

Bachelor thesis Organization & Strategy

The impact of leadership on work motivation

ANR	610678
Student	Saskia van Dijk
Study	Strategic Management
Topic	Entrepreneurship
Academic Year	2009/2010
Supervisor	Drs. Marloes Rothengatter
Number of words	6928
Date	June 11th, 2010

Tilburg University

Management Summary

This thesis deals with the topic of how leadership can impact work motivation. Interest in the linkage between leadership and work motivation is created by the fact that both variables are of great importance for a successful performance of an organization. Both subjects are highlighted in literature in many ways. To examine the linkage, it is necessary to define both concepts.

In this thesis, leadership is defined as ‘the ability of an individual to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the (groups) of which they are members’ House (cited by Schaffer, 2008, p.6). By defining the concept of leadership, it has been shown that numerous leadership models enhance different leadership styles. Theories developed by for example Hersey and Blanchard, Kerr and Jermier, Fiedler and House all identify different styles, but all make classifications between task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership. For this thesis it is chosen to create a model with these two major styles of leadership, recognized by all theories (House, 1996; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Kerr & Jermier, 1979). Characteristics that make both styles exclusive are, amongst other, the way decision-making processes are designed, the communication and the physical distance between a leader and its’ followers.

In academic literature, motivation is highlighted in many ways as well. By collecting and reading several academic articles to find out what factors drive work motivation, it showed that Herzberg’s two factor theory was complete in the elements that are taken into account. An important note of the theory is that factors which cause motivation are not the same factors as those which reduce motivation. The factors which cause motivation are called ‘Motivators’ and they include Achievement, Advancement, Possibility of growth, Responsibility, Recognition and the Work itself. The factors which reduce motivation are called ‘Hygiene factors’ and they include Status, Salary, Interpersonal relations, Company policy, Working conditions and Interpersonal supervision.

To make the impact of leadership on motivation clear, for each leadership style it was presented how it affects the elements that drive motivation. After evaluating all these elements, it can be concluded that both forms of leadership cannot influence all of the aspects Herzberg’s theory include. Some factors are outside the range of a leaders’ capabilities and are not features of the two styles as discussed.

Furthermore, has been seen that some motivators and hygiene factors are connected with each other. Hence, it should be noted that some of the elements of Herzberg’s model mutually intensify each other. Another interesting conclusion is that by the factors that can be influenced by leadership, relation-oriented leadership stimulates motivation of employees more positive than task-oriented leadership does. In this context, the overall conclusion of this thesis is that leadership affects motivation in several ways, and to maximize an employees’ motivation it is best to enhance relation-oriented leadership.

Contents

- Management Summary..... 2
- Chapter 1: Introduction 5
 - 1.1 Introduction 5
 - 1.2 Problem Indication 5
 - 1.3 Problem statement 6
 - 1.4 Research Questions 6
 - 1.5 Relevance 6
 - 1.6 Research Design and data collection..... 7
 - 1.7 Overview of the Rest of the Chapters..... 7
- Chapter 2: A classification in leadership styles and their most important characteristics..... 9
 - 2.1 Defining leadership 9
 - 2.2 Research into leadership styles..... 9
 - 2.3 Leadership styles 11
 - 2.3.1 Relation-oriented leadership..... 11
 - 2.3.2 Task-oriented leadership 11
 - 2.4 Summary 12
- Chapter 3: Employees’ motivation..... 14
 - 3.2 Herzberg’s two factor theory..... 15
 - 3.3 Summary 17
- Chapter 4: The role of leadership in motivating employees..... 18
 - 4.1 How Hygiene factors are satisfied by task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership 18
 - 4.2 How Motivators are satisfied by task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership..... 20
 - 4.3 Overview of factors and how they are satisfied by task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership 23
- Chapter 5: Conclusion and recommendations 24
 - 5.1 Conclusion..... 24

5.2 Limitations.....	25
5.3 Academic and practical recommendations	25
References	26

Chapter 1: Introduction

1.1 Introduction

This thesis is focused on the topics ‘Leadership’ and ‘Motivation’. On both fields, the amount of research that has been done extended enormously in the last decades. Interest is in the linkage between these two fields.

