has with the organization (POS).

Because this study focuses on the perspective of managers on employee engagement, the LMX theory and the exchange relationship between the manager and employee has a particular relevance. Originally, the LMX theory was principally related to role theory, but has in more recent years evolved into a theory that heavily relies on the previously reviewed social exchange theory (Dulebohn et al., 2012, p. 1715). When a leader-member relationship is initiated, the manager has the opportunity to provide certain members with more opportunities for role making, with the purpose of developing the exchange relationship with those particular members which in turn is likely to improve the quality of the relationship (Choy et al., 2015, p. 105). Choy et al. (2015, p. 105) further write that when the quality of the relationship is already high, which they refer to as the mature stage of the exchange relationship, both parties develop a degree of reliance on the other party and put more effort into supporting each other which can further advance the mutual benefit of the social exchange. The relational aspects of this kind of relationship is sometimes called *currencies of exchange*, a term underlining the importance of the effort, contribution, enthusiasm, mutual obligations and so forth that both parties have invested in development and maintenance of the LMX relationship (Choy et al., 2015, p. 106).

Previous research on LMX has suggested that LMX relationships of higher quality have positive associations to subordinate in-role performance as well as extra-role activity, but also supervisor effectiveness (Deluga, 1998, p. 189). The quality aspect of a LMX relationship refers to the quality of the exchanges, and has been conceptualized in the sense that exchanges range on a continuum between low and high quality exchanges (Deluga, 1998, p. 190). Further, Deluga (1998, p. 190) writes that low quality exchanges are “characterized by restricted levels of reciprocal influence and support”. Often this implies that supervisors practice formal authority and provide their employees with the basic organizational benefits, and employees reciprocate with what is formally outlined in their job requirements (Deluga, 1998, p. 190). High quality exchange relationships, or mature relationships as Choy et al. (2015) refer to them, are rather characterized by some interpersonal attraction, mutual trust, loyalty, and good communication (Deluga, 1998, p. 190). High quality LMX subordinates are likely to receive special opportunities and benefits such as additional support in career development, favorable performance appraisals, and valuable promotion opportunities (Deluga, 1998, p. 190). In turn, managers of higher quality LMX relationships are more likely to receive favorable effectiveness ratings, and workers that exceed what is expected of them in the form of extra role activities (Deluga, 1998, p. 190-191).

To conclude, we can see that LMX has a lot in common with the theory of SET; employees form unique relationships with their leaders, and over time a pattern of

exchange is likely to emerge. To advance the development and quality of this exchange relationship, managers can provide employees with additional resources and role opportunities, and in return expect more effort, and engagement, from their workers. Further, the SET and LMX theories are consistent with the definition of employee engagement as a two-way relationship given by Robinson et al. (2004, p. ix), where employees will decide their level of engagement based on the effort that the organization puts into engaging employees. Assuming that managers are interested in the successful performance of their organizations they will be interested in the engagement of their employees, and provide them with what they believe are the right economic and socio-emotional resources in order to achieve this.

2.3 Motivation and Employee Engagement

2.3.1 Motivational Factors

There have been some studies connecting the concepts of employee engagement and work motivation, but mainly the concepts have been researched separately (Putra et al., 2015, p. 2). Putra et al. (2015) tested a model of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation and how employees within the tourism industry perceived that these factors influenced their work engagement. The study showed that both extrinsic and intrinsic motivational factors had an impact on employees' work engagement (Putra et al., 2015, p. 11).

As mentioned earlier in this theoretical framework, the drivers of engagement that we have decided to include in our study are work environment, relationships with coworkers, relationships with managers, training and career development, compensation, organizational policies, and employee well-being. In the study investigating the effects of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on work engagement in the tourism sector, Putra et al. (2015) referred to the drivers behind work engagement as motivational antecedents. Similar to the drivers identified in this study, the motivational antecedents used were pay, promotion, supervision, benefits, operating conditions, coworkers, nature of work, and communication (Putra et al., 2015, p. 7). From here on, the previously defined drivers of engagement will be referred to as motivational factors.

Based on our review of literature on intrinsic and extrinsic motivation, we can distinguish the nature of our chosen motivational factors with the motive of investigating how the influence of these intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors on employee engagement is perceived by managers. First of all, the general distinction made between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation as stated by Giancola (2014, p. 25) is that "intrinsic motivation is driven by forces within the employee, while extrinsic motivation is driven by outside forces". Further, Ryan and Deci (2000, p. 56) wrote that while intrinsic motivation is performing an activity for its inherent satisfactions rather than for some separable consequence, extrinsic motivation pertains whenever an activity is done in order to attain some separable outcome (Ryan & Deci, 2000, p. 60). By taking these definitions into consideration, we can say that the intrinsic factors of this study are relationships with co-workers, relationships with managers, and the well-being of employees; factors that are internal to the employee and that will motivate behavior from within. The extrinsic factors of this study are the work environment, training and career development, compensation, and organizational policies; factors that are external to the employee and will influence motivation extrinsically. As mentioned

previously there may be some slight overlap between the factors as there are different dimensions to each of these factors.

<i>Motivational Factors</i>	
<i>Intrinsic Factors</i>	<i>Extrinsic Factors</i>
Relationships with coworkers	Organizational Policies
Relationships with managers	Training and career development
Employee well-being	Compensation
	Work environment

Table 1. Overview of the motivational factors.

2.3.2 Managers, Motivation, and Employee Engagement

There are certain aspects that managers must take into consideration when motivating their employees. According to Parashar (2016, p. 8) managers should motivate their workforce by leading from the front in order to achieve organizational goals. Similarly, George and Jones (2012, p. 98) recall that managers should encourage and motivate the members of their organizations to perform to the best of their abilities in order to help the organization achieve its goals. Managers of all organizations should also be careful in assigning the cause of low performance to low employee motivation, and the cause of high performance to high employee motivation (George & Jones, 2012, p. 159). Motivation is of fundamental importance in organizations, and in order for managers to be able to motivate their employees as efficiently as possible, managers must have a clear understanding of who their employees are and how diverse they are, because the more accurately managers perceive their employees, the more able they are to motivate them (George & Jones, 2012, p. 98). Lazaroiu (2015, p. 100) states that managers must realize that an employee can have various needs to satisfy at the same time, and managers must ascertain that they understand their employees and not make assumptions. For example, if a manager assumes that an employee that has a high level of performance has a high level of motivation, they might fail in taking advantage of the talents and competencies of the employees (George & Jones, 2012, p. 159). On the other hand, managers that know their employees are more likely to notice when an employee performs at a high level but is not highly motivated, and can bring superior contributions to the organization if the managers put greater effort into increasing their motivation (George & Jones, 2012, p. 159).

One key challenge that managers are facing is how to encourage employees to contribute inputs to their job and the organization (George & Jones, 2012, 160). Managers want employees to be motivated and contribute to the company, because ultimately it is inputs that transform into job performance and consequently organizational performance (George & Jones, 2012, p. 160). In order to determine what motivates employees, managers must first determine what needs employees are trying to satisfy, acknowledging that each employee will have different needs (George &

Jones, 2012, p. 161). Employees are best motivated when there is a clear communication manager-employee-manager, when managers participate in the employees' working lives and when the employee is involved in a group or team work (Parashar, 2016, p. 10). This is why managers must ensure that each employee is satisfying their own personal needs, by engaging in behaviors that contribute to the achievement of organizational goals (George & Jones, 2012, p. 161). In summary, to motivate employees managers should try to identify the needs that each employee is attempting to fulfill, and make sure that these needs are being satisfied if the employee is performing the desired behavior (George & Jones, 2012, p. 162).

In order to motivate employees to perform, managers must first of all consider if the employee in question possesses the knowledge and capabilities required to perform the task at hand at the necessary level (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). If the employee has the skills and the knowledge to perform, the manager should also ensure that the employee is receiving the desired outcomes once the level of performance is achieved (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). Managers must thus determine what outcomes motivate employees, meaning that managers need to determine the valence of different outcomes for the employees. George and Jones (2012, p. 164) further write that this will not only increase motivation, but ensuring valence in outcomes also makes it less likely for employees to quit their job. At the same time, managers must make sure that the employees that are performing at the desired level actually get the outcomes that they desire, in other words, outcomes with a high positive valence (George & Jones, 2012, p. 166). The different instrumentalities should be communicated to the employees by managers, providing them with knowledge of what precise outcomes will result from different performance levels (George & Jones, 2012, p. 166). Sometimes, the level of motivation in employees is low because employees do not believe that their efforts will result in increased performance. In this case, managers should reassure the employees by letting them know that they are capable of performing at the high level desired if they try hard enough (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167).

Another way in which managers may increase employee performance is by helping them improve their skills and abilities, through activities like trainings or courses (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). If opportunities for growth and development are not supplied to employees, they may turn to distractions and belongingness needs, beginning to socialize more with colleagues (Lazaroiu, 2015, p. 100), which may not be beneficial for managers or organizations. According to expectancy theory, not only should rewards be grounded in employee performance and the abilities to perform at high levels, but managers also must ensure that employees perceive this to be the case (George & Jones, 2012, p. 167). Managers must therefore administer outcomes based on these inputs in order to motivate employees to contribute the inputs that the organization needs, and make sure that the input-outcome ratios of different employees are approximately equal so that they can provide more outcomes to employees that contribute with more inputs (George & Jones, 2012, p. 168). Managers have to consider that motivation is highest when equity exists and when outcomes are distributed fairly among all employees, depending on their inputs (George & Jones, 2012, p. 170).

Finally, it is important for managers to treat all employees equally and with courtesy, politeness, respect, and dignity in order to promote interpersonal justice as defined in organizational justice (George & Jones, 2012, p. 173). In connection to this, managers

should avoid making derogatory remarks or underestimate employees (George & Jones, 2012, p. 173). Employees' perceptions of organizational justice are an important aspect of work motivation, and if they are low it increases the possibility of counterproductive work behaviors in the organization (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174). Counterproductive behaviors commonly violate organizational values and norms and can potentially harm individuals as well as the organization as a whole, which is why managers should pay close attention to equality and fairness in their organization (George & Jones, 2012, p. 174).

Treating employees fairly and with respect has also been related to higher levels of employee engagement, as shown by Robinson et al. (2004, p. 20) exposure to any type of harassment (verbal, racial, or sexual) or violence at work has a negative influence on engagement levels. It was specifically shown that the source of harassment is of high importance in relation to work engagement; when a relative or a customer is the source of harassment it is considered to be expected, and although unpleasant it is "part of the job" to deal with rude customers or similar (Robinson et al., 2004, p. 20). However, when coworkers or managers are the source of harassment the impact on engagement is much greater and is considered as "a shock to the system" rather than something that is expected (Robinson et al., 2004, p. 20). Based on these findings, Robinson et al. (2004, p. 24) states that it is fundamental for employee engagement that managers treat their employees fairly, that they care about their employees and provide them with open, two-way communication.

As mentioned previously, the focus of much of the employee engagement literature has been on the improved organizational performance that engaged employees can lead to, including the current literature that connects managers and engagement. This was observed by Jenkins and Delbridge (2013, p. 2672), who stated that current research had its focus on the capability of managers to deliver engaged employees with the ultimate goal of organizational benefit. This is visible in the various HR consultancy and research firm surveys we reviewed; many conducted their surveys of employee engagement and developed a set of engagement drivers with the motive of providing managers and organizations with the information they need in order to engage their employee and obtain organizational benefits, such as increased performance. For example, Robinson et al. (2004, p. 3) includes a separate chapter in their research report about "the reasons why organizations should pay attention to employees' engagement levels, specifically the potential business benefits". Similarly, Wellins et al. (2005, p. 16) argued for the importance of organizations and managers fostering engagement as it is closely related to business outcomes. A major motivation behind these studies of engagement drivers is thus how managers can use them to improve business performance.

All the concepts mentioned and explored in this chapter are directly connected to motivation and employee engagement. The theories help gain an understanding of the causes of employee engagement and the underlying grounds of motivation in employees. As a connection between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation and employee engagement has been suggested (Silvera, 2013), we argue that the theories regarding motivation can be combined with employee engagement in order to understand how employees are engaged at work. We are thus interested in exploring the links between these theories and connecting them with the perspectives of managers in private and

public sector organizations. With the basis of our thesis, the perceived influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement, our objective is to develop a deeper understanding of the perceptions of managers regarding our chosen research area. To increase our understanding we have chosen to conduct interviews with managers, and our expectation is that by investigating the topic through qualitative interviews, we can expand and advance the research on the topic and consequently make a theoretical contribution to current research on employee motivation and engagement.

3. Methodology

In this chapter we aim to present the methodological considerations we have made in our study. Starting with the scientific method where we explain our pre-understanding of the chosen topic, our underlying assumptions, and our research design, we will then move on to the practical method where we explain the process of our collection of empirical information as well as how it will be analyzed.

3.1 Choice of Subject

We are two students currently enrolled in the International Business program at Umeå University. We both have an interest in the field of management, specifically in human resource management (HRM) related issues, which is something that has been reflected in our choice of subject for this thesis. The HRM field is one that we both aspire to work within in the future, and as we both wished to pick a topic of study that was of great interest to us and letting this interest motivate and drive our research forward, this common interest greatly facilitated the choice of topic. Moreover, we share a common interest of employee engagement, which led us to choose the subject of this thesis; how managers perceive the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement. Because we believe that employees are engaged by different factors based on their individual needs and wants, which has also been suggested by previous research (e.g. Robinson et al., 2004; Towers Perrin, 2008), we chose to include both intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors in our study. In addition, we both aim to hold management positions in the future, and we believe that conducting research within this field of management will provide us with useful knowledge that will aid us in our future careers.

After conducting our literature review we made the choice of studying an additional aspect of motivation and engagement, namely managers' perceptions of how intrinsic and extrinsic motivation influences engagement in employees that work for organizations within the private and public sectors. Previous research has suggested differences in the nature of main sources of motivation (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998, Houston, 2000), and therefore we wanted to explore whether the perceptions of managers are in line with this research. This is particularly interesting to us as we both have work experience within both the private and the public sector. Finally, we chose to conduct our study in Sweden and, thus, only include managers in Sweden, partially because previous studies have suggested differences between countries (Towers Perrin, 2004) but also because the Swedish work environment is the one that we are the most familiar with. We believe that this will help us develop insights into the root causes of employee motivation and engagement, and we will be able to enhance the managerial implications of the thesis.

3.2 Preconceptions

Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 29-30) mention that personal values and beliefs of researchers, in other words our preconceptions of a particular topic, have the potential to intrude on a number of areas in research conduct. Scientific and everyday interpretations will be influenced by prior understanding of human action and social or natural phenomena (Flick et al., 2009, p. 92), and researchers must therefore be conscious of their own assumptions and preconceptions when conducting research (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 144). In this section we will consider the preconceptions that

we have regarding motivation and engagement, and what effects these preconceptions may have had on our study.

First of all, both authors of this thesis have some theoretical preconceptions regarding the chosen topic for this thesis. During our studies at Umeå University we have both had several courses that incorporated organizational behavior related concepts such as motivation and engagement, and thus previously obtained theoretical information from sources such as lectures, books, and articles. Additionally, one author has read postgraduate level courses within international human resource management, including courses within HRM and talent management where a lot of emphasis was put on engagement of employees as well as the managerial role. Some deeper knowledge and understanding of the key concepts of this study was thus acquired during this time. It may also be important to note that while we have similar educational backgrounds, our cultural backgrounds are very different as one of us grew up in Sweden and one in Colombia. These cultural differences may contribute to the fact that we view employee motivation and engagement differently, as well as what are the most prominent drivers behind them. Notwithstanding, we believe that our different backgrounds and subsequent understandings of the concepts could be valuable to our thesis, as they can contribute with two different, but complementing, perspectives. In summary, both authors of this thesis are familiar with and have prior theoretical knowledge, to varying extents, of the concepts and the related theories that are central to this study.

Second, both authors of this thesis have work experience within organizations which implies that we have some practical knowledge about certain aspects of both motivation and engagement, as well as of their importance in a workplace. Because we were employees in organizations, including both private and public sector organizations, we only possess practical knowledge from an employee perspective. The prior experiences that we have of working for organizations may have influenced our perceptions and perceived meaning and importance of motivation and engagement in the workplace, contributing to that we personally find certain motivational factors to be more influential on engagement than others. As mentioned by Flick et al. (2009, p. 92) prior understandings and experience will influence scientific and everyday interpretations and, therefore, we as researchers may tend to interpret information in a light that is in line with our existing knowledge. By keeping our preconceptions in mind throughout the research process, we believe we were able to mitigate the effects that our preconceptions might have had on our study.

