

# **OWNERSHIP TYPE OF ORGANISATION TO DETERMINE MOTIVATION OF MANAGEMENT PERSONNEL: AN EMPIRICAL STUDY**

**Anna Wziętek-Staśko**

Professor, University of Dąbrowa Górnicza, Faculty of Applied Sciences,  
Management Department, Poland  
[awziatek-stasko@wp.pl](mailto:awziatek-stasko@wp.pl)

## **Abstract**

*The purpose of the paper is to present the results of author's own empirical research devoted to assessing the effectiveness of a motivating impact of selected 47 motivation tools (cash tangible tools, non-cash tangible tools and intangible tools) in Polish managers' opinion. In particular, the scientific analysis process was focused on establishing of any significant statistical differences in the above-mentioned assessment depending on the ownership type/form of an organization (state or privately owned, the third sector) and the management level (low, medium and top managers). The factographic material collected in the research was analyzed with statistical concluding based on two non-parametric tests: U Mann – Whitney test and ANOVA Kruskal Wallis test. The statistical analysis of the collected factographic material allowed for formulating an important conclusion that the ownership form of the organization does not have a major impact on differences in the perception or assessment of the effectiveness of the motivating impact of 47 motivators, according to the managers. Similarly, neither the position occupied in the reporting line is the factor significantly differentiating their preferences. The paper serves as an inspirational source of knowledge for management practitioners and theoreticians interested in effective motivating system for managers in contemporary organizations in different economy sectors.*

*Keywords: Motivation, Manager, Motivator, Efficiency, Motivation System*

## INTRODUCTION

*"We need new leadership: leaders in every sense of the word, people of the highest righteousness, fully dedicated to building lasting organisations (...) Leaders with the courage to build and develop a business with benefit to all stakeholders and understanding the importance of their service to the society" Bill George (Covey, Link & Merrill, 2013:146)*

Employee motivation themes continue to inspire researcher. In spite of extensive research in this field, some areas, of niche nature, can be identified that require exploration. Motivating the managers is one of such areas, less popular but of tremendous importance in the process of creating modern business models. As B.George observed, contemporary times give some specific requirements to the leaders whose work should be a service. They are to be righteous and courageous people but also, or rather first, having a strong identification with their organisation and a team of colleagues. What is more, they should be professionals having full awareness of the role they play. As observed by the famous management guru, P.Drucker: "(...) a manager's role is to create a true whole, larger than the sum of its components, to create a productive being that produces more than the sum of invested resources (...) His task requires effectiveness brought out and given to any powers hidden in his resources - primarily in human resources - and neutralising their potential weaknesses. This is the only way to create a true whole (...) A manager is both composer and conductor" (Drucker, 1998: 365-366; Drucker, 2001: 200). A similar view is also expressed by other researchers (Nielsen& Parker, 2012: 428-448; Hersey, 2009: 12). The purpose of this theoretical and empirical paper is to emphasise the importance of the issues focused on the role of managers and their effective motivation as well as presentation of the results of own empirical research indicating instruments with the most effective motivating function on the managers of different levels, working in private, state and third sector organisations.

### **Manager as the Key Figure in the Life of an Organisation**

"There is general agreement that leadership skills are significantly less common and more difficult to achieve than managerial skills. One can learn to be a manager but must be equal to become a leader" A.K.Koźmiński (Koźmiński, 2013:92)

There are many varieties of contemporary leadership: classical leadership, direction-based leadership, participation-oriented, achievement-oriented, visionary, organic or intergroup leadership (Hogg, Knippenberg & Rast 2012: 232-255), Blanchard's situational leadership, transactions, transformation or authentic leadership (Nieckarz, 2011: 134; Cooper, 2015: 49-51; Zhou, 2015: 1267-1270; Platow et.al., 2015: 20-37), limited leadership (Koźmiński, 2013), principle-based leadership or compass-based leadership (Covey et al.1997). Modern