In this first chapter, an introduction is presented, starting with the problem indication. This indication results in a problem statement. Following up on this, sub questions are formulated and the relevance and research design of this study are given. Chapter one will finalize with an overview of the rest of the chapters in this thesis.

1.2 Problem Indication

Leadership plays a very important role in organizations. Its importance is described in several articles, and different authors have made different emphasizes. Some studies reveal that leadership can lead to improved work performance (Huang, Iun, Liu & Gong, 2009), others emphasize the process of influencing and motivating other people (House, 1996) or connect leadership with “a facilitating progress toward goal attainment and successful performance” (Zaccaro & Klimoski, 2001, p.6). According to these authors, tasks of leaders are for example improving team effectiveness and establishing performance goals. Lyons and Schneider (2009) state that in this era ‘leadership represents a motivational, emotional, and developmental part of organizations successes’ (p.747). All these statements and citations of different authors make obvious that leadership is of great importance for an organization to perform well. The behavior of the leader can make a major difference in the performance of an organization.

The extent of motivation of employees also plays an important role in organizations because it is identified as a crucial factor in organizational performance as well (Kovach, 1995). By finding out what drives employees in organizations, leaders can try to organize work performance, which can enhance the willingness of employees to work harder. In this context, it is useful to note that motivation is not the only driver of performance (Rollinson, 1998).

Where it is proven that both leadership styles and motivation play an important role in the performance of organizations, the desire to get insight in the actual relationship between the two variables is created. The relationship itself is identified by several authors, for example by Vroom and Jago (2007). They state that the process of leadership involves motivating followers. Dependent on the behavior of the leader, followers can be motivated in several ways. Furthermore, numerous studies have analyzed leaders’ behavior and the effect on the behavior of followers (Grojcan, Resick, Dickson

& Smith, 2004). The question that arises from this point is how leaders can affect the behavior of their employees and what they can achieve with different kind of leadership styles.

1.3 Problem statement

Following up on the problem indication, questions about the motivation of employees and the role of leadership in this process arise. In this thesis research is done to answer the following question:

What is the impact of leadership on work motivation?

In this question, ‘motivation’ is the dependent variable. To give an answer to this research question, it is important to get a broader insight into different styles of leadership and the motivation of employees. According to Furnham and Eracleus (2008), motivation of employees is a matter of personality variables, but are there any other factors that influence the motivation of employees? And is there any evidence in the literature that the different leadership styles lead to different levels of motivation by employees? All previously named aspects are discussed in order to answer the main question.

1.4 Research Questions

The following research questions are answered to solve the main question. They also need to be answered to give a broader insight into the different variables.

1. What different types of leadership styles can be identified and what are their most important characteristics?
2. What is the work motivation of employees and what factors have an influence on that motivation?
3. What is the effect of different leadership styles on the motivation of employees?

1.5 Relevance

The purpose of this research is to examine current literature in the field of leadership styles and their effect on the motivation of employees. The academic contribution of this thesis is to provide an overview of (conflicting) views and to conclude how the relation between leadership and work motivation can be explained. The managerial relevance of this thesis is to explain how managers can increase their employees’ motivation by making use of different leadership styles. Managers can use this work to discover how their styles of leadership connect to their employees’ motivation. In entrepreneurship, leadership is an important subject because it is believed that all firms need leaders who create a strategy and a direction to follow this strategy. Leaders also need employees to follow

their directions and help by working to achieve goals. The leader needs to ensure that for example customers, employees and investors stay committed to the firm.

1.6 Research Design and data collection

The literature used in this paper is found by use of the University of Tilburg (UvT) online search engine. Online databases like Web of Science and Picarta are used. Search words that are used are for example: leadership style and (work) motivation. After searching on these words, a lot of articles can be found. These articles are screened on the year they have been published. To bring a correct and useful thesis it is important that the articles are not outdated. Therefore, the most recent articles have been read first. This led to the ‘exploration’ of several important authors who developed their own theories about leadership as well as motivation. When these authors were recognized, it has been checked which other authors cited their articles and models and what kind of supports and critics they give.