3.3 Ontology

It is of importance for researchers to explain their philosophical standpoints when conducting research, as these philosophical standpoints involve assumptions that underpin how researchers view the world and consequently what research strategies and methods are utilized (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 101). Ontology regards the nature of reality and social entities and whether these social entities should be approached as objective entities existing in a reality that is external to social actors, or whether social entities should be approached as social constructions that are established from the actions and perceptions of social actors (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 20; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 108). This question portrays the two main stances in ontological issues; objectivism and constructionism respectively (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 108).

Objectivism is an ontological position suggesting that social entities and their meanings have a reality that is independent of social actors concerned with its existence (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 21). Thus, this position implies that phenomena have a predetermined existence that is separate from social actors that will act on and constrain these social actors (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 21), in our case referring to the phenomena of employee motivation and engagement. Constructionism on the other hand challenges this view and suggests that social phenomena rather than being pre-established are continually being created by social actors; social interaction will construct these social phenomena, and they are in a state of constant change (Gephart, 2004, p. 455; Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 22). We therefore view motivation and engagement as existing in an emergent reality that is in a state of constant reconstruction.

Because the aim of this study was to develop a deeper understanding of managers' perceptions, in which they are likely to ground their actions, we embraced the ontological position of constructionism. In this setting we view both motivation and engagement of employees as subject to continuous change; phenomena that can be created and revised over time. We thus believe that social phenomena, in this case motivation and engagement, are created socially through perception and subsequent actions by social actors, in this study the managers in private and public sector organizations. The constructionist doctrine supports our aim to develop a deeper understanding of how the phenomena of motivation and engagement are continuously being constructed and reconstructed. Our understanding of reality is thus that these phenomena exist within organizations due to its social actors; the interactions of people within the organization provide these with new insights, making them continuously revise their perceptions and subsequent actions.

3.4 Epistemology

Epistemology concerns what is, or should be, viewed as acceptable knowledge (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 102). Saunders et al. (2007, p. 102) defines three main stances within epistemology; positivism, realism, and interpretivism. Positivism is an epistemological doctrine that supports the application of natural sciences methods to the study of social reality, stating that science can and should be conducted in an objective way where the goal of research is to draw generalizations similar to those made in natural science studies (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 15; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 103). Further, positivism suggests that only phenomena that researchers can observe will generate credible data, leading to the creation and testing of hypotheses (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 103). Realism is another epistemological consideration that supports the application of natural sciences methods to the social world to an extent, suggesting that there is a reality of objects that is independent to the mind of researchers (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 102). Realism can be further divided into direct realism and critical realism. Whereas direct realism argues that the world is portrayed accurately the way we experience it via our senses, critical realism states that our experiences are sensations and that these sensations can be deceiving, thus not giving us an accurate portrayal of what is real but rather an image or representation of what is real (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 105).

Interpretivism, contrary to positivism and realism, differentiates between objects of natural sciences and people, suggesting that social researchers must aim to understand the subjective meanings behind social action (Gephart, 2004, p. 456-457; Bryman &

Bell, 2011, p. 17). Supporters of interpretivism argue that researchers must understand the differences between individuals in their roles as social actors, as it is assumed that diverse meanings exist which will influence how they interpret and respond to situations (Gephart, 2004, p. 457). Interpretivism is the epistemological stance we took in our study. We believe that individuals, in our case managers and other people within organizations, will perceive the world differently. The perceptions that they have, that we in this study aim to develop a deeper understanding of, are not tangible objects of natural sciences but rather something that resides in the minds of the managers. Because individuals will perceive the world in different ways they are likely to behave differently in situations of similar nature, in our study the managers in private and public sector organizations and how they perceive that different motivational factors influence employee engagement and subsequently how they will use them. In order to understand these differences we, as researchers, must interact with the social actors to comprehend how they view reality and to understand their behavior from their own points of view. In our study we thus interacted with managers in private and public sector organizations in order to develop a deeper understanding of their perceptions on which they base their actions.

3.5 Research Approach

There are two main ways of viewing the relationship between theory and research when conducting a study; deduction and induction (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 117; Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 11). According to Gephart (2004, p. 455) the deductive approach, which is commonly associated with quantitative research and a positivist position, has the goal of developing and testing hypotheses that can uncover causal relationships between variables. In deduction the researcher deduces a hypothesis (or multiple hypotheses) on the basis of what is already known about a domain and of theoretical considerations in relation to that domain, looking to explain causal relationships (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 117). The contrasting approach, induction, is where the researcher infers the implications of the findings and where these findings are put together in order to create the theory, which can be considered to be the reverse of deduction (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 11-13; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 118). As written by Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 13), “the process of induction involves drawing generalizable inferences out of observations”, meaning that in induction research theory will be the outcome of research.

In our study, we adopted the inductive research approach. We grounded this choice in our philosophical stances and research design; the inductive approach is commonly associated with a qualitative data collection where the researcher uses a smaller sample and aims to look into different perspectives of phenomena, as is in line with the constructionism and interpretivism stances (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 119). This is also in line with the objectives of our study where we aimed to develop a deeper understanding of a particular phenomenon, using a smaller sample of managers and going more into depth in our exploration of their perceptions. In our study we did not develop and test any hypotheses, and it was not our aim to explain any causal relationships. Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 11) write that in induction the findings of research will be related back to and complement the theory from which it originated. We developed our research gap from previous research within the field of motivation and engagement, and our goal was to explore this gap in order to develop theory of how managers in private and public sector organizations perceive the influence of extrinsic

and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement. The developed theory can then be related back to the research from which the gap stemmed.

3.6 Research Design

The two main research designs that are used in business and management research are qualitative and quantitative research designs (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 27; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 145). The main distinction made between the two research designs is that while quantitative studies focus on numbers and utilizes processes and methods that generate numerical data, a qualitative research design puts emphasis on words and prefers techniques that generate non-numerical information (Gephart, 2004, p. 455; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 145). In a quantitative research design philosophical doctrines that views reality as something external and objective are thus favored, where natural sciences methods are applied to the social world, entailing a deductive approach to the relationship between research and theory where there is development and testing of hypotheses (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 27). Qualitative researchers instead commonly adopt inductivist, constructionist, and interpretivist stances as approach and method (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 386). Qualitative research can also be portrayed as a research design that describes the world from the point of view of the people who participate, with the aim of contributing to a deeper understanding of social realities (Flick et al., 2004, p. 3). This implies that phenomena are commonly studied in the environments in which they naturally occur, and where the social actors' perspectives are used in order to understand them (Gephart, 2004, p. 455). From our previously motivated philosophical standpoints and choice of research approach, we argue for the relevance and appropriateness of the qualitative research strategy in this thesis. This qualitative research design suits our purpose of developing a deeper understanding of our chosen topic and, further, the lack of qualitative studies within the area of motivation and engagement was also a contributing factor for this choice.

The nature of our research design can be further explained by looking at the purpose of our research and our formulated research question. Saunders et al. (2007, p. 132) differentiates between descriptive, explanatory, and exploratory research purposes. Explanatory studies aim to establish causal relationships which is typical for quantitative studies, and descriptive studies aim to describe a specific phenomenon, such as a situation or an event (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 134). Exploratory studies have the purpose of finding new insights and to look at particular phenomena in a new light, and to clarify the understanding of an issue (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 133). Flick et al. (2004, p. 137) mention that exploratory studies should lead to a deeper understanding of the issues that are being investigated. The aim of our study was to generate a deeper understanding of how managers in private and public sector organizations perceive the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement. By looking at managers' perspectives on this topic we are observing the phenomena, motivation and engagement, in a new light, which is in line with the purpose of an exploratory research design.

3.7 Literature Search

The theoretical framework of our study is based on previous research within the areas that we have chosen to explore in this thesis. According to Saunders et al. (2007, p. 57) the main purpose of a literature search and review is to find out what has been researched previously, and in turn highlight the current gap in research which will help

researchers avoid repeating research that has already been conducted, refine the parameters of one's own research, and to give further insight as to what methods and approaches are suitable.

Initially a broader and more general search of the concepts of work motivation and employee engagement was conducted which provided us with some basic information on what had been researched in the area previously. This broader search revealed that while the concepts had been widely researched as separate concepts, in particular work motivation, the empirical material on the relationship between the two was scarce. This broader search subsequently guided us to conduct a narrower and more detailed search of the relationship between our key concepts, where we found our research gap in that there were no studies that explored the managerial perceptions of the relationship. The key search words that we used for our literature search and subsequent development of our theoretical framework were employee engagement, work engagement, work motivation, employee motivation, extrinsic motivation, intrinsic motivation, managers and engagement, managers and motivation, drivers of engagement, motivation and engagement, private and public sector motivation. These key search words were used in different combinations to conduct a more exhaustive literature search. Further, we looked at the reference lists of influential studies within the field and could through these identify other articles that were highly relevant for our study as well as frequently cited by other researchers.

To conduct our literature search we primarily utilized the databases made available by the Umeå University library, mainly Business Source Premier (EBSCO) and Emerald Journals. We also looked for relevant articles using Google Scholar. Saunders et al. (2007, p. 65) write that secondary literature sources, in the form of refereed academic articles and books, frequently are used in literature reviews and are of great importance when conducting research. Mainly peer-reviewed academic articles were used in our literature review and to develop our theoretical framework, but on a few occasions also annual reports and surveys issued by HR consultancy and research firms. Peer-reviewed articles, also known as refereed articles, are articles that have been reviewed by academic peers before they were published in order to evaluate the quality as well as their suitability (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 65). By using these articles in our literature review we are thus able to ensure some quality and trustworthiness of our sources. Additionally, a textbook by George and Jones (2012) was used for the theoretical framework as it contained a lot of useful information about motivation and related theories, which could then be elaborated upon using relevant academic articles. To ensure validity of our sources throughout the study we aimed to find the original sources and avoid secondary referencing. However, at times the original source of the information was not obtainable or inaccessible to us and secondary referencing was necessary.

In addition to data gathered and presented in secondary sources, most research questions are answered using primary data and combining it with the secondary (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 247). In order to achieve our objectives and answer the research question of this study we found it necessary to collect new, primary data of how managers perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement. We collected our primary data through conducting semi-structured interviews, as will be explained more in depth later on in this chapter.

3.8 Qualitative Data Collection

3.8.1 Choice of Interviewees

Sampling is an important step in the research process (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 427). There are different sampling methods a researcher may use when choosing the participants to include in a study, with the main distinction being made between probability and nonprobability sampling (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 207; Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 176). Probability sampling is a random selection where each unit has equal probability of being chosen, whereas non-probability sampling is not based on random selection (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 176). Purposive sampling, sometimes also called judgmental sampling, is a form of non-probability sampling where the respondents are selected in a strategic manner, ensuring that they are relevant for a researcher to answer the research questions and meet the objectives of a study (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 442; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 230). In this study we aimed to explore the perceptions of managers in private and public sector organizations, and the purposive method of sampling was suitable for this purpose as it is a commonly used method for research that includes small but especially informative samples (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 230). We thus selected our participants based on their relevance to our study and how well we believed they would be able to aid us in answering our research question. A potential drawback of the purposive sampling method is that it is not generalizable to a population (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 442); but as our aim was to generate a deeper understanding of our chosen topic it is not our intent to generalize.

In order to collect our empirical information we needed access to relevant interview participants, which in our case were the managers in private and public sector organizations. We initially reached out via email to 23 managers, 12 from the public sector and 11 from the private sector, briefly explaining the objectives of our study and asking if they would be interested in participating. The managers were chosen because we believed they would be relevant to answer our research question and help us achieve the objectives of our study; to develop a deeper understanding of how managers in private and public sector organizations perceive the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement. Our selection of managers was refined by geography to Sweden, mainly reaching out to managers in Umeå to allow for the possibility of face-to-face interviews to take place. We also included some managers who worked in other locations in Sweden. Most of the managers that we contacted via email worked for companies where we had contacts, either with the manager or with another employee in the company that could give us a recommendation. This is a technique recommended by Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 428), to use contacts you already have in order to gain access to the participants you need for your study.

3.8.2 Qualitative Interviewing

There are various kinds of interviews that researchers can choose to use in a study. Interviews may be strictly formalized and structured where each question is standardized and asked in the same way to each respondent, or interviews may be informal and more conversation-like (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 311). Structured interviews, also referred to as quantitative research interviews, are based on standardized questionnaires that include a set of questions that are identical, usually also containing predetermined coded responses, where these questions are read to each

respondent in the exact way that they are written (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 312). In contrast, the interview methods used for qualitative research are semi-structured and unstructured interviews. These interviews are not standardized and will rather than having each question spelled out be centered around some themes that can vary between interviews (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 312).

For this particular study semi-structured interviews were suitable as we wanted to cover managers' perceptions of the influences that our identified motivational factors have on employee engagement. These questions were outlined in an interview guide, and they were of an open-ended nature which allowed some freedom in the way respondents chose to answer the questions. As mentioned by Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 467) in semi-structured interviews it is common to let the order of the questions be determined by the flow of the conversation between the interviewer and the respondent, but overall keeping a similar structure and wording of the questions in the interviews. The focus of the interviews were on the point of view of the managers being interviewed, and thus additional questions that are not outlined in our interview guide could arise as we were conducting the interviews depending on what the manager found to be relevant and of importance. The goal of conducting semi-structured interviews was the generation of more in-depth, detailed answers which suits our purpose of developing a deeper understanding of our chosen topic.

3.8.3 Interview Guide

Because we made the choice of conducting semi-structured interviews, we have developed a list of specific questions that should be covered in these interviews. This list is referred to as an interview guide (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 467). The interview guide is a helpful tool in semi-interviews as it can aid researchers to organize their thoughts and formulate interview questions that are non-leading, and that ultimately help to answer the research question (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 475).

Based on our theoretical framework and the topic of our thesis we started the development of our interview guide by discerning two general themes that we wanted to include in the guide; intrinsic motivational factors and engagement, and extrinsic motivational factors and engagement. The interviews were prefaced with an introduction to our study and the key concepts, including our definitions of work motivation and employee engagement. Based on the general themes we developed some introductory, more general questions that we would ask at the beginning of the interviews, including an introduction to the organization and the manager and how they generally motivate and engage the employees within the organization. We then continued with the questions regarding the motivational factors and how managers perceive their influence on employee engagement, adapting them to fit the different aspects of each motivational factor that we chose to include. We made sure to use a language that was comprehensible and relevant to our participants, and avoided using concepts that were too technical as recommended by Saunders et al. (2007, p. 324).

A testing of the interview guide was conducted before any of the scheduled interviews took place in order to see what kinds of responses it would generate. This testing was conducted through video chat via Skype, interviewing a manager from a private organization that one of us previously worked for. This was very useful as it allowed us to make some adjustments to the interview guide, and provided us with an estimation of

how long the interviews would be. The interview guide we used during the interviews can be found in appendix 1.

3.8.4 Qualitative Data Collection Process

There are various ways in which researchers may conduct semi-structured interviews, such as face-to-face, via telephone, or via electronic means such as the Internet (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 313). Each of these methods will have certain advantages and disadvantages that researchers have to consider before deciding what methods to use. In face-to-face interviewing the researcher is able to establish personal contact with the participant, and is given the possibility to note any nonverbal behavior that may be pertinent to the data collection (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 342). The drawbacks are that it may be costly and more time consuming due to distance; which are the mentioned advantages of telephone and electronic interviewing where access can be easier, costs are normally lower, and higher speed (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 341-342). However, a researcher will lose the personal contact that can be established during face-to-face interviews through using these methods, as well as the nonverbal aspects of an interview (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 342). As mentioned previously we primarily reached out to managers in Umeå in order to allow for face-to-face interviewing, and we did so because we believe that establishing personal contact with the managers could yield more open and personal answers which would be preferable as we are aiming to develop a deeper understanding. We were both present during the interviews, which can add value to a semi-structured interview as both researchers are then able to ask follow-up questions and interpret what is being said during the interview as well as the way in which it is being said (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 206).

Date	Manager	Sector	Location	Length of Interview
20160408	1	Public	Manager's office	1 hour 13 minutes
20160411	2	Private	Manager's office	50 minutes
20160411	3	Private	Skype interview	49 minutes
20160413	4	Private	Manager's office	46 minutes
20160414	5	Public	Manager's office	52 minutes
20160414	6	Private	Skype interview	45 minutes
20160426	7	Public	Manager's office	1 hour 3 minutes
20160427	8	Public	Manager's office	47 minutes

Table 2. Overview of interviews.

Two of the interviews were conducted via Skype due to distance. As for the interviews that were conducted face-to-face in Umeå, we allowed the managers to choose the location for the interview to make it as convenient for them as possible. Saunders et al. (2007, p. 321) mention that the location of the interview has the possibility to influence

the data that is being collected. It is particularly important that the location is convenient to the participants, and that it is in an environment that is comfortable to them and where the likelihood of disturbance is low (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 321). In all of the interviews this place was the office of the respective manager.