technology development era created new opportunities and that's how subsequent management models were created: remote management (Sprenger, 2011: 9), or shared leadership (Bergman&Bergman at.al., 2012: 17-42; Hoch, 2013: 159-160; Bolden, 2011: 251-254; Small & J.R. Rentsch, 2010: 203-211), as well as the following models: "Cheerleader Motivator", „Quarterback Motivator", „Coach Motivator" (Perkins, 2011: (40-42) Some promote AMO model (Ability, Motivation, Opportunity to participate) as an effective management tool (Almutawa, Muenjohn & Zhang 2016; 18-22)), others emphasise the importance leadership based on the ability to develop emotions and relations (Blikle, 2014: 92). A variety of leadership concepts and models proves the difficulty in working out their optimal shape. Some researchers tend to believe that leaders and managers are mutually complementary figures. "Leaders should collaborate with good managers and managers should have leaders since leadership deprived of management is ineffective and pretentiously aesthetic and management deprived of a leadership vision becomes stunted" (Koźmiński, 2013:93). Similarly, B.J. Feder demonstrates his view that "Two types of mind are needed for efficient and dynamic operation of an organisation: a manager's mind to develop procedures and rules for work and a leader's mind to inspire and motivate people (...) It was only a short while ago when we learnt the truth telling us about the source of differences between a manager and a leader which is human mind. Manager and leader are two different minds in an organisation" (Feder, 1999). It is not easy to estimate one's own leadership potential since it touches directly one's self-esteem. Typically those with low and volatile (unstable) self-esteem are unable to come up with the estimation (Koźmiński, 2013:237). As concluded by the above-mentioned author, managers are excellent craftsmen but it takes a master and an artist to become the leader (Koźmiński, 2013:88). Irrespective of the person managing our work, bear in mind that: "People do not leave bad companies but only bad managers" (Stuart-Kotze, Ch. Dunn, 2011:64; Lester et. al, 2011: (409-429) The above-quoted conclusion should inspire managers towards in-depth self-reflection on their role in an organisation, dependencies between the quality of leadership and the quality of employees' work and a close relation existing between employees' motivation and their own motivation.

### **Level of Motivation in a Manager as a Factor which Determines Motivation of the Manager's Staff**

"It is impossible that other people are motivated by a person who is not motivated. Here is the source of many difficulties that managers struggle with" (Enkelmann, 1997: 68)

N.B. Enkelmann also confirms this view in another study claiming that: "(...) Many managers do not know how to motivate their employees effectively as they themselves do not

identify themselves completely with their employer and they lack the power of conviction. How can one motivate effectively to something that one does not believe in? If a manager is not deeply convinced that his goal is right and that his work makes sense, he will not be able to arouse any enthusiasm in his employees and, because of that, he will not be able to motivate them and stimulate them to generate more efficient performance” (Enkelmann, 2000 also Zhang, Wang, Shi, 30). The view is shared by other authors (Zhang, Wang, Shi, 2012:111-130; Chen, 2016:1913–1926). For this reason, managers effectively demotivate their staff instead of motivating it (Wziątek-Staško, 2016: s. 37-46, Pandza, Deri, Galambos A. & Galambos T., 2015: 101; Buzady & Georgiu, 2011: 35-41; Chromjakova, 2016: 95-110). As H.Shep claims "A salary may be enough to attract an employee but not enough to retain them not to mention turning it into true ambassadors of a brand” (Shep, 2011:58). Professional leadership is more than that.

As J.C. Maxwell observes, everybody talks about leadership; few understand what leadership involves. Most people want to be leaders, few can. Management is a process which can guarantee implementation of the program and achieving the goals of an organisation; leadership involves creating visions of development and stimulating people's motivation. People do not like management; people want leadership. 15). However, contemporary leadership is going through a deep crisis as indicated by the results of the international research carried out by Gallup Institute. According to the "State of The Global Workplace. Employee Engagement Insights For Business Leaders Worldwide” reports, only as little as 13% employees worldwide engage in their work (the engaged employees), drawing their satisfaction from their engagement and guaranteeing that their company is growing. 63% are not engaged employees. These are employees who are not passionate about their work and put no energy into it; they only wait for their work day to end, "sleepwalkers" according to the authors of the report. The third group includes employees contesting their work (the actively disengaged). They are not satisfied with their work and busy with demonstrating their dissatisfaction, undermining achievements of other persons, who are engaged in their work. They represent 24% of respondents (State..., 2013). It is a reason for concern that, unfortunately, the engagement crisis is suffered not only by operational employees or specialists. Globally, managers also claim to suffer from the crisis. The above brings an important question - where is the contemporary leadership going to and what the source of such a serious engagement crisis? Can demotivated managers effectively motivate employees in their teams? Not really, as proved by the above-presented research results.

The above-mentioned results, which are a reason for concern, inspired the author to start own, self-designed empirical research aimed at diagnosing the actual needs of contemporary managers including, in particular:

- 1/ Assessing effectiveness of 47 selected motivation tools in managers' opinion.
- 2/ Checking for any material statistical differences in the assessment of effectiveness of the motivators considering the ownership status of the organisation.
- 3/ Checking for any material statistical differences in the assessment of effectiveness of the motivators considering the level of management.

## RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

An original, 3-part questionnaire was a tool used in the research process:

- 1/ Part I - tangible financial tools (6 parameters assessed). A1-A6.
- 2/ Part II - tangible non-financial tools (16 parameters assessed). B1-B16.
- 3/ Part III - intangible tools (25 parameters assessed). C1-C25.

In total, 47 selected instruments used to motivate people to work were analysed. Research participants were asked to assess the effectiveness of each motivator on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1 identified a motivator of no importance to respondent and 5 indicated that a motivator was the most effective in influencing the level of the person's motivation). The collected fact-based material was analysed by using statistical reasoning in order to formulate appropriate hypothesis and verify whether they were true. The statistical reasoning was based on two non-parametric tests: Mann-Whitney's U test and Kruskal Wallis's ANOVA test. The significance level of  $\alpha=0.05$  was assumed for the purpose of the research. It is assumed that:

- when  $p < 0.05$ , a statistically significant dependence occurs (marked with \*);
- when  $p < 0.01$ , a highly significant dependence occurs (\*\*);
- when  $p < 0.001$ , a very highly significant dependence occurs (\*\*\*)

414 managers participated in the research process, including 216 women (52%) and 198 men (48%). The research tool was delivered to the research participants, as a random sample, personally, in a hard copy (on paper). The age structure of the respondents was as follows: age: 18-25 (N=172, 42%), age: 26-35 (N=127, 31%), age: 36-45 (N=73, 17%), age: 46-55 (N=32, 8%), 55 and more (N=10, 2%). The educational background structure of the respondents was as follows: university graduates (N=119, 28.5%), high school graduates (N=290, 70%), vocational school graduates (N=3.1%), elementary school graduates (N=2, 0.5%). The participants represented state organisations (N=110, 27%), private organisations (N=282, 68%) and NGOs (N=22,5%), large enterprises at the most (N=226, 55%), as well as the medium-sized (N=59, 14%), small (N=84, 20%) and microenterprises (N=48, 11%). The

respondents' structure in terms of their currently occupied position at work was as follows: lowest level managers (N=286, 69%), medium-level managers (N=47, 11%) and the top managers (N=81, 20%). The respondents had different work experience, including: below 5 years (N=201, 49%), from 5 to 15 years (N=126, 30%), and more than 15 years (N=87, 21%). In total, respondents represented 15 economy sectors, which is a huge asset of the research, the largest group coming from "the industry" (N=80, 19%).

## ANALYSIS AND RESULTS

An analysis of the fact graphic material collected in the research led to some interesting, while slightly surprising, conclusions. Managers do not have exorbitant expectations. Not too many statistically material differences were found when assessing effectiveness of the selected 47 motivators by a group of the lowest level managers. They apply to as few as 4 motivators: B4 "Low-interest loans" ( $p=0.005682$ ) - the top one in the ranking by the state managers, B6 "Company car, also available for private use" ( $p=0.004356$ ) - with the most powerful impact on the motivation of managers in the private sector, B8 "Cafeteria" ( $p=0.013145$ ) - again, the most powerful motivation affecting motivation of private sector managers, similarly to B16 "Financing business trips, entertainment allowance etc." ( $p=0.016639$ ). All the above-mentioned motivation tools are classified to non-monetary tangible tools. In the Table 1 see the complete summary of how effective each motivator is based on opinions of the low- level managers, considering the ownership criterion.

Table 1: Effectiveness of the Motivators in the Opinion of Low- Level Managers

<b>MOTIVATOR SYMBOL</b>	<b>MOTIVATOR</b>	<b>State sector</b>	<b>Private sector</b>	<b>Third sector</b>	<b>P</b>
A1	<i>Basic salary</i>	3.47	3.46...	2.70...	0.181701
A2	<i>Monthly bonus</i>	3.53	3.73...	3.70...	0.489641
A3	<i>Yearly bonus</i>	3.54	3.55...	3.70...	0.922328
A4	<i>Cash reward</i>	3.59	3.64...	3.80...	0.859964
A5	<i>Stock, stock options</i>	2.59	2.66...	2.80...	0.842208
A6	<i>Promotion with a salary raise</i>	3.76	4.12...	4.30...	0.066352
B1	<i>Subsidised summer vacations</i>	3.67	3.48...	2.90...	0.115513
B2	<i>Cinema, theatre tickets, gym &amp; fitness</i>	3.00	3.27...	2.80...	0.180193
B3	<i>Special assistance loans/benefits</i>	2.96	2.87...	3.00...	0.852325
B4	<i>Low-interest loans</i>	3.26	2.67...	2.60...	0.005682*
B5	<i>Subsidised summer vacation camps for employees' children</i>	3.16	2.93...	2.60...	0.320328
B6	<i>Company car, also available for private use</i>	3.09	3.57...	2.60...	0.004356*
B7	<i>Company laptop and cell phone, also for private use</i>	2.96	3.33...	2.70...	0.051126
B8	<i>Cafeteria</i>	2.57	3.00...	2.30...	0.013145*
B9	<i>Additional insurance available to employees and their family</i>	3.09	3.19...	3.30...	0.770277
B10	<i>Private medical services for employees and their families</i>	3.21	3.48...	2.80...	0.086847