This leads to the other criteria on which articles are screened, namely the critics and supports these articles have received, in what journals are they published and how many times have they been cited in other scientific articles. By giving attention to these aspects, it is possible to determine how reliable the articles used are. To be as objective and neutral as possible, articles from different authors and different journals are used. In the Bachelor thesis guide, a list with journals considered to be high quality is published. Articles published in these journals (among others) will be used.

These journals include the following:

- Journal of Organizational behaviour
- Journal of Business Ethics
- Journal of Management Studies
- Leadership Quarterly

Articles found in journals that are not presented in the list will be checked on quality by looking at the number of times the articles are cited.

1.7 Overview of the Rest of the Chapters

This study is of descriptive nature. In the following chapters, literature is collected to answer the problem statement. This is done by answering the sub questions by information, found in scientific literature. After these research questions have been answered, an overall conclusion and answer to the main question is given.

In chapter two, the theoretical background of leadership styles is discussed. This information is used to get a broader insight in the variable ‘Leadership’. First, an explanation of leadership and the categorization of different styles recognized in literature are given. Secondly, the most important

characteristics of these styles are given.

In the third chapter, attention is paid to the variable 'Motivation'. This chapter starts with an explanation of employees' motivation. Secondly, an overview of factors that influence motivation is given.

In chapter four, the variables are linked to give information in order to answer the main question.

Chapter five includes the conclusion and limitations. Recommendations for further research are given.

Chapter 2: A classification in leadership styles and their most important characteristics

In the last decades, the field of research on leadership styles has increased enormously (Schaffer, 2008; Yukl, 1989). Several models are developed in literature to give information and insights into different sorts of leadership styles. Some of these models disappeared; others have remained because of the great supports received in scientific literature.

This chapter starts with a short explanation and a definition of leadership. In this way, vagueness about the meaning of leadership will be prevented. In paragraph 2.2, several theories that are found to have similarities are explained, following up by paragraph 2.3, where two major styles of leadership will be presented. These two major styles are developed with insights from the theories explained in paragraph 2.2. This chapter ends with paragraph 2.4, where a short summary is given.

2.1 Defining leadership

The concept of leadership styles is defined many times by different authors. According to Vroom and Jago (1997) most of these definitions rely on the importance of influencing followers. It is not possible to lead without followers. A suitable definition in the context of this thesis is made by House (cited by Schaffer, 2008, p.6): ‘Leadership is the ability of an individual to influence, motivate and enable others to contribute toward the effectiveness and success of the (groups) of which they are members’.

2.2 Research into leadership styles

To define the concept of leadership styles and to get insight in different styles a leader can maintain, several models have been studied. While studying, it has been shown that several models include similarities at some characteristics. Therefore, it is decided to explain these models and to combine several characteristics into a new model.

The models that will be used are explained shortly in this paragraph.

LPC Contingency Theory (Fiedler)

The Contingency Theory is developed by Fiedler (Yukl, 1989) and deals with ‘the influence of position power, task structure and leader-member relations between leader trait and leader effectiveness’ (p.265). LPC stands for Least Preferred Coworker. According to Fiedler (as cited in Justis, 1975) the most appropriate style is the one that leads to high task performance. This is caused by the relationship between the following functions: (1) leaders’ position power; (2) nature of the task; (3) nature of the leader-member relation.

Situational Leadership Theory (Hersey & Blanchard)

Hersey & Blanchard build their Situational Leadership Theory on the 3D leadership framework of Reddin (Graeff, 1983; Vechhio, 1987). According to this model, two dimensions are recognized in leadership: task oriented and relation oriented (Yukl, 1989). In task oriented leadership, emphasis is put on the final goal and on the way a task is performed. The leader decides how employees work, what procedures are being held on to and how control and evaluation takes place.