We audio-recorded all of our semi-structured interviews with the consent of the interviewees. Audio-recording interviews imply that we also had to transcribe our collected audio recordings, to reproduce the interviews into written words (Saunders et al., 2007, p. 475). As researchers we are not only interested in what is being said, but also in what way it is being said as well as any accompanying non-linguistic behavior, which is why things such as sighs, coughs, and tone of voice should be included in the transcription (Flick, 2004, p. 248; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 475). Transcription of interviews allow for a more thorough examination of what participants said, and it is an important part of the following scientific analysis (Flick, 2004, p. 248; Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 481).

The interviews were conducted in English, which the interviewees were informed of in the initial email that was sent asking for their participation. All of the participating managers but one were of Swedish nationality, where one was American but had lived and worked in Sweden for many years. Thus the native language of most managers was Swedish, but after careful consideration we made the decision of conducting our interviews in English. The advantage of conducting the interviews in English is that the transcriptions do not need translating, which in turn will allow us to avoid potential issues that can arise in the translation process (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 488). On the other hand it can be questioned whether we got the most exhaustive answers as the interviews were not conducted in the first language of the managers, but we deemed their level of English to be sufficient in order to answer our questions.

3.8.5 Presentation and Analysis of Qualitative Data

We made the choice to present the collected empirical material according to the main themes of our thesis, which is in line with manner in which we structured our analysis according to the developed thematic network. We begin by presenting the managers' general perceptions of motivation and engagement in their respective organizations, and then moved on to present the managers' perceptions of the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors on employee engagement, going through each of our identified factors. Quotations from the interviews were used when presenting the material, as it is our aim to convey accurate perceptions of the managers and to present the material in a way that is interesting. We have also chosen to include quotes to enhance the trustworthiness of our research, as suggested by Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 702).

Qualitative interviewing can quickly generate a large amount of information, and if it is to yield results that are useful it is pertinent that this collected material is analyzed in a proper way (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 386). There are several techniques of analyzing qualitative interviews, however they are not as standardized as the methods used to analyze quantitative data (Flick, 2004, p. 253; Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 571). Some of the more common methods of analysis are the analytic induction, thematic analysis, and grounded theory (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 574). We chose to analyze our collected empirical material using a thematic analysis, facilitated by a thematic network; a web-

like illustration summarizing the main themes that construct a piece of research (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 385).

A thematic network is explained as a way in which a thematic analysis of qualitative data can be organized, by discerning different level themes of the collected data and structuring these in a network (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 387). The analysis starts by distinguishing the lowest level themes, the so called basic themes; simple characteristics of the qualitative data that say little about the context of a text in isolation, but must be read together with other basic themes to make sense beyond its direct meaning (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389). These basic themes are then divided into middle level themes called organizing themes, with the purpose of organizing the basic themes into groups that refer to similar issues (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389). The organizing themes are more indicating of the context of a text as they are broader and more abstract than the basic themes, summarizing the issues of groups of basic themes (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389). Attride-Stirling (2001, p. 389) further writes that the purpose of the organizing themes is also to form clusters of themes that form the highest level themes; the global themes. The global themes of a qualitative analysis are highest level themes that represent the principal meanings of a study; they summarize the groups of lower level themes and communicate what the text is about in its entirety (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 389).

Attride-Stirling (2001, p. 390) suggests a three stage process when conducting a thematic network analysis. First, there is a breakdown of the collected textual data in order to code the material and identify the themes and construct the network. The second stage is describing and exploring the network, in order to summarize the characterizing patterns (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 394). The third and final stage is to integrate the exploration, and to interpret the patterns that emerged during the exploration (Attride-Stirling, 2001, p. 394).

In our study, the basic themes are coded statements made by the managers in private and public sector organizations regarding their perceptions of the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement. These themes are then divided into the organizing themes, which are the different motivational factors we identified in our study. Finally, these organizing themes are divided into the two global themes of intrinsic motivational factors and engagement, and extrinsic motivational factors and engagement, which represent the core of this thesis.

3.8.6 Ethical Considerations

Ethical issues are a very important aspect of conducting research and there is a need for all researchers to be aware of them (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. xxxvii). Dealing with matters of research ethics is very sensitive in qualitative research (Flick et al., 2004, p. 333), and these matters may arise at various stages of business and management research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 122; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 162). These issues cannot be ignored, because they relate directly to the integrity of the research and all the disciplines involved (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 122). Researchers have to be aware of the issues involved so that they can make informed decisions about the implications of the choices they make (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). Bryman and Bell (2011, p. 128) mention four main ethical principles; harm to participants, lack of informed consent,

invasion of privacy, and deception. All of these principles were considered as we conducted our study.

First of all, harm to participants can involve different kinds of harm, such as physical harm, stress, and harm to self-esteem (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). It is the responsibility of the researcher to carefully assess the possibility of harm to research participants, and this possibility of harm should be minimized (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 128). Researchers must do everything they can in order to ensure that research participants are in no way directly harmed or affected as a result of their participation in a research project (Zikmund et al., 2012, p. 92; Collis & Hussey, 2013, p. 32). The issue of harm also includes maintaining confidentiality and anonymity; when participants are given the opportunity to remain anonymous, researchers assure them that they will not be identified with any of the opinions they express (Collis & Hussey, 2013, p. 32-33). The interviews in this research are conducted in controlled spaces, making sure that no physical harm will come to any of the participants. Confidentiality has been taken into consideration when conducting the interviews, and if any information is made public, it is done only with the consent of the research participant which they were informed of before the interview, otherwise all personal information should be maintained confidential. In this research, each interviewee has also been assigned a number in the presentation of the empirical information.

The second area is lack of informed consent. Informed consent explains that the research participant has a clear understanding of what the researcher wants him or her to do and consents to the research study due to the fact that he or she is able to take an informed decision of whether or not they wish to participate in a study (Zikmund et al., 2012, p. 89). However, informing participants too much can lead to them answering in a biased way, or completely abstaining from answering (Collis & Hussey, 2013, p. 34; Flick et al., 2004, p. 201). Therefore, informed consent should be at a relative balance between under-informing and over-informing participants in order for them to be able to accept or reject the offer of participating in a study (Orb et al. 2000, p. 95). The interviewees of this research project were informed to a full extent of the objectives of the research and have willingly accepted our request to interview them. All of them received information at the beginning of the interviews, including the question of whether or not they accepted to be recorded during the interview, and recordings were only used if the participant agreed.

The issue of invasion of privacy refers to the degree to which invasion of privacy can be accepted (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136; Flick et al., 2004, p. 335). People believe that the compilation and distribution of their personal information is a serious violation of their privacy (Zikmund et al., 2012, p. 100). It is the responsibility of the researcher to protect the privacy of the participants in his or her study (Collis & Hussey, 2013, p. 35). Even though the notion of privacy is linked to the notion of informed consent, this does not mean that the participant abrogates the right to privacy completely by providing informed consent (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). In regards to interviews, participants may sometimes refuse to answer questions, often based on the grounds that certain questions dive into their privacy or cover areas that they might find sensitive or too private to make public (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). Since it is impossible to know beforehand whether or not an individual will or will not be affected by sensitive or particular topics, it is recommended that researchers treat each individual case

sensitively, giving all respondents the opportunity to withdraw if they so please (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136). This is why every participant in this study was treated as a new and sensitive case. During the interviews, the interviewee boundaries were respected and in the case that the interviewee abstained from answering a certain question, this choice was respected and the interview proceeded with the following questions.

The last ethical issue that we considered in our study is deception. Deception occurs when “researchers represent their research as something other than what it is” (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 136), and should be minimized in research and its effects dealt with as much as possible (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 137). The potential for deception in a research is either through lies or through behavior that is misleading (Collis & Hussey, 2013, p. 32). One big reason why deception should be avoided is because if business researchers would be known for being deceptive, their image would be affected both among internal and external stakeholders, making it hard to find financial support and future cooperation (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 137-138). The issue of deception was reduced in this study by completely informing the participants of the subject of the study and why they were being interviewed. When the interviewees were initially contacted via email a brief description of the study was provided to each of them. Further, at the beginning of the interview a more detailed description of the study was provided, and further questions regarding the understanding of the study were encouraged in order to make sure that the participants understood the purpose of the research, and the reasons why they were chosen to be a part of the study.

4. Empirical Study

In this chapter of the thesis we will present the collected empirical information. We will present the material according to the themes of our study, starting with a more general discussion of employee engagement, moving on to the intrinsic and extrinsic motivational factors and their perceived influence on engagement.

4.1 Motivation and Engagement

We initially asked the managers how they engage their employees, and how they perceive that their employees act when they are engaged. Many of the managers said that when they perceive that employees are engaged the employees enjoy their work and have fun in their work roles, at the workplace, and when they are getting more out of their work: *“If you think your job is fun, and if you think that your job is meaningful, then you become much more engaged. If you are doing the same work but you are getting so much more out of it, both for yourself and for our working teams”* (1). In contrast, it was mentioned by managers that when an employee is disengaged that employee will simply do what he or she is told but nothing more; a disengaged employee will not voluntarily perform additional tasks or take on roles that are not formally outlined: *“When someone is not engaged they just do what they have to do, barely, and go home. So I think that is the best measurement, someone is just really engaged and interested, takes initiative and seems to enjoy what they are doing”* (3). Some of the managers mentioned that it is also possible to feel when employees are engaged by the atmosphere at the workplace, because when they are engaged they show more feelings, they are more creative in their work, and they are generally more productive and eager to get things done: *“When you are engaged you show feelings... So engaged [employees] can be happy, sad, angry, and so on”* (8). Another manager said: *“You can actually feel it when people are feeling well and they are [engaged], they get more creative solutions... When you walk through the office, if it is feels like there is something cooking everywhere, or if it feels like nothing happens. So it is quite obvious to read”* (7).

Many of the managers also perceived that clarity is important in the engagement of the employees, in areas such as setting and communicating clear goals and outlining clear responsibilities and boundaries for employees. When employees have the basics in place, such as what their tasks and goals are, what budget they have, and who their manager is, then they are more comfortable and can think further in their work because they do not feel the need to think about the basic things: *“I know that a good way to engage people is to have a clear vision and a mission, and set goals and strategies”* (4). One of the managers said: *“You need a good foundation with the values of the company, the philosophy, the leadership policy, the clear vision strategy and target, to be understood and communicated”* (5). In connection to clarity of tasks, goals, and responsibilities, one of the managers mentioned that when employees start asking fewer questions about these things, that is generally because they feel comfortable in their position and they are engaged in their work: *“[The employees] know what we are doing, what their goal is, they know what they have to work with and they know who to ask if something is not working... When I start getting fewer and fewer questions from someone then that is because, most of the time, they feel confident about what they are doing and they are confident that they have my support”* (1).

Understanding the employees' personal goals and aspirations was another aspect that many managers believed to be important for the engagement of their employees. If a manager can understand employees' drivers and what keeps them motivated at work, they are better able to fulfill the needs that their employees have in order to influence their engagement levels positively. One manager stated: *"Just to understand what drives do they have for coming to work and how do I fulfill their needs for challenge. So therefore I need to, I try to anyway, get to know my employees very well in that aspect. In what kind of drives do they have. What keeps them going, why do they get up in the morning"* (6). Another manager said: *"Whatever people are working on, like their job role, that is related to what do they want to achieve, what are their career goals, what do they want to learn and why do they want to do that. I think that is quite important to understand that, not to just put someone in the job and let them work but try to understand what are their motivations and aspirations"* (3). Further, it was argued by managers that the employees' individual and personal goals should be aligned with those of the organization as a whole. Common goals can make employees feel as though they are making a contribution to the success of the organization, while still working on their own goals, which will be engaging: *"The trick is, I think, to have these common goals, so you can have something where you can feel that you can contribute to the greater good"* (7).

Managers also mentioned productivity and an eagerness to work as one of the things they notice in their employees when they perceive that they are engaged: *"They are focused on their work and they are not in a hurry to leave work for the day. What they accomplish is with high quality, basically. And they are quick to respond to questions from customers"* (4). In connection to productivity, some managers mentioned that when their employees are engaged they will be less distracted by other things in the workplace, but rather focused and invested in the tasks they are performing at work. For example, one manager mentioned the physical work environment: *"As a boss when you start getting those kinds of questions about why do they have that kind of computer, why do they get that mobile phone and I got this one, that is a sign they are not engaged... Because now they are really just focused on these things that in the end, what is the difference?"* (1). Similarly, some managers mentioned that social media usage at work could be a sign of lack in engagement as the focus of the employees will be somewhere else: *"[The employees] try to do as much as they can during the work day, and do not start going off to Facebook and disappearing in non work-related stuff. They want to deliver good quality and make the customers happy and people proud of what they do"* (4).

When questioning managers on motivation and employee engagement and the more general aspects of the concepts, no major differences in the perceptions of managers of public and private sector organizations could be observed. Merely mild differences between the individual managers were found, where different aspects of general motivation and engagement in employees were emphasized, but when looking at the perceptions of public and private managers as groups these differences did not exist.

4.2 Intrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement

We will now introduce the collected information on how managers perceive that the intrinsic factors included in this study influence the engagement of their employees. The factors are relationships with co-workers, relationships with managers, and employee well-being.

4.2.1 Relationships with Coworkers

When asked about employees' relationships with other coworkers and how this influences employee engagement, the informal aspects of the relationships were emphasized. When employees are more familiar with one another on a personal level, they are more comfortable at work and can have fun together. One manager mentioned that they had tried to encourage employees to work in informal groups, as when employees volunteer themselves it generally means that they are engaged: *"I have been trying to get people to work in informal groups. So that nobody has to feel like they are doing something alone. They can make that content and informally, instead of me always having to dictate, and I find generally if people themselves volunteer then they are more engaged"* (1). Relating to informality, most managers said they perceived the personal relationships between employees to be of particular importance to their engagement. Most managers mentioned regular team talks as a way of engaging employees, by ventilating potential frustrations and problems that may exist in work teams and groups: *"We commonly have what we call "team days", so every maybe two or three months we would sit down together the whole team and discuss how things were going... and to ventilate frustrations that may exist between different team members"* (3). Some managers also mentioned team building and other activities outside of work in order to improve the relationships between employees, and in turn letting them get to know each other on a more personal level: *"[The teams] have a small budget to go out and have some beers or play some pool or whatever, to do some team building just for the team"* (4). Another manager said: *"We always do stuff to try to work on these things... we make some trips together, we have dinners together, and so on"* (2).

We also asked the managers how they perceive that working in teams and employees collaborating with one another influence the engagement of their employees, where the managers all perceived it has a positive effect. When employees work together and collaborate, they interact with each other and form important relationships that contribute to their engagement and well-being at work as they form a sense of belonging to the team: *"I think that interaction, almost 100% of people like to interact and I think that is a learning and expressing themselves in groups and things like that, I think it is really important for most of the people to be in a group that they feel great to be in. And, it is definitely a key to engagement. Especially if you set groups goals and then you can work together to reach the goals"* (2). In connection to this, another manager said: *"I think it is important that you have a team, so you have some kind of closer colleagues... you have to have a smaller group that you can really connect to and that you can have your day to day relation with"* (7). Besides the social and interactive aspect of working in teams and collaborating, some of the managers also mentioned the professional aspect of teamwork. For example, teamwork can add more speed in a project or process, which in turn can be engaging for the employees when they see that working together with other employees creates efficiency and productivity: *"I can send it to my colleague to have a look and then I learn more from getting that feedback. And*

also, for being in a team where you feel that there is more speed in the project, I also think creates more engagement” (4). Another manager linked it to processes in the organization: *“In order to have a process with a high level of performance you need teamwork, all the knowledge we have put in needs to cooperate... So teamwork is a key”* (5).

4.2.2 Relationships with Managers

Managers were then asked how they perceive that their way of managing and leading their employees influences the engagement of employees. Many of the managers emphasized balancing the personal and professional relationships that they develop with their employees in order to enhance engagement. The interviewees clarified that if a manager is always formal and develops no personal relationship to employees, employees may simply wait for the manager to tell them what to do and how to do it, expressing little engagement in their work. However, if a manager is too focused on the personal relationships, employees’ professional obligations may become unclear or forgotten, which also would be disengaging. It was also mentioned by many of the managers that the professional/personal balance depends on the situation. One manager stated: *“I think if you can find the right level of being the one standing in front, if you find the right level that will enhance the engagement, if you are just standing in the back, they will stop listening to you, you cannot really inspire them, standing behind them. But also always being in the front, always pointing at people, you would not get engagement, they would be waiting for you to tell them what to do. So it is about finding the balance between when you are going to be in the front and when you are going to stand in the back”* (6). Another manager said: *“I would say that I will combine both [formal and informal managing] depending on the situation. You need to adapt the leadership to the situation you are in”* (5).