B11	<i>Financing crèche or preschool</i>	3.00	3.08...	3.40...	0.665005
B12	<i>Fully or partly financed training events and courses</i>	3.44	3.62...	3.10...	0.250051
B13	<i>Financing or co-financing vocational learning, studies, MBA.</i>	3.74	3.76...	3.50...	0.787463
B14	<i>Scholarships and grants</i>	3.13	3.31...	3.00...	0.397731
B15	<i>Financing membership fees in professional and business</i>	2.51	2.63...	2.70...	0.763566
B16	<i>Financing business trips, entertainment allowance etc.</i>	2.87	3.33...	3.00...	0.016639*
C1	<i>Job security</i>	4.17	4.00...	3.50...	0.191682
C2	<i>Company reputation and prestige</i>	3.60	3.59...	3.20...	0.566870
C3	<i>Corporate social responsibility</i>	3.39	3.48...	3.30...	0.795968
C4	<i>Diversity management</i>	3.51	3.71...	3.60...	0.491465
C5	<i>Friendly atmosphere at work</i>	4.03	4.12...	3.60...	0.297588
C6	<i>Good relations with co-workers</i>	4.11	4.14...	3.80...	0.574345
C7	<i>Working with interesting people</i>	3.81	3.93...	3.60...	0.519420
C8	<i>Clearly defined career path</i>	3.81	3.74...	4.10...	0.581925
C9	<i>Promotion opportunities</i>	3.79	3.90...	4.00...	0.716383
C10	<i>Professional development opportunities</i>	3.57	3.67...	3.70...	0.813846
C11	<i>Self-fulfilment opportunities</i>	3.74	3.71...	3.80...	0.957883
C12	<i>Opportunities to demonstrate one's initiative, creativity</i>	3.59	3.59...	3.70...	0.952511
C13	<i>Prestige coming from the position in the organization</i>	3.40	3.48...	3.50...	0.880114
C14	<i>Work content</i>	3.41	3.43...	3.40...	0.989728
C15	<i>Flexi time</i>	3.76	3.69...	4.00...	0.707992
C16	<i>Recognized importance of the life-work</i>	3.87	3.96...	3.90...	0.839856
C17	<i>Work safety and comfort</i>	3.74	3.74...	3.70...	0.992660
C18	<i>Well-organised work</i>	3.70	3.75...	3.70...	0.944595
C19	<i>Independence in decision-making and performance</i>	3.63	3.67...	3.80...	0.899763
C20	<i>Participation in management process</i>	3.23	3.39...	3.40...	0.531357
C21	<i>Praise and recognition</i>	3.76	3.74...	4.00...	0.793571
C22	<i>Excellent performance recognized in public</i>	3.44	3.49...	4.10...	0.305427
C23	<i>Good relations with the line manager</i>	3.96	3.89...	3.80...	0.869950
C24	<i>Swift and clear feedback</i>	3.71	3.80...	3.90...	0.810646
C25	<i>Showing interest in personal problems of employees</i>	3.29	3.43...	3.50...	0.668705

Table 1...

The analysis of the research results related to assessment of how effective motivators are according to the medium-level managers showed that no statistically material differences were found for each motivator. It means that managers who form these groups assess the motivating impact of each tool at a similar level (Table 2).

Table 2: Effectiveness of the Motivators in the Opinion of Medium- Level Managers

<b>MOTIVATOR SYMBOL</b>	<b>MOTIVATOR</b>	State sector	Private sector	Third sector	<b>P</b>
A1	<i>Basic salary</i>	3.46	3.31...	3.20	0.87132
A2	<i>Monthly bonus</i>	3.38	3.31...	2.80	0.63845
A3	<i>Yearly bonus</i>	3.54	3.21...	3.20	0.67981
A4	<i>Cash reward</i>	3.85	3.31...	2.60	0.07892
A5	<i>Stock, stock options</i>	2.62	2.79...	2.60	0.84805
A6	<i>Promotion with a salary raise</i>	3.69	4.07...	3.40	0.24409
B1	<i>Subsidised summer vacations</i>	3.62	3.45...	2.40	0.08391
B2	<i>Cinema, theatre tickets, gym &amp; fitness</i>	2.69	3.07...	3.20	0.52092