On the other side there is relation oriented leadership, in this form the relation between employee and leader has a central place. Leaders encourage and stimulate their followers by giving more attention to employees' creativity and supporting teamwork (Graeff, 1983). In these two dimensions of leadership, four different styles have been recognized (S1: Telling; S2: Selling; S3: Participating; S4: Delegating) which vary in the extent of relationship behavior and task behavior (Hersey & Blanchard, 1988).

Path Goal Theory (House)

House developed his original 'Path-goal theory' in 1966 and reviewed this model in 1996. According to House (1996, p. 325) it is 'primarily a theory of task and person oriented supervisory behavior'. Leaders have influence on their followers in performance, satisfaction and motivation by making clear goals, the offering of rewards by reaching goals, and the elimination of obstacles that occur by reaching goals (House, 1996). The extent of how this behavior can be effective depends on situational factors like psychological characteristics of employees, environmental characteristics and task structure (Stinson & Johnson, 1985).

Depending on these situational factors, four main styles of leadership are possible (House, 1996):

- (1) Directive; where the leader directs his employees by giving advice
- (2) Supportive; where the leader acts supportive and friendly
- (3) Participative; where the leader asks his employees for information and takes their suggestions into account
- (4) Achievement oriented; where the leader makes high objectives for his employees, and expects them to perform high.

Leader Substitutes Theory (Kerr & Jermier)

With the Leader Substitutes Theory, Kerr and Jermier (1978) give critics to leadership models which assume that leadership is always effective, independent of the situation a leader operates. According to Kerr and Jermier (1978), there are organizational variables which can function as substitutes for leadership. In their study, they assume that a number of characteristics of the variables subordinates, tasks and the organization can neutralize leadership. In this approach, a distinction has been made between relation-oriented and task-oriented.

2.3 Leadership styles

As mentioned in the previous paragraph, it showed that some models have similarities in the classification that has been made. The models enhance styles which are not 'exclusive', which means that styles do not differ for all characteristics (Fulk & Wendler, 1982). By explaining these models in the previous paragraph, it showed that they all make a distinction between two major forms of leadership: relation-oriented and task-oriented. Several characteristics of the models are used to explain the main differences between these two forms of leadership.

2.3.1 Relation-oriented leadership

Relation oriented leadership is recognized by different authors (Kerr & Jermier, 1978, Yukl, 1989). Some leadership models (for example Situational Leadership Theory by Hersey & Blanchard and Path Goal theory by House) specify relation-oriented leadership into different sub styles, which vary on task-majority of the employee (Yukl, 1989). The characteristics of these sub styles are processed into the major form relation oriented leadership.

An important characteristic of relation-oriented leadership is the fact that the leader concentrates on the satisfaction of his subordinates' needs and preferences (House, 1996; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Kerr & Jermier, 1979). Subordinates participate in decision making processes in a way that their opinions and suggestions are asked and taken into account. Moreover, subordinates are free in the implementation of their task. Leaders will not specify strict rules but give employees the opportunity to develop their skills and abilities in knowledge and creativity and the opportunity to decide how to enable things (Hersey & Blanchard, as cited in Graeff, 1983; Kerr & Jermier, 1978).

The communication between the leader and his subordinates is informal (Yukl, 1989). This also suggests that there is a relatively small distance between leader and follower. According to Shamir (1995) a small distance between leader and follower ensures that leaders cannot hide any mistakes or misunderstandings, which make leaders more human and fallible in the perception of employees.

Furthermore, it can be concluded that this form of leadership is people centered (Kerr & Jermier, 1978). This means that the leader puts the well-being of employees on first place instead of tasks. Interaction between workgroups and the leader are supported and facilitated (Kerr & Jermier, 1979). The development of employees is also supported by leaders.