Some of the managers believed in the importance of a manager to be inspirational, and to demonstrate traits in their leadership style that they want to pass on to their employees. By being a role model for their employees, and by being engaged themselves and expressing this engagement in various ways, they can influence the engagement of their employees. One manager said: *“By walking around and being present, I think that if you do that and if you are a kind, generous and happy person, I think that your employees will get the same after a while. I try to inspire people by being because I am inspired myself, and trying to pass it forward in some kind of way”* (2). Similarly, another manager stated: *“I would say that I am quite positive, enthusiastic and engaged. From just being enthusiastic and interested, I think that in turn creates a lot of engagement”* (4). One manager mentioned that it is also important to be consistent as a manager in order for employees to be more comfortable. If the employees know what reaction to expect from managers, they will feel safer and more inclined to take on extra role behavior: *“You should be predictable, that is very important as a manager. So that everyone can trust and know how I will act, then they can relax themselves”* (7).

We then asked the managers about their communication with their employees and how it influences engagement. Similarly to the leadership styles adopted, many of the managers said that it is about finding a balance between more formal communication and an informal communication in order to engage employees. Again, it was emphasized that it depends on the situation, and that sometimes as a manager you have

to be formal and strict, whereas other times you can have a discussion with employees which creates a better dialogue: *“You need to find a balance. There are times when I have to be more formal, I have let people go. I cannot joke that away. Sometimes you get disappointed, people are doing the wrong things, you have to be correct in the way you address it. There are times when you need to be formal, then you have to stand up and be a leader that is serious about what they do. And you cannot lose your seriousness, but at the same time you can keep your humor”* (6). Another manager said: *“[Communication] will always be different in different roles, which means that I cannot be too informal... I feel like I should keep some distance actually, because then that is safe for them as well as for me”* (7).

Many managers further mentioned that they have an open door policy and that they have worked to create open and more informal communication where employees should feel comfortable to discuss both personal and professional issues with them. This open communication was mentioned as being a way of developing trusting and supportive relationships with between managers and employees, and vice versa, which they all believed to be of importance for employee engagement. One manager stated: *“I think [an open communication] is one of the parts that leads to that everyone can have their say and no one is afraid to speak up if something is wrong, if they have ideas on how we could do better”* (4). Another manager said: *“I think [trust and support] creates safety. And if you can feel safe then I think you can be more true to what you are doing. And that creates more informal and true communication”* (8). It was also mentioned that this open communication should be of a two-way nature, that both parties should provide open communication in order to maximize the positive effect on engagement: *“I try to be quite humble and have [communication] as a two-way street, so is there anything that I can differ, is there anything I can do better, and not just tell them what to do. So if they have some opinions on my performance those are very welcome. And I think that sets a good atmosphere, I think it makes people more, have a more trusting relationship”* (3).

All managers agreed that communication is key to engagement, and some said that feedback whether it is positive or negative and handled in a respectful manner influences engagement positively. The key point is to make sure the employees feel as though their suggestions and concerns have been heard and respected, that the manager has listened, and if they get a negative response that they understand why they are getting that response. One manager stated: *“I think people are prepared to accept a negative answer as long as they felt like they were heard and got a fair chance to say what they wanted to say... if they get a negative response to something, as long as I have handled this negative response in a way where they feel like their views were respected and so forth that they will still be engaged in what they are going to do. But if I gave them a response where they felt like they were not respected then that will negatively affect their engagement much more and it may even be so that they actively work against it, or what the goal is”* (1). Another manager summed it up as: *“I think feedback is, if it is said in the right way, it is constructive, I think feedback always is good”* (8). Beyond an open communication with employees, one of the managers also mentioned that trusting employees with decision making and responsibilities can be engaging as it builds trusting and supportive relationships: *“I like to believe that if you trust people they trust you back. So building trust by not being there and distrusting and checking up on people too often, but more trust them to do their job... I try to give them a lot of*

responsibility and not try to steer them too much, and more let them be responsible. So not to supervise them too much, but to trust them that they do their job, basically” (4).

4.2.3 Employee Well-Being

We then asked the managers about employee well-being, and how it affects employee engagement. For the physical well-being of their employees, most managers expressed interest in their employees by providing them with extra money or an hour a week off work for physical activities in order for them to feel physically well and healthy: *“I give them a contribution of 2000 crowns a year to buy a gym card or whatever, to keep [my employees] fit and healthy. The wellbeing in a physical way” (6).* Another manager mentioned: *“We have this friskvårdstimme, one hour a week. That is for [the employees’] own physical health” (7).* The supporting relationships and team building were mentioned by some of the managers in connection to the emotional well-being of the employees. Emotional well-being can be improved by making the employees feel like they have the support they need during difficult or stressful times, both from the manager, the team, and the organization as a whole: *“If life happens, if life goes wrong and you get sick, then you have to have a lot of support from the work, and from the managers, and from your work colleagues in the group” (8).* One of the managers also said: *“To have these one-to-one talks and have the team reviews, I think that’s very good for the emotional side [of well-being]” (3).*

Almost all of the managers perceived a work-life balance to be of importance to the engagement of their employees, and mentioned that having too much or too little to do at work can cause stress for the employees, which will be detrimental for emotional well-being and engagement. Further, a lot of the managers mentioned that it is particularly difficult in today’s society with the pressure of social media and digitalization; feeling a pressure that you always have to be connected, which can interfere with your engagement at work. One of the managers said: *“I think it is especially difficult [to find a balance] nowadays, because we have [cell phones] and [computers] which are always up and going” (8).* Another manager had made similar observations and stated: *“People are getting more stressed and that is in the society in general. I think it is a mix between digital stress, you know, always being online, always have your smartphone ready for someone to call or mail or send you a message, that develops stress... There are a lot of stressful things that goes on in the world right now and I think it affects people very much” (6).* One of the managers brought up the issue of positive stress and how it can be a greater threat to well-being among employees because it is not as easy to notice. When employees are engaged and interested in their jobs they can take on additional responsibilities, they can work more than they are required to, and eventually it can get to a point where it becomes negative. The manager stated: *“Many times you talk about the negative stress, but I would say the positive stress is more dangerous, because if you have a negative stress you probably will acknowledge the symptoms much earlier... You are getting further into the tunnel before the roof caves in on you” (5).*

Some of the managers also mentioned that the appropriate workload is individual and differs between the employees, and that it sometimes can be tied to engagement in their work roles. One manager said: *“The workload is quite interesting, because that is also individual, because how much is too much and how little is too little... I think if you do the right things, the things that motivate you, then you can do a lot. But if you do things*

you do not like or things that you do not agree that they are important to do or something else that you do not really think you have the competence or the tools to do, then [a little] will be overwhelming” (7).

Some of the managers reflected on that they can only influence so much in their employees’ work-life balance. Life outside of work is a large part of the work-life balance, and when things happen in an employee’s personal life only the workload can be adjusted from a managerial point of view. One manager stated: *“One reflection I can have there is that I can only influence so much. I mean theoretically we are only at work eight hours per day and the other 16 hours are spent outside the workplace. Of course that has a large influence on engagement” (1).* Beyond keeping an eye on how much employees work it was also mentioned by some managers that managers can influence the employees’ balance through setting a good example, for example by going home from work in time themselves and to not involve employees in work related activities if they happen to work late themselves. One manager said: *“It is a matter of what kind of signal you send as a leader as well, because the other person will follow you” (5).* Another one stated: *“Try to make some people go home, because [some employees] would stay here all night if you do not tell them to go home and to have a life. It is a management thing, but it is also a responsibility for the individual too, to try to make sure that it is in a pretty good balance” (2).* One of the managers mentioned that they introduced the opportunity for employees to work a lower number of hours per day in order for employees to manage their balance: *“Some people work 6 hours a day, some people work 7 hours. Their salaries are lowered by that amount as well... I think that from that lesser number of hours, they are more effective and they get a better balance” (4).*

Regarding intrinsic motivational factors and engagement, the managers in private and public sector organizations did not differ in their perceptions of the influence of intrinsic motivation on employee engagement. The managers had different methods in order to intrinsically motivate their employees, but again these differences existed between the individual managers and were no longer relevant when looking at the perceptions of managers in private and public sector organizations as groups. Overall, the perceptions of how intrinsic motivation influences employee engagement were similar between all the managers.

4.3 Extrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement

In this section we will introduce the collected information on how managers perceive that the extrinsic factors included in this study influence the engagement of the employees in their organization. The extrinsic motivational factors included are work environment, training and career development, compensation, and organizational policies.

4.3.1 Work Environment

When we questioned the managers about the work environment we specifically asked them about aspects of job design such as autonomy and variety in tasks and skills and how this influences engagement. We also asked about the physical work environment, where many of the managers replied that they have regular visits from different agencies in order to check if the physical work environment is beneficial for all the employees and that they are frequently updating the equipment. It is necessary that the

work equipment is safe, and also that each employee has the work equipment that they need to perform their respective jobs, or engagement can be negatively affected. *“I am responsible for making sure they have all the equipment that they need to do their work properly and safely, making sure they are well informed about all the security and safety rules... Once a year we have the occupational health group here, the “företagshälsovård”, come and do an ergonomical inspection so they check the lighting and the air temperature, and the desks and the monitors”* (1). Another manager mentioned: *“Everyone has computers, one or two screens, and a desk that can be heightened and lowered. And we do regular check-ups on the work place environment, so no one gets sore necks, shoulders and arms, because that is quite common in our line of work, because we are just hammering on the keyboard”* (4).

Regarding autonomy and decision making and how it influences engagement in employees, all managers thought the ability of an employee to make decisions is an important factor in employee engagement. It was mentioned that allowing employees to make decisions in their work is one way that managers can give back the power to the employees and provide them with freedom, which can be engaging when they feel like they have the ability to affect. Many managers further mentioned a link to personal investment; that an employee through making decisions and influencing what is happening in the organization can feel personally invested and thus more engaged. One manager said: *“I think the more they are able to see they have flexibility in how they do the work then they become more engaged... if they have actually picked out the method to perform the task then they have a personal investment”* (1). Similarly, another manager mentioned: *“That is one of the issues we are constantly discussing; how do we get one another to feel strongly enough for the tasks, for the problems they are about to solve, so they can make the right decisions by themselves”* (6).

However, it was also mentioned that it has to be the right amount of autonomy and decision making power, and that this appropriate amount depends on the individual employee. Some employees are not decision makers by nature, and are thus not engaged by having the opportunity or responsibility to make decisions: *“If you are not in any way a decision maker, you probably just do what you are asked and nothing more than that”* (4). Other times it may be insecurities or risk aversion that is holding the employee back from taking decisions despite that they would like to, and in that case employees may have to be pushed to take decisions in order to learn what they can do: *“I think when people say, I want to have the influence, I want to be able to plan my work, I want to have the ability, or possibility, to come with ideas... If I provide you with this type of freedom to plan your work, then you also have to accept it and deal with your own feelings, how should I do this, and dare to take the decisions you are actually allowed to take”* (7).

It was also emphasized that employees must be provided with the right tools to make these decisions, because if they do not feel as though they have the tools to make the decisions they will feel more insecure and it will not influence engagement positively: *“If you are a little bit unsure of what the rules are or what tools you have then your engagement becomes less because you are a little bit scared, so it is a lot about confidence building. If you do not know people’s confidence that they think that they can do this job and they have the tools then I think they become more engaged”* (1). Some managers also related decision making back to the clarity of rules and

responsibilities, it should be clear to employees what is out of their decision making zones but also what decisions they are allowed to and have the resources to make. One manager said: *“It is a necessity that you have very clear rules and responsibility, you need to have a set of tools in order to take decisions in your daily work. It should also be very clear for everyone what is out of their decision making zone”* (5).

When asking about variety in skills and tasks, some of the managers mentioned that a uniform environment with little variety in tasks and skills can decrease engagement in employees because they can get bored of what they are doing; some change is thus necessary for engagement: *“Almost all of perception is based on change and if nothing changed we would not perceive anything. So we as humans search out change in a lot of ways”* (1). Another manager stated: *“You need variety to feel good. If you do the same 24 hours a day, you get bored, and then you will not be motivated to do the work”* (2). With the bottom line being that employees enjoy variety in their work and it is engaging to them, similar to levels of autonomy it was mentioned that different employees prefer different degrees of variety. Whereas some employees want to be specialized in an area and perform few tasks, others want to have a wider variety: *“Most people like a variety of course... No one likes to do the exact same thing every day every time, but the level of variety is very different from people to people. The problem is to keep them enough challenges for them to develop, both as person and professional”* (6). One manager also stated: *“It depends on the personality of people. Some people like to be specialists and dig very deep and know everything about a smaller area. And some people like to be more on the overall”* (7). Additionally, some managers said that while variety in tasks and skills can be engaging, it should not be too much either or it can have an adverse effect on engagement: *“I think that could be both engaging, but it could also create stress depending on where you are. It should be just the right amount of having to switch from different job types, but not too much, that could be stressful”* (4).

4.3.2 Training and Career Development

In training and career development many managers mentioned that training and career development will increase the tools and resources that employees feel like they have, and thereby increase their engagement: *“I think it comes back to this having the right tools to do a job, and with training you can feel like you have the right tools and competency and you should feel more secure and thus more engaged in your work”* (1). It was also mentioned by some managers that employees have the ability to suggest things for their own training and development in forms of courses, conferences, and personal development goals, which is engaging as their own aspirations and personal goals are taken into account by the manager and organization: *“Every individual has the opportunity to state what they would like to have, what kind of development they would like to have... I think it can influence you in a good way if there are goals or targets that you can influence yourself”* (7). Another manager said: *“I also like everyone to feel like they have the opportunity if there is something that they feel, a course, that maybe is not related directly in that kind of concrete way but they feel for their own personal development that they have the opportunity to do that”* (1). One of the managers emphasized the fact of learning while doing, or learning on the job, can be just as stimulating as going on external trainings: *“I do not think this formal education, going to courses necessarily has to be the best one. But in order to be able to work with something, and get input when you are doing so and be able to learn as you are doing*

something, I think that can be quite valuable for people... In my experience most people get mostly motivated by learning new things on the job” (3).

The resources that relate to training and career development must however match the opportunities that are given to the employees and the job that is being performed, meaning that they must be able to use what they learn. If the provided resources do not match the work that the employee is doing or will be doing, i.e. if he or she is not able to use the new knowledge or skills at work, it can have an adverse effect on employee engagement. Similarly, if the provided resources do not lead to any career development or advancement in the organization, it may also have an adverse effect of employee engagement and in some cases lead to the loss of employees. One manager said: *“[If] you get a lot of education and things like that and you cannot move on, then it is not always good. And then if you never get some kind of opportunity to use it, then you get less engaged... You can give them a lot of education and things like that, but if they want to get a new position it is hard... Sometimes you lose good people because of that” (2).*

In general, the managers have a stable and regular performance appraisal system in their respective organizations. Some of the managers emphasized the importance of these meetings in order to get to know the employee and their personal aspirations and subsequently provide them with appropriate goals that influence engagement positively. The employees should be able to influence their goal setting to increase engagement. One manager stated: *“We set time together and try to have a really really open conversation and that is always my goal. To try to find out what my employees really want to do and what their dreams are” (2).* Another manager said: *“It also gives [the employees] an opportunity to set their own goals and to suggest things... I think it can influence you in a good way if there are goals or targets that you can influence yourself” (7).* It was also mentioned that it is important for these meetings to have an informal aspect in order for the employee to feel comfortable sharing what he or she would like to improve, but also to facilitate the goal setting for the manager: *“We have the first development meeting we call “lära känna-samtal” so that we can, try to have a meeting with the individual and not the performance. So we get to know each other, because it is very important to have that ingredient so that a meeting is as informal as it should be” (8).*

One manager mentioned that the engaging effect of performance appraisal meetings vary from employee to employee, as some employees already have a clear picture of what they have achieved since their last performance appraisal meeting, as well as what their goals are and what they need to work on. One manager said: *“For some people I think it is really important, and then actually for other people I think it is completely irrelevant... [Some employees] feel like they know where they are at and they have gotten enough feedback, they just want to work and get going” (1).* Another manager mentioned that there was no performance appraisal system in the organization, but instead they relied on more informal discussions with the employees. Some of the other managers mentioned that they also try to include these smaller meetings and discussions beyond the formal performance appraisals: *“The [meeting] that we have monthly is more about the work today and the work next week and how are we progressing, and then every six months we look at what we have been talking about in the bigger conversations twice a year. We try to follow up and see how we are making progress,*

are we going the right way, has some new things happened that we have to change the goals or things like that. It is important both for me and my employees to have these conversations” (2).