B3	<i>Special assistance loans/benefits</i>	2.92	2.90...	2.40	0.66347	Table 2...
B4	<i>Low-interest loans</i>	2.92	3.14...	3.40	0.73479	
B5	<i>Subsidised summer vacation camps for employees' children</i>	3.00	3.28...	3.20	0.75271	
B6	<i>Company car, also available for private use</i>	3.23	3.28...	2.40	0.26285	
B7	<i>Company laptop and cell phone, also for private use</i>	2.92	3.24...	3.40	0.51574	
B8	<i>Cafeteria</i>	2.46	3.00...	2.20	0.13450	
B9	<i>Additional insurance available to employees and their family</i>	2.77	3.55...	3.60	0.11428	
B10	<i>Private medical services for employees and their families</i>	3.15	3.48...	4.20	0.23165	
B11	<i>Financing crèche or preschool</i>	3.08	3.10...	3.20	0.97297	
B12	<i>Fully or partly financed training events and courses</i>	3.77	3.83...	3.20	0.43014	
B13	<i>Financing or co-financing vocational learning, studies, MBA.</i>	3.69	3.90...	3.40	0.60579	
B14	<i>Scholarships and grants</i>	3.54	3.28...	3.40	0.65436	
B15	<i>Financing membership fees in professional and business</i>	2.38	2.86...	2.60	0.47825	
B16	<i>Financing business trips, entertainment allowance etc.</i>	2.77	3.52...	3.00	0.13050	
C1	<i>Job security</i>	4.38	4.14...	3.60	0.36580	
C2	<i>Company reputation and prestige</i>	3.23	3.72...	3.80	0.43605	
C3	<i>Corporate social responsibility</i>	3.62	3.79...	3.40	0.72962	
C4	<i>Diversity management</i>	3.69	3.62...	4.00	0.81414	
C5	<i>Friendly atmosphere at work</i>	3.77	4.24...	4.00	0.41186	
C6	<i>Good relations with co-workers</i>	3.85	4.28...	4.40	0.35649	
C7	<i>Working with interesting people</i>	3.69	4.07...	3.40	0.37498	
C8	<i>Clearly defined career path</i>	3.77	3.62...	3.40	0.77533	
C9	<i>Promotion opportunities</i>	3.77	3.86...	3.60	0.84908	
C10	<i>Professional development opportunities</i>	3.77	3.59...	3.60	0.89727	
C11	<i>Self-fulfilment opportunities</i>	3.92	3.72...	3.60	0.81914	
C12	<i>Opportunities to demonstrate one's initiative, creativity</i>	3.85	3.86...	3.80	0.99075	
C13	<i>Prestige coming from the position in the organization</i>	3.77	3.72...	3.20	0.60562	
C14	<i>Work content</i>	3.46	3.41...	3.20	0.84511	
C15	<i>Flexi time</i>	3.38	3.93...	3.40	0.32410	
C16	<i>Recognised importance of the life-work balance</i>	4.08	3.97...	4.40	0.64530	
C17	<i>Work safety and comfort</i>	3.69	3.90...	4.00	0.77806	
C18	<i>Well-organised work</i>	3.77	3.76...	2.60	0.09260	
C19	<i>Independence in decision-making and performance</i>	4.08	3.62...	3.40	0.29458	
C20	<i>Participation in management process</i>	3.77	3.41...	3.20	0.48656	
C21	<i>Praise and recognition</i>	4.00	3.76...	3.80	0.80109	
C22	<i>Excellent performance recognized in public</i>	3.92	3.38...	3.40	0.31440	
C23	<i>Good relations with the line manager</i>	3.69	3.97...	3.80	0.78890	
C24	<i>Swift and clear feedback</i>	3.77	3.79...	3.60	0.93757	
C25	<i>Showing interest in personal problems of employees</i>	3.31	3.55...	3.60	0.82609	

In case of the top level managers, the analysis showed only two statistically significant differences. They are related to B8 motivator - "Cafeteria" ( $p=0.03934$ ) - which scored the highest in the opinion of managers from private sector and C20 "Participation in management process" ( $p=0.02440$ ) - which is also the most effective according to the managers from the same group of respondents. Also note that the top management group included not only presidents, CEOs and general managers but also their deputies and branch managers which, in their opinion, justify the high scoring of C20 motivator. A full scoring of assessment of how



effective motivational impact of the distinguished motivators are according to the top- managers is presented in the table 3.