2.3.2 Task-oriented leadership

Task-oriented leadership is the second major style next to relation-oriented leadership. Both forms of leadership can be seen as opposite of each other, because they differ at all points. For example, where a relation-oriented leader emphasizes his subordinates' satisfaction, a task-oriented leader focuses on providing structure to his employees to encourage them in completing their task at the first point

(House, 1996; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Kerr & Jermier, 1979). By bringing in structure, employees work according to pre-specified rules and procedures, resulting in strict guidance by their leaders. Furthermore, employees cannot cooperate in the coordination of work; all they have to do is following the direction of the leader without receiving supports (Hersey & Blanchard, 1969). This results in a structured work-place where jobs are done according to a tight planning. The communication between leader and follower is formal in task-oriented leadership, which results in a high social distance (Shamir, 1995). Overall, it can be concluded that task-oriented leadership is job-centered, because the implementation and the way tasks are completed are most important to the leader. Goal emphasis and the facilitation of work are more important than supporting employees (Kerr & Jermier, 1979).

2.4 Summary

As shown in this chapter, numerous leadership models enhance different leadership styles. Theories developed by for example Hersey and Blanchard, Kerr and Jermier, Fiedler and House all identify different styles, but all make classifications between task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership. For this thesis it is chosen to create a model with these two major styles of leadership, recognized by all theories (House, 1996; Hersey & Blanchard, 1969; Kerr & Jermier, 1979). In table one the most important differences in characteristics of both styles are presented.

Relation oriented	Task oriented
<i>Main characteristics</i>	
Behavior is oriented on satisfaction of subordinates needs and preferences	Behavior is oriented on providing psychological structure for subordinates
Consulting with subordinates and taking their opinions and suggestions into account when making decisions	Scheduling, coordinating work without any assistance from followers
Followers get freedom in the implementation of their tasks; they are allowed to decide for themselves how to enable things	Followers are autonomous, they work according to guidance, policies, rules and procedures, edited by their leader
Informal communication between leader and followers	Formal communication between leader and followers
Small physical distance between leader and followers	Long physical distance between leader and followers
People-centered	Job-centered
Leaders let their followers strive for higher standards of performance and to have more confidence in their ability to meet challenging goals	

Table 1: Overview of characteristics of relation-oriented and task-oriented leadership

Chapter 3: Employees' motivation

In order to find the impact of leadership on motivation, it is necessary to examine the variable 'Motivation' as well. This chapter starts with a short explanation of motivation and some highlights of the research done in this field (paragraph 3.1). In paragraph 3.2, attention will be paid to characteristics that are proven to have influence on an employees' motivation by using Herzberg's two-factor theory. In paragraph 3.3, a short summary and conclusion will be given.

3.1 Defining motivation

The concept of motivation is discussed by many people. Because of the amount of research done on motivation it is difficult to find a universally accepted definition. Because the relevance of this thesis is to give an insight in the extent of motivation influenced by leadership, only the content of work motivation will be taken into account.

To define the concept of work motivation, a citation is taken from Pinder. This citation has been supported by several studies. Pinder (as cited in Meyer, Becker & Vandenberghe, 2004; Lundberg, Gudmundson & Andersson, 2008) defines work motivation as: 'a set of energetic forces that originates both within as well as beyond an individual's being, to initiate work-related behavior, and to determine its form, direction, intensity, and duration' (p. 11).

The studies done in motivation show an important shift in the meaning of the concept. In the 50's and 60's, motivation was seen as a factor that lies outside employees. Motivation was determined by either reinforcement or punishment (Locke & Latham, 2002). However, the most recent studies on motivation show that the concept is also caused by psychological factors in human beings as well. In psychology, motivation is used to explain the way people behave in certain situations (Hofstede, 1980; Benabou & Tirole, 2002).

This shift can be translated in the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Intrinsic motivation describes the motivation of an employee that originates from intrinsic goals. That means, people work because they like to and not because they have to. Extrinsic motivation is the motivation that originates when external factors, as for example rewards, motivate employees to work (Benabou & Tirole, 2003).

The drivers of motivation are investigated by numerous authors. Some studies focus on specific factors that cause motivation, for example Houkes, Janssen, De Jonge & Nijhuis (2001) who focus on individual determinants; Hackman & Oldman (1976) who focus on the design of work and Van Herpen, Van Praag & Cools (2005) who focus on performance management and compensation.