4.3.3 Compensation

When asked about the influence of financial compensation on employee engagement, many of the managers mentioned that while it can act as a part of the package, few employees are engaged exclusively by financial rewards. Many mentioned that they believe financial compensation can make employees less engaged if they feel like they are not being fairly financially compensated, for example if they receive less than another employee who is doing the same work as they are. One manager stated: *“Wages are one of these things that can have a very big negative effect if you feel like it is not just, compensated for the work you do. You get to a certain level where increasing it does not give you any more positive aspects and I see that most of the times when it comes up wage issues here or in my other employment that was really when people felt an injustice, when people felt like their wage was so much lower than other people who they felt were doing roughly the same job and had the same responsibility” (1).*

Some of the managers mentioned that financial compensation can act as a motivator in the short run but not in the long run. This is due to that employees will become adjusted to their new financial compensation after a certain amount of time. It was also mentioned that employees who are strongly motivated by financial compensation may not have the same connection to the organization and its mission, and are more likely to leave if they receive an offer with a higher level of financial compensation: *“After one year of living with a new salary you will adapt, and do not think you have enough... So you need to have something else, and I think a big part to keep the motivation is that you have growth in knowledge, growth in responsibility, and also that you understand how you are a piece in the big puzzle... If you do not have the other part with the soft values... Then my philosophy if you come for money then you will go for money” (5).* When asked about financial compensation it was also mentioned by some managers that financial compensation can result in competition and decrease the collaboration between employees as well as the creativity. Rather than sharing knowledge, employees will keep knowledge to themselves and for their own benefit, to receive the extra financial compensation: *“I find then the goal becomes to get the carrot... In a way it kind of stifles creativity because then everyone’s just interested in being first, winning” (1).* A different manager mentioned: *“If you put that kind of money focus in a company you will have people protecting their knowledge, not sharing their knowledge... Negative things I have seen with bonus programs for managers is that it is driving towards sub optimization: I reached my target, but the company target was not met” (5).*

This ties into that all managers perceived non-financial rewards as being more motivating as well as engaging for employees. Whereas financial compensation is of importance at the basic level as it is part of the package, it was mentioned that the real compensation for a lot of employees is the recognition they receive for their work and achievements, and feeling as though they are properly accredited for it. Getting the proper credit will be engaging for employees and motivate them to work and perform: *“If people do a good job then tell them they are doing a good job, and if they are helping me with something then I show my appreciation. I would say to give people recognition, that is one of the most important things you are doing as a leader and a*

manger as well is to make sure that you are giving people the recognition that they deserve... if you just have a normal salary I do not really think [financial compensation] has any influence [on engagement]. Do they believe in what we are doing, are they learning what they want to learn? Then the rest just comes naturally” (3). Some managers mentioned feedback and recognition sometimes was the only source of compensation, that there were no bonus systems or other financial compensation involved when compensating their employees for a job well done. They all believed this is, to the majority of employees, the most engaging kind of compensation. One manager said: “Sometimes [I compensate my employees] just by letting them know it is a good job. Sometimes we get people to present their jobs for the rest of the colleagues, look what we have done and this is how we did it” (6).

4.3.4 Organizational Policies

When asked about the organizational structure, most of the managers mentioned that they believe it can influence the engagement of the employees because the structure affects the flow of communication in an organization. If the structure is hierarchical the communication may be more formalized than it would be in an organization that is flatter, where employees may have direct contact with higher position managers. For this reason, most managers believed that a flat organization could be beneficial for engagement, but there should still be clearly outlined policies and processes within the structure not to cause any ambiguity. One manager stated: “I think this is one of the most crucial things that you can affect as a manager because I think it is related to how communication flows through the organization. If it is not really clear what is going on and people do not really know things then the engagement will get less because first of all it is not really clear like what is the focus... Structure is very important when looking at how the communication flowing and what are the information needs that people have” (3).

We then asked the managers if and how they integrate flexibility into organizational policies. All of the managers mentioned that they want to integrate as much flexibility as possible as they believe it affects engagement positively when they provide their employees with some freedom. One manager said: “Solving the tasks that are to be done, the order in which they are done, I like to leave that to the people who are actually going to be doing the work. I do not want to micromanage the system” (1). One manager mentioned trying to reduce rigid policies to provide employees with more flexibility: “I believe in a lot of flexibility, and in the organizations I have been in, there have not been a lot of rigid policies, bureaucracy, I mean I tried to take all of these out... I think the key thing is to, if people know like what is the purpose of what we are doing, what is the overall goals we are trying to achieve, then there will be a lot of flexibility achieving these because people understand it and they can adapt to it” (3). Similarly, another manager mentioned that rules and policies sometimes are not the best way to perform tasks, but that going against these can sometimes result in more creativity: “I usually say you must know when to break the rules, that is the key to all success in every occasion actually. There are rules to be followed, you must know when to break them. And you know what, that is the discussion we are having right now. In what way, in how many ways can we develop the exact amount of structures that we need to be, to feel safe. When we feel safe, we say I know my tasks, I know what we do, I know why we are here, I know how to do it, and how much flexibility can we have in these structures so you do not choke the organization or the creativity” (6). It was also

mentioned from one of the managers that when you provide employees with flexibility, as a manager you must be prepared that failure is a possibility: *“We have to be prepared as an organization that if we give people a lot of flexibility then we encourage them to be creative and new thinking, that means that sometimes they are going to fail and the important thing then is that we learn from that failure and go on”* (1).

Managers in private and public sector organizations had very similar point of views when answering the questions regarding extrinsic motivational factors and their influence on employee engagement. However, some managers from the public sector mentioned that because public sector organizations are financed by the government, they have a strict budget and hence, they are not able provide as much additional financial compensation as managers in private sector organizations. Despite this difference between private and public sector organizations, there were no significant differences in the perceptions between public and private sector managers and how extrinsic motivational factors, including financial compensation, influence engagement.

5. Analysis and Discussion

In this chapter we will analyze and discuss the collected qualitative data according to the global and organizing themes of our developed thematic network. Before analyzing the data, we will present our thematic network in order to provide an overview of what will be analyzed and discussed. We will conclude the chapter with an overview of the key findings that corresponds to the identified basic themes of our study.

5.1 Thematic Network

The following thematic network was generated while analyzing the data gathered from the interviews with managers in private and public sector organizations. As explained in the method, the basic themes are coded statements from the private and public sector managers regarding how they perceived the influence of the different motivational factors on employee engagement. The organizing themes were created by compiling the basic themes under a common variable, and these organizing themes could again be grouped together to form the global themes of this study.

<i>Basic Themes</i> <i>(coded statements from managers)</i>	<i>Organizing Themes</i>	<i>Global Themes</i>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 1. Personal relationships are important 2. Employees should interact and connect 3. Personal/professional balance 4. Managers should inspire 5. Open communication creates trust 6. Constructive feedback is engaging 7. Work-life balance influences stress levels 8. Support is important for well-being 9. Managers can influence the balance at work 	<p>Relationships with coworkers</p> <p>Relationships with managers</p> <p>Employee Well-Being</p>	<p>Intrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement</p>
<ol style="list-style-type: none"> 10. Work equipment should be safe 11. Making decisions creates a personal investment 12. Employees need the right tools to make decisions 13. Variety and autonomy levels depend on the individual 14. Training and development provides employees with tools 15. Employees should be able to use new knowledge and skills 16. Goals should be appropriate 17. Financial compensation should be fair 18. Financial compensation can be motivating in the short run 19. Financial compensation can stifle collaboration and creativity 20. Proper recognition and credit is important 	<p>Work Environment</p> <p>Training and Career Development Opportunities</p> <p>Compensation</p>	<p>Extrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement</p>

<p>21. Organizational structure affects the flow of communication</p> <p>22. Flexibility creates freedom</p>	<p>Organizational Policies</p>	
--	--------------------------------	--

Table 3. Thematic network.

5.2 Intrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement

The first global theme we identified in our thesis is intrinsic motivational factors and engagement. The intrinsic factors of our study, and the organizing themes of our network, are relationships with co-workers, relationships with managers, and employee well-being. Because of the similarities between the organizing themes of relationships with coworkers and relationships with managers and how they relate to theory, we will introduce the two under one heading.

5.2.1 Relationships with Coworkers and Relationships with Managers

Interpersonal relationships at work and the connections that employees are able to make has been previously identified as an important driver of employee engagement, and has been suggested to be highly valued by employees in their engagement (Robinson et al., 2004; Anitha, 2013; Wellins et al., 2005). When asking the managers about the relationships that their employees have at work, including both those with co-workers and those with managers, many managers emphasized the importance of the personal aspects of relationships and that they perceive it is important for employee engagement. This is how we distinguished the two basic themes of *personal relationships are important* regarding relationships with coworkers, and *personal/professional balance* under the organizing theme of relationships with managers. This was a common notion in the empirical findings, where it was particularly highlighted that employees need to have interaction and be able to make connections at work, and that open communication in an organization is key to developing trusting and supportive relationships. This led us to develop the basic themes of *employees should interact and connect* under relationships with coworkers, and *open communication creates trust* in connection to relationships with managers.

These basic themes relate to having good relationships at the workplace, where there is an open communication that allows for more personal relationships to be developed. This in turn creates trust, according to what managers perceive. Having good relationships at work can be connected to the belongingness needs as defined by Maslow (1943) in his hierarchy of needs; the social needs of an individual including social interaction, friendship, and affection and love. Similarly, in Alderfer's ERG theory relationships at work can be connected to the relatedness needs; the needs of individuals to create and maintain interpersonal relationships that are important to them, as well as desires relating to an employee's longing for acceptance and status (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698). Having good relationships at work, including both those with co-workers and those with managers, will thus create motivation for an employee. In addition, interpersonal justice which is a part of the organizational justice theory, concerns how employees perceive the fairness of the treatment given to them by their superiors (Greenberg, 1990, p. 411). If the employee perceives that he or she is not being treated in a fair way in his or her relationships at work, especially when compared to other employees, he or she will feel demotivated at work.

Having interpersonal relationships at work was defined as one of the contributors to psychological safety and psychological meaningfulness at work by Kahn (1990). According to Kahn (1990, p. 708) employees have a higher level of psychological safety when they feel as though they will not suffer negative consequences for their engagement at work. This is in turn related to having trusting and supportive interpersonal relationships at work, as well as having good group and intergroup dynamics, where an employee can feel safe in expressing opinions and communicating openly. Psychological safety is one of the main three drivers behind employee engagement, as was further supported by May et al. (2004, p. 33) who found that employees' feelings of psychological safety can be enhanced through building trusting, supportive relationships at work, and the usage of open communication. Further, Kahn (1990) suggests that partaking in meaningful interaction with coworkers will create psychological meaningfulness for the employee, and that meaningfulness has a strong relation to the interactions an employee has at work. The managers' perceptions that employees are more engaged when they feel safe in their relationships at work, including both relationships with managers and with coworkers, and when they can express themselves and interact and communicate openly, is thus in line with Kahn's (1990) suggestion that psychological safety and psychological meaningfulness create engagement in employees.

As previously mentioned, the importance of personal relationships was also emphasized by the managers when we questioned them about the employee-manager relationships in their respective organizations, and that there has to be a balance in the personal and professional relationships. This professional-personal balance was also mentioned by some managers regarding the communication with their employees, that an open, two-way communication is encouraged but that there still needs to be some formality in order to be clear in terms of rules and responsibilities. This relates as well to the psychological safety as defined by Kahn (1990), who states that clarity in management will influence psychological safety. May et al. (2004, p. 33) further supported the influence of management clarity on psychological safety and thus employee engagement, and wrote that management should be consistent and predictable in their actions in order to clarify expectations and create safety. Many managers agreed that *managers should inspire* employees, which creates a basic theme under relationships with managers. Regarding this, managers mentioned that in order for their employees to be more engaged, the employee has to be able to see that the managers are engaged as well. For managers being engaged involves many aspects. Employees have to see that managers are present in the everyday work. By leading by example and being a role model, being kind, happy and willing to give a helping hand in a positive and enthusiastic way, these positive traits and behaviors can be passed on to employees.

Many of the managers mentioned an open, two-way communication as a way of developing trusting and supportive manager-employee relationships at work, and that feedback whether it is positive or negative will have a positive impact on employee engagement. The statements of the managers regarding this contributed to the development of the basic theme *open communication creates trust*, and also the basic theme of *constructive feedback is engaging*. Managers mentioned that as long as feedback is handled in the correct way, and the employees feel like they have been heard, and that their suggestions or concerns have been handled with respect, even if the response is negative it will have a positive influence on engagement. As suggested in

the study of LMX by Settoon et al. (1996), the higher the extent to which exchanges and relationships are based on mutual trust and respect, the higher level of employee engagement can be expected. The LMX theory can further explain why managers stated that trust and support and an open communication is of importance to employee engagement. As stated by Deluga (1998, p. 190) high quality leader-member exchange relationships are characterized by interpersonal attraction, mutual trust, loyalty, and good communication, whereas exchange relationships of low quality generally have little informality but are rather characterized by managers who practice formal authority and employees who perform their outlined duties. Thus, when managers provide their employees with resources such as trust, support, open communication, respectful feedback, and other resources that contribute to the creation of a personal dimension to the relationship, employees will reciprocate. According to Saks (2006, p. 603), one way that employees may reciprocate is with engagement, being more engaged in their role performances at work.

Giving constructive feedback can also be related to organizational justice theory, particularly the interpersonal and informative types of justice as defined by George and Jones (2012, p. 173); when employees perceive justice in the way they are treated by managers, and the justice in the way that managers explain how they reach a decision. When employees feel like they have been heard, and their managers treat them with respect and overall fairness, this will be motivating to the employee. If there is a negative response to the suggestion or concern delivered by the employee, the manager must be careful in describing the process and reasoning used to make the decision. From this, the employee will perceive whether the response is justified, and become more or less motivated based on these perceptions.

5.2.2 *Employee Well-Being*

The third organizing theme of our network, and the last intrinsic motivational factor we included in our study, is employee well-being. In the study by Towers Perrin (2008), well-being was defined as the most valued driver of engagement by employees. Feeling good and well at work, both physically and emotionally, is also important for work motivation. This is visible when looking at the hierarchy of needs developed by Maslow (1943), where safety needs relate to the needs an employee has to feel secure and safe at work. This includes feeling secure and safe physically, referring to the physical well-being of the employee, but also the emotional safety and security in that there will be a work-life balance and a workload that is not overwhelming. In other words, a work environment that is not detrimental to health whether that is through emotional or physical stress will have a positive influence on employee motivation.

When discussing employee well-being with the managers, many managers mentioned that an appropriate work-life balance for employees has a big influence over their work engagement. The managers also mentioned that it is important to get to know the individual employee and what is the appropriate workload in each particular case. Based on what the managers said regarding the work-life balance, we distinguished the basic theme *work-life balance influences stress levels*. During the interviews, it was highlighted that the physical well-being of employees has some influence in engagement and most managers made an effort to make sure that their employees had the appropriate tools to take care of their personal physical well-being. These tools could be through providing them with extra time or money to exercise or relax.

Managers furthermore added that emotional support from the workplace is needed in stressful situations, which led to the development of the basic theme of *support is important for well-being*.

The work-life balance that an employee has is related to the psychological availability, as defined by Kahn (1990), one of the three major determining factors of employee engagement. In his developed framework, Kahn (1990, p. 714) states that an employee is able to engage his or herself in work depending on how he or she is able to cope with the various demands of work and personal life. These demands include both physical and emotional energy, and what goes on in employees' personal lives outside of work. Many of the managers mentioned that the work-life balance varies between employees, depending on how much they have going on in their personal lives, and this is something a manager must consider when determining the appropriate workload for each employee. It was also mentioned that a manager has limited abilities to influence the work-life balance of employees, as life outside of work will happen and is not controllable by managers. This was emphasized by managers, as they mention that nowadays technology is advancing very fast, and it is easier for individuals to bring work home than it was before. Managers mentioned that stress levels are increasing among employees because of the pressure to be available online that exists in society. Formerly, it was easier for managers to control how much work their employees would take home whereas now, even if managers do not want their employees to work more than eight hours a day, they do not have authority over this anymore.