Table 3: Effectiveness of the Motivators in the Opinion of Top- Level Managers

<b>MOTIVATOR SYMBOL</b>	<b>MOTIVATOR</b>	State sector	Private sector	Third sector	<b>P</b>
A1	<i>Basic salary</i>	3.52...	3.83...	3.14...	0.18898
A2	<i>Monthly bonus</i>	3.52...	3.74...	3.14...	0.44646
A3	<i>Yearly bonus</i>	3.52...	3.70...	3.57...	0.78744
A4	<i>Cash reward</i>	3.74...	3.77...	3.43...	0.78985
A5	<i>Stock, stock options</i>	2.81...	2.89...	2.71...	0.88474
A6	<i>Promotion with a salary raise</i>	3.89...	4.28...	3.71...	0.22615
B1	<i>Subsidised summer vacations</i>	3.41...	3.11...	4.14...	0.09233
B2	<i>Cinema, theatre tickets, gym &amp; fitness</i>	2.93...	3.19...	4.14...	0.08139
B3	<i>Special assistance loans/benefits</i>	2.52...	3.00...	3.00...	0.25418
B4	<i>Low-interest loans</i>	3.07...	3.06...	3.14...	0.98860
B5	<i>Subsidised summer vacation camps for employees' children</i>	3.44...	3.23...	3.71...	0.55548
B6	<i>Company car, also available for private use</i>	3.30...	3.70...	4.43...	0.09704
B7	<i>Company laptop and cell phone, also for private use</i>	3.48...	3.68...	2.86...	0.24800
B8	<i>Cafeteria</i>	2.33...	3.00...	2.86...	0,03934
B9	<i>Additional insurance available to employees and their family</i>	3.15...	3.43...	2.71...	0.33567
B10	<i>Private medical services for employees and their families</i>	3.59...	3.57...	3.71...	0.96058
B11	<i>Financing crèche or preschool</i>	2.93...	3.30...	2.71...	0.37396
B12	<i>Fully or partly financed training events and courses</i>	3.67...	3.77...	4.14...	0.60526
B13	<i>Financing or co-financing vocational learning, studies, MBA.</i>	3.93...	4.04...	4.43...	0.57807
B14	<i>Scholarships and grants</i>	3.00...	3.19...	3.29...	0.69276
B15	<i>Financing membership fees in professional and business</i>	2.52...	2.87...	2.57...	0.41245
B16	<i>Financing business trips, entertainment allowance etc.</i>	3.26...	3.47...	3.57...	0.68164
C1	<i>Job security</i>	4.22...	4.36...	4.71...	0.52673
C2	<i>Company reputation and prestige</i>	3.52...	3.85...	4.00...	0.31536
C3	<i>Corporate social responsibility</i>	3.67...	3.77...	4.29...	0.42912
C4	<i>Diversity management</i>	3.11...	3.70...	4.00...	0.12198
C5	<i>Friendly atmosphere at work</i>	3.93...	4.02...	4.00...	0.92877
C6	<i>Good relations with co-workers</i>	4.07...	4.09...	3.86...	0.83218
C7	<i>Working with interesting people</i>	4.00...	3.96...	4.14...	0.90774
C8	<i>Clearly defined career path</i>	3.59...	4.06...	3.57...	0.14214
C9	<i>Promotion opportunities</i>	3.48...	3.83...	4.14...	0.23687
C10	<i>Professional development opportunities</i>	3.78...	3.83...	4.29...	0.45376
C11	<i>Self-fulfilment opportunities</i>	3.59...	3.87...	3.57...	0.46071
C12	<i>Opportunities to demonstrate one's initiative, creativity</i>	3.93...	3.87...	4.14...	0.79338
C13	<i>Prestige coming from the position in the organization</i>	3.85...	3.94...	3.71...	0.86785
C14	<i>Work content</i>	3.74...	3.70...	3.14...	0.37639
C15	<i>Flexi time</i>	3.96...	3.91...	4.14...	0.86027
C16	<i>Recognized importance of the life-work</i>	4.07...	3.98...	3.57...	0.57556
C17	<i>Work safety and comfort</i>	3.70...	3.81...	3.86...	0.91944
C18	<i>Well-organised work</i>	3.74...	4.04...	4.00...	0.53726
C19	<i>Independence in decision-making and performance</i>	3.78...	4.32...	4.00...	0.06101
C20	<i>Participation in management process</i>	3.41...	4.06...	3.71...	0,02440
C21	<i>Praise and recognition</i>	3.85...	3.87...	4.29...	0.62517

C22	<i>Excellent performance recognized in public</i>	3.26...	3.43...	4.29...	0.12131
C23	<i>Good relations with the line manager</i>	3.89...	4.04...	4.14...	0.80290
C24	<i>Swift and clear feedback</i>	3.74...	4.02...	4.00...	0.43308
C25	<i>Showing interest in personal problems of employees</i>	3.70...	3.70...	3.71...	0.99960

Table 3...