During the interviews, managers referred to their own abilities in the matter of work-life balance and this is reflected in the basic theme of *managers can influence the balance at work*. The importance of employees' work-life balance and managers ability to adjust it if needed for the emotional and physical well-being of their employees is further supported in the findings of May et al. (2004, p. 33), who state that managers should avoid overloading their employees with work related demands in order to improve employees' perceptions of psychological availability. Psychological availability in turn is the third major contributor to employee engagement as found by Kahn (1990) and May et al. (2004). The fact that many managers provide their employees with support for both their physical well-being but also for their emotional well-being, and that they perceive it has a positive effect on employee engagement, can be explained by the POS and LMX theories. Many of the managers mentioned that they provide support for their employees, both for their physical and their emotional well-being. As mentioned previously, for the physical well-being, some managers mentioned that they have organizational policies in place where the employees are provided with extra money or time to take care of their physical health. This is on behalf of the organization and will influence the employees' perceived organizational support positively. When employees receive resources from their organization it creates an obligation on them to reciprocate. Even if the employee perceives that it is the manager who provides them with these beneficial resources, Rhoades and Eisenberger (2002, p. 698) suggest that because the manager acts on behalf of the organization as a representative it will still increase the perceived organizational support. The exchange relationship that emerges can, according to Saks (2006), influence employee engagement positively, as employees can reciprocate through higher levels of engagement, and become more productive.

5.3 Extrinsic Motivational Factors and Engagement

The second global theme we identified was extrinsic motivational factors and engagement. This theme includes the organizing themes of work environment, training and career development, compensation, and organizational policies.

5.3.1 Work Environment

The first extrinsic motivational factor is the work environment, where we chose to specifically focus on the physical work environment and employees' job design including autonomy and involvement in decisions, which has been found to be important for engagement from the perspectives of employees (Harter et al., 2002). The first basic theme that was found under work environment is that *work equipment should be safe*. All the managers agreed that the physical work environment is something that is in constant vigilance and improvement. Without a safe work environment, employees will not perform their job or tasks to the best of their abilities because a basic need will be in demand of fulfillment. Maslow (1943) mentions that one of the needs that human beings always seek to satisfy is safety needs. According to George and Jones (2012, p. 161), safety needs can be described as the need an individual has for a safe environment, which can be directly translated to safe working conditions. In ERG theory, safety needs are comprised in most basic group of needs, existence needs. According to these theories, something that managers need to take into consideration is that once a need is satisfied it will no longer be a source of motivation to the employee (Maslow, 1943, p. 375). However, as mentioned by the managers on several occasions during the interviews, the work environment is something that will always need improvement as it is affected by technology, and as a consequence, we can conclude that the improvement of the work environment will always be a source of extrinsic motivation for employees.

The second basic theme that we deduced from what the managers said about the work environment is *making decisions creates a personal investment*. In general, managers mentioned that when their employees have the ability to make decision, and when they make decisions, they feel more connected with the job or task they are performing, which in turn influences engagement in a positive way. If the employees do not feel that they can contribute to the job or task they are performing, they feel disconnected and hence, engagement and motivation will be lacking. Managers mentioned that sometimes employees do not want to make their own decisions even if they are allowed to, and this is forthwith related to expectancy theory. This theory explains that employees only will be motivated to contribute with their inputs and make decisions if they believe that the result will achieve a given level of performance (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). Thus, as some managers also mentioned, if employees are not given the right tools for them to feel safe to make decisions, they will not be motivated to do so, and obtain an unwanted or negatively valent outcome. This leads us to the third basic theme we distinguished; *employees need the right tools to make decisions*. According to instrumentality in expectancy theory, if employees do not find that their decision making will lead to desired outcomes in the future, they will not feel motivated to perform the given task or job at hand. George and Jones (2012, p. 166) mention that instrumentalities that are high are effective employee motivators. The interviewed managers are in agreement with this, as they are aware that the employee needs to see the benefit of an action in order for him or her to be engaged and motivated to make it.

The next basic theme that was inferred from the work environment organizing theme is connected to the previous themes. *Variety and autonomy levels depend on the individual* was something that the majority of managers mentioned, that all employees are unique and individual and what works for one might completely not work for the others. According to need theory, managers have to realize that all employees need to satisfy different needs, and it is essential for managers to realize what exact needs each employee is trying to satisfy in order for each employee to perform the desired behaviors at a desired level (George & Jones, 2012, p. 162). The amount of autonomy desired by individuals can be related to the self actualization needs proposed by Maslow (1943) in his hierarchy of needs. All human beings have this need but the level of needing to satisfy it is different in everyone. Just like self actualization needs, esteem needs are also characterized by the possibility of an individual to feel good about his or herself and his or her capabilities as mentioned by George and Jones (2012, p. 161).

Managers mentioned that employees want autonomy, and they are willing to give autonomy, only when the employee feels capable enough to perform the job in a way that will lead to the desired outcomes and expectations. Some managers mentioned that they are cautious with too much variety and that it is very particular and individual with every employee. Some employees want to have complete control over their knowledge and capabilities and only focus on working with one task, while other employees want variety and to spread their knowledge across different functions. With the information gathered from the interviews, it is possible to say that the right amount of variety and autonomy per employee is what leads to every individual being engaged. Further, providing employees with tools and the correct amount of autonomy and variety in tasks and skills can be related to SET and the rules of reciprocity as defined by Gouldner (1960). When managers or the organization provide employees with the tools and resources they need in order to make decisions, or when they provide their employees with appropriate levels of autonomy and variety, the employees are likely to feel an obligation to repay the organization or manager. According to the study by Saks (2006), it is likely to increase employee engagement.

5.3.2 *Training and Career Development*

Training and career development was the second organizing theme under the global theme extrinsic motivational factors and engagement. The perceived importance of training was emphasized by employees in the study conducted by Paradise (2008), suggesting that it increases engagement. Further, Robinson et al. (2004) in their study showed that employees also value career planning and performance appraisals, and that they feel like it influences their engagement positively.

Even though managers' opinions of the actions they take in their organizations regarding training and career development were to some extent varied, in general they all agreed that it is important that employees get the trainings that provide them with the right set of tools to be able to do the job that is required of them and develop in different areas that they feel will enhance their career development. This relates to the first basic theme of this organizing theme; *training and development provide employees with tools*. In Alderfer's ERG theory, growth needs are mentioned which include personal development (Arnolds & Boshoff, 2002, p. 698), and in the hierarchy of needs self actualization needs is one group of needs that include the need of an individual to be able to use his or her skills and abilities to the fullest potential and striving to achieve all

that he or she can achieve on a job (George & Jones, 2012, p. 161). By providing the correct training and career development, managers can make sure that these needs of personal development and achieving one's fullest potential are satisfied by all employees. Nonetheless, many managers mentioned that it is important to give employees the right amount of training, as well as the appropriate kind, or it can be disengaging when they are not able to use the new knowledge and skills acquired. Some managers also mentioned that giving employees too much knowledge that they will not be able to apply in their current job position/description can lead to employees becoming demotivated, disengaged, and potentially even leaving the organization. This led us to discern the second basic theme; *employees should be able to use new knowledge and skills*.

The last basic theme under training and career development is *goals should be appropriate*. By appropriate goals, we refer to goals that the employee, individually, can relate to and wants to achieve. According to the managers, one of the best ways to set appropriate goals is through performance appraisal meetings. When managers have performance appraisal meetings, they mentioned that they try to find out as much as possible about the employee and what he or she wants to achieve in the future. According to organizational justice theory, employees are going to be more motivated to perform at high levels when they perceive that the procedures used to make decisions about the distribution of outcomes are fair (George & Jones, 2012, p. 171). Thus, when employees perceive that the performance appraisals and goal setting processes are fair, based on their inputs, motivation will be positively influenced. Organizational justice theory can also be connected to the previous basic theme; *employees should be able to use new knowledge and skills*. Organizational justice explains that employees will be affected, not necessarily by how the company treats them, but how they perceive the company is treating them (George & Jones, 2012, p. 171). When the employee is not able to use the knowledge and skills that he or she has obtained, they will perceive this as unfair and hence, it will be demotivating. May et al. (2004, p. 33) further argue that managers can enhance psychological meaningfulness through learning more about the personal aspirations of their employees, and subsequently provide them with appropriate work roles and job design. Then, the organization or the manager will try to help the employee as much as possible providing him or her with the tools they need in order to reach these goals, creating psychological meaningfulness and subsequently employee engagement.

According to the managers, when the employee feels that the company or organization is investing in him or her, they feel the need of reciprocating what the company has done for them, leading them to become more engaged. The basic themes of this organizational theme can thus be related to SET, that when managers or organizations provide their employees with resources, which in this case refer to knowledge, skills, accurate performance appraisals and suitable goals, employees will feel the need to reciprocate. According to Settoon et al. (1996, p. 219) it will create a sense of indebtedness in the employee that will only be reduced once the employee reciprocates and repays the favor. Ergo, the employee will feel the need of reciprocating, and as mentioned prior, an employee can become more engaged in his or her work until he or she feels the debt is compensated.

5.3.3 Compensation

The third organizing theme found under the global theme of extrinsic motivational factors and engagement is compensation. In our study, we referred to compensation as any form of financial or non-financial inducement given to an employee for the job that he or she is performing. From an employee perspective, financial and non-financial compensation has been suggested to be one of the antecedents of employee engagement, for example in the studies conducted by the Society for Human Resource Management (2013) and Paradise (2008). When asked about compensation, managers pointed out a clear distinction between financial and non-financial compensation. In relation to need theory, the two satisfy different needs. Financial compensation relates to the physiological needs as defined by Maslow (1943), that employees must have a salary sufficient to provide themselves as well as their families with the basic life necessities. Non-financial compensation on the other hand, such as feedback and recognition, are more related to esteem needs; to be accurately acknowledged for work and accomplishments. This helps explain why managers perceived that the majority of their employees are not further motivated by increases in their financial compensation, and why it can only work as a short term motivator; when employees receive an increase in their salary, they will merely be content for a short while because they adjust their living to the new income. This can be supported by what previous research has found regarding extrinsic rewards and compliance; only temporary compliance can be achieved through extrinsic rewards (Lin, 2007, p. 145). Because motivation can provide an explanation as to why employees behave or act in a particular way within their organization (Rokeach, 1973: cited in George & Jones, 2012, p. 156), it can be argued that compliance with the organization is a result of having the motivation to do so. This is how we distinguished the basic theme of *financial compensation can be motivating in the short run*.

In connection to financial compensation, such as wages, bonuses, and benefits, many of the managers mentioned that employee salaries have to be fair. Some of the managers gave as an example that if two employees perform the same job, they should have the same salary or it can be a large demotivator for them. This provided the basic theme *financial compensation should be fair*. As explained by equity theory, employees perceive the connection between inputs and outputs, and if they perceive that they are not justly compensated for the work they put in that will have a negative effect on their motivation (Pritchard, 1969). If employees perceive that managers are not providing them with the correct pay for their work, including both salaries that they perceive are too low and salaries that are too high, this will be demotivating for the employee. In addition, in the social comparison process the employees will compare their input-output ratio to that of a referent, and then determine equity or inequity (Pritchard, 1969). What the managers perceived regarding financial compensation and that it must be fair, both with regards to the work that the employee is performing but also with regards to the pay employees performing similar jobs are getting, is thus in line with equity theory.

Financial compensation in connection to SET is related to the economic exchanges that occur between an organization and employees rather than the social exchanges, as defined by Slack et al. (2014, p. 538). Rather than being characterized by rules of reciprocity, negotiated rules of SET generally apply (Cropanzano & Mitchell, 2005, p. 878). When describing low quality exchanges in connection to LMX, Deluga (1998, p. 190) writes that they are generally characterized by supervisors who practice formal

authority and provide their employees with the basic organizational benefits, and employees reciprocate with what is formally outlined in their job requirements. If negotiated financial compensation is the only part of a leader-member exchange relationship it is thus classified as a low quality relationship, which implies that the engagement level of the employee is likely to be lower.

While answering questions regarding financial motivation, managers also mentioned that financial compensation can hinder or slow down collaboration between employees as well as creativity, which brings us to the third basic theme; *financial compensation can stifle collaboration and creativity*. Some managers mentioned experience with financial bonus systems in their organizations, however, in few cases had it produced the intended positive outcomes. Rather than pushing people to work harder the bonus systems sometimes acted as a way for employees to stop collaborating with one another and withhold their knowledge for personal gain, and compete with each other to get the financial bonus. Some managers mentioned that they saw that employees began working just enough to obtain the bonus, but did not put in extra work for the sake of the organization. Employees decreased their creativity and instead found ways to work that were quick and easy because the extra work would not lead them to a bigger financial bonus. This basic theme relates to expectancy theory, stating that an employee will only be motivated to perform at a certain level if performing at this level will lead to desired outcomes (George & Jones, 2012, p. 163). Schedlitzki and Edwards (2014, p. 87) link the path-goal theory to the assumption that an employee is more likely to perform well if they are confident that they will achieve the outcome that is expected and that they will receive the outcome that is most valued by them. This implies that, as mentioned by the managers, if an employee does not see the benefits that working in a certain way will bring him or her, he or she will not be inclined to continue giving these inputs to the organization and will only give the amount of inputs that will result in him or her receiving the financial compensation stated by managers, but nothing more.

The last basic theme found under compensation was *proper recognition and credit is important*. All managers agreed that it is important for employees to feel that they are properly recognized for the work they are performing, but also equally recognized among other employees within the organization. Organizational justice theory explains the employee's perception of how fair his or her organization is (George & Jones, 2012, p. 170). Procedural justice is a form of organizational justice that explains that employees are going to be more motivated to perform at high levels, when they believe that the procedures used to make decisions about the distribution of outcomes are fair, hence their motivation will increase if they believe that their performance will be accurately assessed (George & Jones, 2012, p. 171). Thus, when employees feel as though they are being properly recognized for their work and accomplishments, their motivation will increase. Recognition and non-financial compensation is related to the social exchanges of SET. As mentioned previously, SET explains that when employees receive resources of socio-emotional nature, they will feel the need to reciprocate and repay their organization (Saks, 2006, p. 603). When employees receive recognition and credit for their work they are thus getting beneficial resources from their organization or manager, which they in turn can respond to and reciprocate through higher engagement levels.

5.3.4 Organizational Policies

The final organizing theme found under the global theme extrinsic motivational factors and engagement was organizational policies. Organizational policies are determinant factors that influence how flexible an organization is as well as how the organizational structure is perceived by employees. Previous studies by Anitha (2014) and Wellins et al. (2005) have found that from an employee perspective, organizational policies such as work-life balance aid and fairness in organizational processes and systems, positively influences employee engagement. The first basic theme found under organizational policies was *organizational structure affects the flow of communication*. Managers mentioned during the interviews that when the organizational structure is not perceived as flat, but rather hierarchical, the flow of communication is more formalized. As defined by George and Jones (2012, p. 173), informational justice regards how employees perceive that managers share and explain their decisions as well as the processes used to arrive at these decisions. When information flows through a hierarchically structured organization, these explanations may be lost, and employees are less motivated due to the decrease in perceived justice. In addition, some managers said that employees tend to perceive that there is less personal connection and treatment given to them from managers when they perceive a strong hierarchy with formal communication. This is why some managers worked at creating an open communication environment and creating a flow of communication that is more informal and allows for more personal relationships to emerge. Again, this relates to interpersonal justice, the perceived fairness of the interpersonal treatment employees receive from managers (Greenberg, 1990, p. 411). If employees feel like they have little or no connection with their superiors, employees may perceive that their ideas and thoughts are not considered or taken into account by managers or the organization and subsequently perceive unfair treatment. Communication and treatment can also be related back to the relationships an employee has at work, the two first organizing themes of our thematic network, which we in turn connected to psychological meaningfulness and psychological safety as defined by Kahn (1990). It can thus be argued that an organizational structure that allows for this kind of communication will be engaging for employees.

During the interviews, managers were asked about how they integrated flexibility into their organizational policies. Most of them mentioned that flexibility is something that they strive for, but sometimes it is not possible to give all employees the same amount of flexibility. Flexibility depends on the type of work that is being done, as well as what kind of organization it is. Nevertheless, the managers agreed that the right amount of *flexibility creates freedom*, and increases employee engagement. Regarding flexibility in working hours, for example, one of the managers mentioned that when employees have the freedom to choose how many hours they will work in a day, their engagement increases during these chosen working hours, and a higher level of productivity was perceived. They commented that this is because employees feel more control over the time that they are investing in work, or the task at hand, and know the tasks or goals they have to achieve by the end of this time. Sometimes, managers cannot provide flexibility in working hours to all employees and instead try to compensate in some other form of flexibility. Some managers mentioned that flexibility in variety of tasks that the employees work on has also increased productivity and engagement with employees. They stressed on the fact that all employees are different and some of them like to work only on one task, and feel control over it, knowing that they know everything about it. Nevertheless, some employees are more productive when they get

to work with a variety of tasks instead of sticking only to one. As mentioned before, this means that managers have to dedicate some time to get to know their employees and what pushes them forward. As mentioned by May et al. (2004, p. 33), based on the framework developed by Kahn (1990), managers can enhance psychological meaningfulness through learning more about the personal aspirations of their employees, and subsequently provide them with appropriate work roles and job design.

5.4 Key Findings

<i>Basic Themes</i>	<i>Key Findings</i>
<p>1. Personal relationships are important</p> <p>2. Employees should interact and connect</p>	<p>1. When managers encourage personal relationships between co-workers, employees will feel safer and more comfortable in sharing their ideas which in turn will enhance communication and collaboration.</p> <p>2. When employees interact and connect with one another, they get to know each other and are able to relate to each other, which creates meaningfulness in the employees.</p>
<p>3. Personal/professional balance</p> <p>4. Managers should inspire</p> <p>5. Open communication creates trust</p> <p>6. Constructive feedback is engaging</p>	<p>3. Managers should get to know their employees on a personal level, but keep some distance in order to make employees feel safe in the workplace, and in order to keep work roles and responsibilities clear.</p> <p>4. Managers must be engaged in order to engage their employees. They should lead by example and be a role model to their employees in order to pass on positive traits and behaviors.</p> <p>5. When managers promote an open, two-way communication with their employees, a relationship that builds on high quality exchanges characterized by trust and loyalty can be established.</p> <p>6. When employees receive negative feedback, as long as it is delivered in a way that is respectful and fair, it will have a positive effect on engagement.</p>
<p>7. Work-life balance influences stress levels</p> <p>8. Support is important for well-being</p> <p>9. Managers can influence the balance at work</p>	<p>7. When employees have a lot going on in their personal lives they will have less time for work-related demands and vice versa, which will influence stress levels and the extent to which they can be psychologically present at work.</p> <p>8. Organizations and managers must support employees with the necessary tools to decrease physical and emotional stress, and subsequently ensure their well-being.</p> <p>9. Managers should adjust the workload when employees exhibit signs of physical or emotional stress, to improve their psychological availability at work.</p>
<p>10. Work equipment should be safe</p> <p>11. Making decisions creates a personal investment</p> <p>12. Employees need the right tools to make decisions</p>	<p>10. Managers should be in constant vigilance of the physical work environment. An unsatisfactory physical work environment can cause health problems, stress, and, in consequence, decrease an employee's ability to perform his or her work.</p> <p>11. When employees are provided with the ability to make their own decisions and exercise this ability, they are likely to feel like they can affect what is going on in the organization which creates a personal investment to the work that is being performed as a result.</p> <p>12. When employees are provided with the correct resources and tools to make decisions, they will feel more confident and safe in making them, and believe that the results from making decisions will be the desired ones. If employees do not have the correct resources, they will</p>

<p>13. Variety and autonomy levels depend on the individual</p>	<p>not see the merit of making their own decisions as they are likely to believe that the results to be obtained are not the desired ones.</p> <p>13. Too much job variety and/or autonomy given to an employee, who does not desire it, will increase his or her stress levels. The appropriate variety and/or autonomy levels will on the other hand lead to a more comfortable employee who reciprocates positively.</p>
<p>14. Training and development provides employees with tools</p> <p>15. Employees should be able to use new knowledge and skills</p> <p>16. Goals should be appropriate</p>	<p>14. When a manager provides an employee with the appropriate trainings and development, the employee will feel more confident about his or her abilities and skills, and will take more initiative and more decisions.</p> <p>15. Managers should make sure that they are providing employees with knowledge and skills that employees can use on the job. If the employee can use the skills and knowledge obtained through trainings, they are more likely to perceive fairness.</p> <p>16. When employees are provided with goals that are in line with their personal aspirations, they will perceive fairness and these goals will be more meaningful to the employees.</p>
<p>17. Financial compensation should be fair</p> <p>18. Financial compensation can be motivating in the short run</p> <p>19. Financial compensation can stifle collaboration and creativity</p> <p>20. Proper recognition and credit is important</p>	<p>17. When employees perceive that they are sufficiently financially compensated for their work, and their financial compensation is perceived as fair in comparison to other employees, they are likely to be content with the financial compensation.</p> <p>18. Motivation achieved by additional financial compensation will be short lived, as over time employees will adjust to additional financial compensation.</p> <p>19. If promoted incorrectly, additional financial compensation can increase competitiveness between employees and cause employees to withhold their knowledge for personal gains. It may also cause employees to only work the required amount to receive the financial compensation, not performing voluntary role behaviors.</p> <p>20. When provided with appropriate feedback, recognition, and feedback, employees will perceive fairness and it will increase their needs for self-esteem.</p>
<p>21. Organizational structure affects the flow of communication</p> <p>22. Flexibility creates freedom</p>	<p>21. An organizational structure that is perceived as flat can facilitate the flow of communication. This will lead to employees feeling that their ideas and thoughts are taken into consideration by the organization and managers, and increased fairness.</p> <p>22. When employees have the flexibility to choose things like how they work, when they work, and with whom they work with, they feel a deeper connection to their job.</p>

Table 4. Key findings, corresponding to the basic themes of the thematic network.

Finally, previous research has suggested a difference between private and public sector employees and their primary sources of motivation, finding that employees in the public sector value intrinsic motivation to a larger extent than private sector employees, and that employees in the private sector value extrinsic motivation to a greater extent than employees in the public sector (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Houston, 2000). In our study, we were not able to distinguish any particular differences between how managers in private and public sector organizations perceive the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement as groups of

managers, but merely between individual managers. Even so, the managers who emphasized the importance of extrinsic rewards in the motivation and engagement of employees still seemingly valued the influence of intrinsic motivation higher, and these managers were from organizations within both the private and public sector. It is possible that these findings are affected by the fact that some of the public managers had previously worked within private organizations and vice versa. It can also be related back to what was suggested by Gabris and Simo (1995; cited in Houston, 2000, p. 717), who argue that the differences that exist between private and public sector employees in their motivation has been exaggerated by researchers. Overall, the views of the managers and how they perceive that intrinsic and extrinsic motivation influences employee engagement were fairly similar, and no significantly large differences in perceptions were found.

6. Conclusions

In this chapter of the thesis we will answer our stated research question. We will also present the theoretical contributions and the managerial implications of our study, and finish the chapter with the limitations of our study and recommendations for future studies.

6.1 General Conclusions

The purpose of this study was to develop a deeper understanding of how managers perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement. This study advances research on employee engagement by exploring the managerial perspective, and providing new insights of their perceptions. The research gap that was identified involved the lack of research that connected the concepts of motivation and employee engagement, and the lack of studies investigating the perspective of managers regarding the topic at hand. Further, as previous research had suggested a difference between how employees working for public and private sector organizations are motivated, we made the decision to also explore whether this difference was reflected in the perceptions of managers in the private and public sectors. The desire to explore this research gap led us to formulate our research question:

How do managers in public and private sector organizations perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement?

In order to answer our stated research question and fulfill our purpose of developing and gaining a deeper understanding, we conducted a qualitative study where managers from private and public sector organizations were interviewed. The interviews regarded how managers perceive the influence that motivational factors of intrinsic and extrinsic nature have on employee engagement. By conducting a thematic network analysis on the qualitative data generated during the semi-structured interviews, we were able to answer our research question.

The findings of our study demonstrate that managers perceive a strong influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement, where the influence of certain factors is perceived as more significant for employee engagement than others. The first conclusion we can draw is that managers' perceptions of the influence of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation on employee engagement is largely in line with what has been suggested to be the major drivers from an employee perspective, which is how the motivational factors of this study were initially identified; work environment, relationships at work, employee well-being, training and career development, compensation, and organizational policies.

We can further conclude that intrinsic motivational factors, motivation that is internal to the employee, generally have a larger influence on the psychological aspects of employee engagement. Employees must feel psychologically safe and comfortable at work in order to be able to openly communicate with their coworkers and superiors. This open communication in turn will lead to meaningful interactions and connections, and the development of personal relationships. Despite the perceived importance of personal relationships on employee engagement, in order to feel psychologically safe at work it is also necessary for managers to clearly outline the professional expectations they have on employees and the abilities and boundaries that each employee has. This

will decrease ambiguity, increase creativity and decision making, and ultimately it was perceived that clarity increases engagement levels in employees. From our findings we can also derive that intrinsic motivational factors will contribute to meaningful, high-quality exchange relationships with managers and other organizational members, where employees who are provided with motivational factors of an intrinsic nature will reciprocate with a higher level of engagement and voluntary role behavior rather than what is simply outlined in the job description.

Regarding the extrinsic motivational factors, we can conclude from our findings that managers perceive that they undoubtedly have a positive influence on employee engagement and without them employees most likely would not be engaged. Many of the external things that are provided to employees by managers and organizations, the extrinsic motivational factors of this study, positively influence the exchange relationships that exist and subsequently the employee engagement levels. However, many of these factors are more related to negotiated aspects of the exchange relationships, implying that they only influence the quality of the exchange relationships to a certain extent. This further implies that their influence on employee engagement is lower than that of many of the intrinsic factors, as was perceived by managers. In addition, we can conclude that it is pertinent to employee engagement that the external motivation is given to the employee in a way that is somewhat tailored to the individual; making sure that the external factors are provided to the individual employee in the appropriate amount, the appropriate kind, and in alignment with personal goals. Despite their, to some extent, limited influence on employee engagement, external motivational factors constitute a vital part of the total package that an organization and its managers offer employees.

Finally, regarding the suggested differences in motivation in public and private sector employees, we can conclude that these differences are not reflected in the perceptions of managers. As groups of managers, the perceptions of managers in private and public sector organizations were very similar. According to our findings certain smaller differences exist between individual managers, perhaps attributable to personality, experience, or leadership style, rather than the sector in which they work.

6.2 Theoretical Contributions

The theoretical contributions of this study were largely made in regards to advancing prior research on motivation and employee engagement. Existing research on the concepts were to a large extent conducted by HR consultancy and research institutes, surveying employees with the objective of identifying the motivational factors that employees value the most in their engagement, and as stated by researchers there is currently limited empirical material within the field (Macey & Schneider, 2008; Robinson et al., 2004). By conducting a qualitative study and exploring the managerial perspective of how different motivational factors influence employee engagement, which had not been explored previously, we were able to study the identified research gap.

As observed by Jenkins and Delbridge (2013, p. 2672), current studies that have connected management and employee engagement has had a focus on organizational performance, and the ability of managers to deliver engaged employees with the objective of increasing organizational benefits. Similarly, much of current literature

investigating employee engagement from the point of view of employees has had a quantitative focus on how engagement increases performance related measures such as profits, retention rates, productivity, and customer satisfaction (Smith & Macko, 2014; Harter et al., 2002; Paradise, 2008; Wellins et al., 2005). Beyond providing a managerial perspective on employee engagement, in our study we adopted a psychology based definition of employee engagement in contrast to previous studies that have investigated what drives engagement, which have largely based their research on performance based definitions with the ultimate goal of contributing to how employee engagement can improve organizational performance (e.g. Towers Perrin, 2008, Sibson Consulting, 2010).

Further, we were able to theoretically contribute to the field of motivation and engagement in public and private sector organizations. This is another field dominated by quantitative research where the employee perspective is in focus, generally suggesting that privately employed individuals favor extrinsic motivation, and publicly employed individuals favor intrinsic motivation (Buelens & Van den Broeck, 2007; Jurkiewicz et al., 1998; Houston, 2000). We were able to advance research in this field by conducting our study from the management point of view, concluding that these differences were not mirrored in the perceptions of managers.

6.3 Managerial Implications

The main objective of this thesis was to develop a deeper understanding of how managers in public and private sector organizations perceive the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement, and in addition, to explore whether these perceptions are in line with what previous research has suggested regarding differences in what motivates employees in the private and public sectors. Adding to our theoretical contributions, we argue that our study provides various practical contributions that we consider valuable for managers in all organizations. We provide these general recommendations because we believe that our findings are not limited to any particular kind of organization, but can be valuable for managers in all sectors and industries.

The findings of this study can in particular be of use to individuals who have recently earned a management position in an organization, or individuals who are running startups that are in the growing phase. The conclusions provided in this thesis can be of great help to managers who may have less experience in positions where they are responsible for employees, as it can aid their understanding of how they can engage their employees and implement the good case practices mentioned in this thesis in their respective organizations. The findings can also be useful for managers who have held management positions for a longer period of time and are struggling with questions of how to enhance employee engagement in their organizations, as this study can provide them with perspectives and ideas from other managers.

Employee motivation and engagement has grown into a popular topic in the world of business and management research, with more and more companies investing in their employees' happiness and satisfaction. Based on the empirical evidence that our study has produced, we suggest that managers should invest more time in striving to be cognizant of the individual employee, what drives each of them every day and their personal goals. Once this information is known by the managers, it will be significantly

easier to motivate them and subsequently engage them even more within the organization. According to our findings, it is also crucial for management to invest time in being inclusive with all employees.

By incorporating flexibility in their organization, opening the room for new ideas and giving their employees the freedom to make their own decisions, managers will see a positive change in their employees, as well as in the outcomes of their work. Based on the findings of this study, if managers in private and public sector organizations implement extra financial compensations such as bonuses, they should make sure that they are implementing this new financial compensation in a way that maintains or creates intrinsic motivation as well. This is to make sure that once the extrinsic motivator is gone, the employee is still engaged with the organization and motivated to continue working towards organizational goals.

6.4 Limitations and Suggestions for Future Research

It should be acknowledged that there are a few limitations to this study. These limitations mainly concern the collected qualitative data. Because of the time frame given for the thesis, we adapted ourselves to different circumstances upon approaching and meeting with the managers. Due to geographical distance we were unable to conduct all of our interviews face-to-face. In these cases, we performed the interviews via Skype. Even though we did not notice a big difference in the data that was collected during the interviews that were conducted face-to-face and the ones that were not, it is important to acknowledge that during the face-to-face interviews, we were able to connect more with the interviewees and the feeling of the interviews were to a greater extent relaxed and facilitated a more constant flow of conversation. With this being said, we recommend future studies to recognize this limitation and focus solely on conducting interviews in person.

The second limitation that this study faced is that we only included managers from Sweden, predominantly Umeå but also two other locations. For this reason, we suggest that future studies could include and compare other countries. Previous studies have suggested that there is a difference in what drives employee engagement in different countries (Towers Perrin, 2008, p. 21-27), and therefore it could be explored whether these differences also are valid from a managerial point of view. Our study is the first study exploring the managerial perspective on employee motivation and engagement, and would undoubtedly benefit from an extended study in different geographical regions. Another limitation of our study is that the interviews in the study were conducted in English with Swedish managers. Despite the managers all having a good and sufficient level of English to answer all of the questions, as we could witness, it still affected the responses of some managers who may not have been able to express themselves to the extent they would have liked if the interviews would have been held in Swedish.

It could be interesting to further study and look deeper into how managers in public and private sector organizations motivate their employees, and whether there is a difference in the results. As mentioned in this study, even though previous studies suggested that there is a difference between what motivates employees in the public and private sector, we did not find a difference between what the managers perceived as groups of public and private sector managers. If plausible, a quantitative study on the managerial

perspective of the influence of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee engagement is recommended to advance the research within this area. In addition, a further and more substantial comparison of managers within the private and public sectors is recommended. This will help researchers to see whether there is, or there is not, a significant difference in perceptions between managers in private and public sector organizations.

Another factor that could be considered a limitation in our study is the fact that all interviewees came from different backgrounds and industries. This study could be advanced by putting a focus on and comparing managers from public and private sector organizations, but from the same industry. For example, a study comparing managers that operate in public and private health care or managers in private and public education. By conducting this study it will be possible to see if there is a difference in their perceptions, and possibly, if there are differences, it will facilitate the recognition of these differences.

7. Truth Criteria

In this chapter we aim to evaluate and determine the quality of our conducted research, using the quality criteria of reliability and validity.

The quality of research must be evaluated according to certain criteria in order for researchers to demonstrate the credibility of their findings (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 31). Criteria frequently used for the evaluation of business research are the criteria of validity and reliability, particularly important in quantitative research (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 42). As suggested by LeCompte and Goetz (1982) these criteria have importance for qualitative research as well, as they can be adjusted to suit the evaluation of research of qualitative nature. Reliability concerns the issue of whether the findings and results of a particular study can be repeated (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 41). Validity on the other hand refers to the integrity of findings and the conclusions that are drawn, whether the findings actually portray what they appear to portray (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 42; Saunders et al., 2007, p. 150). In order to evaluate the quality of our research, we will use the criteria of external reliability, internal reliability, external validity, and internal validity as described by LeCompte and Goetz (1982).