The rich factographic material collected during the research does not allow for analysing in detail all the results in the paper. Accordingly, table 4 presents the most powerful motivators in the eyes of managers at different levels in the state, private and third sector. It shows that C1 motivator, which is "Job security", is the most effective one according to the majority of managers. Lack of concern about one's current position is the factor that all top, medium and low level managers in the state companies identified as having the most effective impact on the level of motivation. The second motivator strongly affective employee motivation is C6 motivator "Good relations with co-workers". Managers of the lowest and medium level from private companies and medium-level managers in the third sector organisation identified it as the most effective. The above-mentioned motivators are classified to intangible tools. The only tangible motivator indicated as the most effective one by the lowest level managers working in the third sector organisation, is A6 motivator "Promotion with a salary rise".

Table 4: Effectiveness of the Motivators in the Opinion of All Level Managers

MANAGEMENT LEVEL	ORGANIZATION FORM OF OWNERSHIP		
	STATE	PRIVATE	THIRD SECTOR
<b>LOW LEVEL MANAGERS</b>	C1 Job security	C6 Good relations with co-workers	A6 Promotion with a salary raise
<b>MEDIUM LEVEL MANAGERS</b>	C1 Job security	C6 Good relations with co-workers	C6 Good relations with co-workers
<b>TOP MANAGERS</b>	C1 Job security	C1 Job security	C1 Job security

## CONCLUSION

The purpose of the research presented in the article (as this paper presents only a fragment of extensive research on managers' preferences, excluding opinions of other employees) was to assess effectiveness of 47 selected motivation tools according to 414 Polish managers. After analysis, the research results showed that the majority of respondents believed in the efficiency of intangible tools, in particular job security and good relations with colleagues. In the Likert scale used for the research (1 to 5), "job security" motivator scored between (4.0 to 4.71) in terms of effectiveness, except for two cases of lower and medium level managers - respondents from the 3rd sector. Note that such high scoring is markedly above the scoring of another

motivator, which is often indicated as the key motivator for employees, i.e.: "basic salary". According to respondents, the efficiency of the motivator oscillated between (2.70-3.83). The conclusion is very interesting, indeed.

Another research question related to the type of ownership status of an organisation and its potential statistical impact on or determinant of managerial preferences in delivery of the management function. As it turned out, the analysis demonstrated such dependency in six cases only. Accordingly, we can conclude that the ownership status of an organisation is not a factor significantly determining managers' motivation level. Neither is it the position in the reporting line.

Going back to the leitmotif of the paper i.e. the author's thesis that the level of a manager's motivation develops the level of their colleagues' motivation, it is worthwhile to conduct relevant research to verify how true the thesis is. Large importance attached by respondents - managers to job security and friendly relations at work seems to demonstrate rather clearly their needs and preferred values. They remain consistent with employees' expectations as indicated by other research conducted by the author (Wziętek-Staśko, 2016). Convergence of preferences for key motivators based on both groups' effort to create a friendly work environment is the highest value.

"Working in an organisation that ensures good life is joy to employees and this way it is more effective, more innovative and more error-free. And that is the source of the advantage the businesses and companies have (...) Let's be partners and not competitors, let's work together and support each other instead of competing, let's build good relations based on trust (...). As a result, in such an organisation no one is going to say: "But it's not my job!" (Blikle, 2016:39)

## REFERENCES

- Almutawa, Z., Muenjohn, N. & Zhang, J. (2016). The effect of human resource management system on employees' commitment: the mediating role of the AMO model. *The Journal of Developing Areas. Special Issue on Dubai Conference Held in April 2016, Volume 50, No. 6.*
- Bergman, J.Z., Rentsch, J.R., Small, E.E., Davenport, S.V.&Bergman, S.M. (2012). The Shared Leadership Process in Decision-Making Teams. *The Journal of Social Psychology, Vol. 152, Iss. 1.*
- Blikle A.J. (2014). *Doktrynajakości. Rzecz o skutecznym zarządzaniu.* Gliwice: Helion.
- Blikle, A.J. 2016). *Doktrynajakości. Rzecz o turkusowejsamoorganizacji.* Retrieved April 1, 2017, from <http://socialmediatoday.comwww.moznainaczej.com.pl>.
- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews, Vol.13, Iss. 3.*
- Buzady, Z., Georgiu, A. (2011). Riding the Waves of the Motivation Cycle. *The Absorption Model of Leadership. Od Practitioner, Vol. 43, No. 1.*
- Chen, L. (2016). Linking leader personality traits to motivation to lead: a self-concept approach. *Social behavior and personality, 44(11).*