External reliability concerns the question of whether other researchers would identify the same phenomena in a similar setting, and whether the same constructs would be generated (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 32). In other words, it concerns the replicability of a study. The external reliability of our study may be discussed, as it is generally more difficult to attain in qualitative studies due to the continuous change and fluctuations in social settings (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 395; LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 37). However, we took precautions to increase the external reliability of this study throughout the research process, through careful documentation of the different steps in our research. Regarding the external reliability of our study it should also be considered that during the semi-structured interviews that were conducted, depending on the answers we received from the managers, we asked follow up questions that are not formally outlined in our interview guide. These follow up questions may have generated additional information that affected the findings of our study.

Regarding internal reliability, it concerns whether multiple researchers agree upon what is being observed in a single study (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 41). We argue that the internal reliability of our study is high. When conducting the semi-structured interviews we were both present in order to be able to discuss our perceptions of what was said and in what way it was said by the managers during the interviews. Throughout the research process we have continuously held discussions on various matters, which was particularly important whenever we encountered issues or difficulties where we could discuss and come to decisions collectively. Overall, we deem the reliability of our study to be high.

LeCompte and Goetz (1982, p. 32) define external validity as referring to the extent to which findings are accurately comparable across groups, i.e. the extent to which findings may be generalized. External validity represents an issue in qualitative research as smaller samples are generally used in qualitative data collection, implying that findings cannot be generalized across a population (Bryman & Bell, 2011, p. 395). Our study is not an exception, as we used a smaller sample of managers to generate our data. However, as our purpose was to develop a deeper understanding of our chosen research

topic and not to generalize our findings, we do not view external validity as being a relevant issue to our study.

Internal validity refers to “the extent to which scientific observations and measurements are authentic representations of some reality” (LeCompte & Goetz, 1982, p. 32). Further, LeCompte and Goetz (1982, p. 43) state that internal validity is one of the strengths in qualitative research. By conducting semi-structured interviews we argue that we were able to study what we intended to study, as we had the opportunity to ask follow up questions and steer the focus of the interviews towards what we set out to explore and develop a deeper understanding of. With this, we conclude that the overall quality and validity of our study is high.

Reference list

- Amabile, T. M. (1993). Motivational Synergy: toward new conceptualizations of intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in the workplace. *Human Resource Management Review*, 3(3), 185-201.
- Anitha, J. (2013). Determinants of employee engagement and their impact on employee performance. *International Journal of Productivity and Performance Management*, 63(3), 308-322.
- Arnolds, C. A. & Boshoff, C. (2002). Compensation, esteem valence and job performance: an empirical assessment of Alderfer's ERG theory. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13(4), 697-719.
- Attride-Stirling, J. (2001). Thematic networks: an analytic tool for qualitative research. *Qualitative Research*, 1(3), 385-405.
- Bell, R. L. & Martin, J. S. (2012). The relevance of scientific management and equity theory in everyday managerial communication situations. *Journal of Management Policy and Practice*, 13(3), 106-115.
- Bhuvanaiah, T. & Raya, R. P. (2015). Mechanism of Improved Performance: Intrinsic Motivation and Employee Engagement. *SCMS Journal of Indian Management*, 12(4), 92-97.
- Breevaart, K., Bakker, A. B., Demerouti, E. & Van den Heuvel, M. (2013). Leader-member exchange, work engagement, and job performance. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 30(7), 754-770.
- Bryman, A. & Bell, E. (2011). *Business Research Methods*. 3rd edition. New York: Oxford University Press.
- Buelens, M. & Van den Broeck, H. (1998). An Analysis of Differences in Work Motivation between Public and Private Sector Organizations. *Public Administration Review*, 67(1), 65-74.
- Burns, A. J., Roberts, T. L., Posey, C., Bennett, R. J. & Courtney, J. F. (2015). Assessing the Role of Security Education, Training, and Awareness on Insiders' Security-Related Behavior: An Expectancy Theory Approach. In: *System Sciences (HICSS), 2015 48th Hawaii International Conference*.
- Burton, R. M., Obel, B. & Håkansson, D. D. (2015). *Organizational design: A step-by-step approach*. 3rd edition. Cambridge: Cambridge University Press.
- Caulton, J. R. (2012). The development and use of the theory of erg: A literature review. *Emerging Leadership Journeys*, 5(1), 2-8.

- Cerasoli, C. P., Nicklin, J. M. & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic motivation and extrinsic incentives jointly predict performance: A 40-year meta-analysis. *Psychological Bulletin*, 140(4), 980-1008.
- Choy, J., McCormack, D. & Djurkovic, N. (2015). Leader-member exchange and job performance - The mediating roles of delegation and participation. *Journal of Management Development*, 35(1), 104-119.
- Christian, M. S., Garza, A. S. & Slaughter, J. E. (2011). Work Engagement: A quantitative review and test of its relations with task and contextual performance. *Personnel Psychology*, 2011(64), 89-136.
- Collis, J. & Hussey, R. (2013). *Business research: A practical guide for undergraduate and postgraduate students*. 4th edition. Hampshire: Palgrave Macmillan.
- Colquitt, J. A. (2001). On the Dimensionality of Organizational Justice: A Construct Validation of a Measure. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 86(3), 386-400.
- Crabtree, S. (2013). Worldwide, 13% of Employees are Engaged at Work. *Gallup Management Journal*. [Online]. [Retrieved: 2016-02-12]. <http://www.gallup.com/poll/165269/worldwide-employees-engaged-work.aspx>.
- Cropanzano, R. & Mitchell, M. S. (2005). Social Exchange Theory: An Interdisciplinary Review. *Journal of Management*, 31(6), 874-900.
- Deckop, J. R., Cirka, C. C. & Andersson, L. M. (2003). Doing Unto Others: The Reciprocity of Helping Behavior in Organizations. *The Journal of Business Ethics*, 47(2), 101-113.
- Deluga, R. J. (1998). Leader-Member Exchange Quality and Effectiveness Ratings - The role of subordinate-supervisor conscientiousness similarity. *Group & Organization Management*, 23(2), 189-216.
- Dulebohn, J. H., Bommer, W. H., Liden, R. C., Brouer, R. L. & Ferris, G. R. (2012). A Meta-Analysis of Antecedents and Consequences of Leader-Member Exchange: Integrating the Past with an Eye Toward the Future. *Journal of Management*, 38(6), 1715-1759.
- Estes, B. & Polnick, B. (2012). Examining motivation theory in higher education: An expectancy theory analysis of tenured faculty productivity. *International Journal of Management, Business, and Administration*, 15(1), 1-7.
- Flick, U., Von Kardorff, E. & Steinke, I. (2004). *A Companion to Qualitative Research*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.
- George, J. M. & Jones, G. R. (2012). *Understanding and Managing Organizational Behaviour*. 6th edition. Reading, MA: Prentice Hall.

- Gephart, R. P. (2004). From the Editors: Qualitative Research and the Academy of Management Journal. *Academy of Management Journal*, 47(4), 454- 462.
- Giancola, F. L. (2014). Should HR Professionals Devote More Time to Intrinsic Rewards? *Compensation & Benefits Review*, 46(1), 25-31.
- Gouldner, A. W. (1960). The norm of reciprocity: A preliminary statement. *American Sociological Review*, 25, 161-178.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organizational Justice: Yesterday, Today, and Tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399-432.
- Harter, J. K., Schmidt, F. L. & Hayes, T. L. (2002). Business-unit-level relationship between employee satisfaction, employee engagement, and business outcomes: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(2), 268-279.
- Houston, D. J. (2000). Public-Service Motivation: A Multivariate Test. *Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory*, 10(4), 713-727.
- Jenkins, S. & Delbridge, R. (2013). Context matters: examining ‘soft’ and ‘hard’ approaches to employee engagement in two workplaces. *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 24(14), 2670-2691.
- Jurkiewicz, C. L., Massey, T. K. & Brown, R. G. (1998). Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study. *Public Productivity & Management Review*, 21(3), 230-250.
- Kahn, W. A. (1990). Psychological conditions of personal engagement and disengagement at work. *Academy of Management Journal*, 33(4), 692-724.
- Kumar, R. & Sia, S. K. (2012). Employee Engagement - Explicating the Contribution of Work Environment. *Management and Labor Studies*, 37(1), 31-43.
- Lazaroiu, G. (2015). Employee Motivation and Job Performance. *Linguistic and Philosophical Investigations*, 14(2015), 97-102.
- LeCompte, M. D. & Goetz, J. P. (1982). Problems of Reliability and Validity in Ethnographic Research. *Review of Educational Research*, 52(1), 31-60.
- Lin, H. F. (2007). Effects of extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on employee knowledge sharing intentions. *Journal of information science*, 33(2), 135-149.
- Macey, W. H. & Schneider, B. (2008). The Meaning of Employee Engagement. *Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1(2008), 3-30.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370-396.

May, D. R., Gilson, R. L. & Harter, L. M. (2004). The psychological conditions of meaningfulness, safety, and availability and the engagement of the human spirit at work. *Journal of Occupational and Organizational Psychology*, 2004(77), 11-37.

Nasri, W. & Charfeddine, L. (2012). Motivating salespeople to contribute to marketing intelligence activities: An expectancy theory approach. *International Journal of Marketing Studies*, 4(1), 168.

Orb, A., Eisenhauer, L. & Wynaden, D. (2000). Ethics in Qualitative Research. *Journal of Nursing Scholarship*, 33(1), 93-96.

Paradise, A. (2008). Influences Engagement. *American Society for Training and Development*, 62(1), 54-59.

Parashar, B. K. (2016). Significance of Theory Z in Indian Scenario. *International Journal of Management and Social Sciences Research*, 5(2), 8-16.

Pritchard, R. D. (1969). Equity Theory: A Review and Critique. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(2), 176-211.

Purvis, R. L., Zagenczyk, T. J. & McCray, G. E. (2015). What's in it for me? Using expectancy theory and climate to explain stakeholder participation, its direction and intensity. *International Journal of Project Management*, 33(1), 3-14.

Putra, E. D., Seonghee, C. & Liu, J. (2015). Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation on work engagement in the hospitality industry: Test of motivation crowding theory. *Tourism and Hospitality Research*, 0(0), 1-14.

Renko, M., Kroeck, K. G. & Bullough, A. (2012). Expectancy theory and nascent entrepreneurship. *Small Business Economics*, 39(3), 667-684.

Rhoades, L. & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived Organizational Support: A Review of the Literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698-714.

Robinson, D., Perryman, S. & Hayday, S. (2004). The Drivers of Employee Engagement. *Institute for Employment Studies*, Report 408.

Ryan, R. M. & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and Extrinsic Motivations: Classic Definitions and New Directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 2000(25), 54-67.

Saks, A. M. (2006). Antecedents and consequences of employee engagement. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 21 (7), 600-619.

Saunders, M., Lewis, P. & Thornhill, A. (2007). *Research Methods for Business Students*. 4th edition. Harlow: Pearson Education Limited.

Schedlitzki, D. & Edwards, G. (2014). *Studying leadership: Traditional and critical approaches*. London: SAGE Publications Ltd.

Scott, D. & McMullen, T. (2010). *The Impact of Reward Programs on Employee Engagement*. WorldatWork, The Total Rewards Association. [electronic]. Available via: <https://www.worldatwork.org/adimLink?id=39032>. [Retrieved: 2016-02-16].

Settoon, R. P., Bennett, N. & Liden, R. C. (1996). Social Exchange in Organizations: Perceived Organizational Support, Leader-Member Exchange, and Employee Reciprocity. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 81(3), 219-227.

Shuck, B. (2011). Four Emerging Perspectives of Employee Engagement: An Integrative Literature Review. *Human Resource Development Review*, 10(3), 304-328.

Sibson Consulting (2010). *Rewards of Work Study*. [electronic]. Available via: <http://www.sibson.com/media/1609/2009row.pdf>. [Retrieved: 2016-02-16].

Sinha, K. & Trivedi, S. (2014). Employee Engagement with Special Reference to Herzberg Two Factor and LMX Theories: A Study of I.T Sector. *SIES Journal Of Management*, 10(1), 22-35.

Silvera, I. (2013). Motivation schemes can build long-term engagement. *Employee Benefits*. [Online] June 4. Available via: <http://www.employeebenefits.co.uk/motivation-schemes-can-build-long-term-engagement/>. [Retrieved 2016-02-12].

Slack, R. E., Corlett, S. & Morris, R. (2014). Exploring Employee Engagement with (Corporate) Social Responsibility: A Social Exchange Perspective on Organizational Participation. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 127(3), 537-548.

Smith, J. & Macko, N. (2014). Exploring the relationship between Employee Engagement and Employee Turnover. *Annamalai International Journal of Business Studies and Research*, 6(1), 56-69.

Society for Human Resource Management (2013). *Employee Job Satisfaction and Engagement*. [electronic]. Available via: http://www.shrm.org/Research/Survey-Findings/Documents/14-0028%20JobSatEngage_Report_FULL_FNL.pdf. [Retrieved: 2016-02-16].

Steel, P. (2007). The Nature of Procrastination: A Meta-Analytic and Theoretical Review of Quintessential Self-Regulatory Failure. *Psychological Bulletin*, 133(1), 65-94.

Towers Perrin (2008). *Closing the Engagement Gap: A Road Map for Driving Superior Business Performance*. Towers Perrin Global Workforce Study 2007-2008. [electronic] Available via: https://c.yimcdn.com/sites/www.simnet.org/resource/group/066D79D1-E2A8-4AB5-B621-60E58640FF7B/leadership_workshop_2010/towers_perrin_global_workfor.pdf. [Retrieved: 2016-02-16].

Urdan, T. (2003). Book Review: Intrinsic Motivation, Extrinsic Rewards, and Divergent Views of Reality. *Educational Psychology Review*, 15(3), 311-325.

Wayne, S. J., Shore, L. M. & Liden, R. C. (1997). Perceived organizational support and leader-member exchange: A social exchange perspective. *Academy of Management Journal*, 40(1), 82-111.

Wellins, R. S., Bernthal, P. & Phelps, M. (2005). Employee engagement: The key to realizing competitive advantage. [electronic]. Available via: http://www.ddiworld.com/DDI/media/monographs/employeeengagement_m-g_ddi.pdf?ext=.pdf. [Retrieved: 2016-03-08].

Wiley, C. (1995). What motivates employees according to over 40 years of motivation surveys. *International Journal of Manpower*, 18(3), 263-280.

Zikmund, W., Babin, B., Carr, J. & Griffin, M. (2013). *Business Research Method*. 9th edition. South Western: Cengage Learning.

Appendix 1

Interview Guide

General Questions about Motivation and Engagement

- Could you tell us about your position and what you do in your organization?
- How do you motivate your employees?
- How do you perceive that your employees act when they are motivated?
- Do you do anything to engage your employees?
- How do you perceive that your employees act when they are engaged?
- Is there is a connection between motivation and engagement?
- Are your employees more motivated by intrinsic factors or extrinsic factors?

Motivational Drivers and Engagement

Work environment

- Could you tell us about the work environment in your organization?
- Do you do anything to improve the work environment of your organization?
- How/in what way does the ability to make decisions influence the engagement of your employees?
- How/in what way does variety in job tasks and skills influence the engagement of your employees?

Relationships with coworkers

- Could you tell us about employees' relationships with other coworkers within your organization?
- Do you do anything to improve employees' relationships with other coworkers?
- How/in what way do working in teams and cooperating with one another influence the engagement of your employees?

Relationships with managers

- Could you tell us about employees' relationships with managers, including yourself, in your organization?
- Do you do anything to improve employees' relationships with managers, including yourself?
- How would you explain your leadership?
- How does your leadership influence engagement?
- How would you explain your leadership in terms of communication with employees?
- How/in what way does this communication style influence the engagement of your employees?
- How do you develop trusting and supportive relationships with your employees?
- How/in what way does trust and support influence the engagement of your employees?

Physical and emotional well-being

- Do you do anything to improve the physical and emotional well-being of your employees?
- Does having an appropriate workload and work-life balance influence the engagement of your employees?

Organizational policies

- How does the organizational structure influence the engagement of your employees?
- How do you integrate flexibility into the organizational policies?
- How does flexibility in organizational policies influence the engagement of your employees?

Compensation

- How do you compensate your employees?
- How does financial compensation influence the engagement of your employees?
- How does non-financial compensation influence the engagement of your employees?

Employee training and development

- Could you tell us about the training and career development opportunities of employees in your organization?
- How do training and career development opportunities influence the engagement of your employees?
- Could you tell us about the performance appraisal system in your organization?
- How do performance appraisals influence the engagement of your employees?



Umeå School of Business and Economics

Umeå University
SE-901 87 Umeå, Sweden
www.usbe.umu.se