- Chromjakova, F. (2016). The Key Principles of Process Manager Motivation in Production and Administration Processes in an Industrial Enterprise. *Journal of Competitiveness*, Vol. 8, Iss. 1.
- Cooper, D. (2015). Effective Safety Leadership. Understanding Types&Styles That Improve Safety Performance. *Professional Safety*, February.
- Covey, S.M.R., Link, G. & Merrill, R.R. (2013). *Mądrezaufanie*. Poznań: Rebis.
- Drucker, P.F. (1998). *Praktykazarządzania*. Kraków: Wyd. AE w Krakowie.
- Drucker, P.F. (2001). *MyślprzewodnieDruckera*. Warszawa: Wyd. MT Biznes sp. z o.o.
- Enkelmann, N.B. (1997). *Biznesimotywacja*. Łódź: Wyd. Galaktyka.
- Enkelmann, N.B. (2000). *Charyzma. Jakosiągnaćsukcesdoskonałącwłasnąosobowość*. Warszawa: Wyd. Studio Emka.
- Feder, B.J. (1999). Dwaumysły w jednejorganizacji. *Home&Market*, no 15(89).
- Hersey, P. (2009). Situational leaders. *Leadership Excellence*. Vol. 26, Issue 2.
- Hogg, M.A., Knippenberg, D.V. &Rast, D.E. III. (2012). Intergroup Leadership In Organizations: Leading Across Group And Organizational Boundaries. *The Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 37, No 2.
- Hoch, J.E. (2013). Shared Leadership and Innovation: The Role of Vertical Leadership and Employee Integrity. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, Vol. 28, Iss. 2.
- Koźmiński, A.K. (2013). *Ograniczoneprzywództwo. Studiumempiryczne*, Warszawa: WydawnictwoPoltext.
- Lester, P.B., Hannah, S.T., Harms, P.D., Vogelgesang G.R. &Avolio B.J. (2011). Mentoring Impact on Leader Efficacy Development: A Field Experiment. *Academy of Management*, Vol. 10, No 3.
- Maxwell, J.C. (1998). *Byćliderem, czylijakprzewodzićinnym*. Warszawa: Wyd. Medium.
- Nieckarz, Z. (2011). *Psychologiamotywacji w organizacji*. Warszawa: DIFIN.
- Nielsen, V.L. & Parker, CH. (2012). Mixed Motives: Economic, Social, and Normative Motivations in Business Compliance. *Law & Policy*, Vol. 34, No. 4.
- Pandza, J., Deri, L., Galamos, A., Galambos, T. (2015). Two-factor Analysis of Employee Motivation at Postal Traffic – Department in Novi Sad. *European Journal of Economic Studies*, Vol.(12), Iss. 2.
- Perkins, E. (2011). A Lead Manager Is A Motivator. *International Journal of Choice Theory and Reality Therapy*. Fall 2011, Vol. XXXI, No 1.
- Platow, M.J., Haslam, S.A., Reicher, S.D. & Steffens, N.K. (2015). There is no leadership if no-one follows: Why leadership is necessarily a group process. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, March, Vol. 10, No 1.
- Report: State of The Global Workplace. Employee Engagement Insights For Business Leaders Worldwide, Instytut Gallupa, 2013.
- Shep, H. (2011). *Kultklienta*. Warszawa: Wyd. Wolters Kluwer.
- Small, E.E., Rentsch, J.R. (2010). Shared Leadership in Teams: A Matter of Distribution. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, Vol. 9, Iss.4.
- Sprenger, R.K. (2011). *Zaufanie#1*. Warszawa: MT Biznes.
- Stuart-Kotze R., Dunn Ch. (2011), *Gdziesiątoinajlepsipracownicy*. Warszawa: Wyd. Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business.
- Wziątek-Staśko, A. (2016). The Extent of Managers' Motivation as a Determinant Leadership Quality. *Economics and Management*. Vol. 8, Iss. 1, DOI: 10.1515/emj-2016-0004,37-46.
- Wziątek-Staśko, A. (2016). *Motywowanie w erze Web 2.0+*. Warszawa: CeDeWu.

Zhang, Z., Wang, M. & Shi J. (2012). Leader-Follower Congruence In Proactive Personality And Work Outcomes: The Mediating Role Of Leader-Member Exchange. The Academy of Management Journal, Vol. 55, No 1.

Zhou, J. (2014). Mediating role of employee emotions in the relationship between authentic leadership and employee innovation. Social Behaviour & Personality, 42(8).