Other studies have emphasized models which represent factors driving motivation in a work atmosphere, for example Herzberg's two factor theory. Studies that have investigated and supported this theory are for example Maidani (1991), Lundberg, Gudmundson and Andersson (2008).

3.2 Herzberg's two factor theory

In the 60's, Herzberg developed a theory based on the fact that people have two different sorts of needs. Different aspects of work can satisfy or dissatisfy these needs.

The first set of needs is described as 'hygiene factors'. This concerns the basic needs of a person to survive and enclose extrinsic factors of a job, which are not directly related to a job but 'concern the conditions that surround performing that job' (Lundberg, Gudmundson & Andersson, 2008, p.891). Status, salary, interpersonal relations, company policy, working conditions and interpersonal supervision are all hygiene factors (Herzberg, Mausner & Bloch Snyderman, 1959).

The second set of needs is described as 'motivators', otherwise 'growth needs'. These needs are intrinsically related to a job and enclose achievement, advancement, possibility of growth, responsibility and recognition and the work itself (Furnham & Eracleus, 2009; Furnham et al., 1999). Herzberg made this distinction because he found out that the factors which cause motivation are not the same factors that reduce motivation. This means that in this theory, satisfaction is not the opposite of dissatisfaction, but the opposite of no satisfaction and the opposite of dissatisfaction will be 'no dissatisfaction'.

According to Herzberg (2003) the absence of hygiene factors reduces motivation. But when they are present, they do not lead to motivation.

In contrary, motivators cause extra motivation when they are present. But when they are absent in an employees' environment, they do not reduce motivation.

In table two, all hygiene factors and motivators are explained.

Hygiene factors	Motivators
<i>Status:</i> The degree in which status is a factor in feelings about a job	<i>Achievement:</i> Successful fulfillment of a job, finding solutions to problems and seeing results of someone's work
<i>Salary:</i> All actions in which compensation plays a role	<i>Advancement:</i> Advancement only plays a role when an employee is transferred from one part of the organization to another part, with a change in status or position included
<i>Interpersonal relations:</i> Interaction of people in the performance of jobs. Is it purely social or sociotechnical?	<i>Possibility of growth:</i> The chance for an employee to move upwards in the organization and the way an employee can advance in his skills and profession
<i>Company policy:</i> The competence or incompetence of a company's organization and management, and the valuable effects of a company's policy	<i>Responsibility:</i> The satisfaction derived from received responsibility in the past for the own work or for the work of others, or the gift of new responsibility
<i>Working conditions:</i> The adequacy of physical conditions of work, facilities available and the amount of work that has to be done	<i>Recognition:</i> The recognition an employee has to the leader
<i>Interpersonal supervision:</i> The competence and fairness of the leader	<i>Work itself:</i> The good or bad feelings employees have while doing their jobs

Table 2: Overview of hygiene factors and motivators (Herzberg, Mausner & Bloch Snyderman, 1959)

In the context of this paper, it would be a logical step to discuss only the motivators, because they are proven to increase work motivation, while hygiene factors are proven not to have influence on increasing motivation (Herzberg, Mausner & Bloch Snyderman, 1959). Though, there are several critics to this aspect which suggest that motivators and hygiene factors are not the same for every person (Furnham, Forde & Ferrari, 1999), (a motivator for a person can be a hygiene factor for another). An example of this are the critics the two factor theory receives from House (1967) who showed that achievement and recognition (which can be seen as motivating factors, according to Herzberg (2003)) are more often seen as hygiene factors than as motivating factors. For this reason it is chosen to take all motivators as well as the hygiene factors to conclude which factors influence work motivation.

3.3 Summary

In academic literature, motivation is highlighted in many ways. An important distinction that has been made by several authors is the difference between intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. Where intrinsic motivation comes from inside a human being, extrinsic motivation exists from external factors.

Herzberg's two factor theory describes work motivation to exist from hygiene factors (extrinsic) and motivators (intrinsic). The theory is developed from the insight that factors which cause motivation are not the same factors as those which reduce motivation. All motivators and hygiene factors are explained in table 2 and will be used in the following chapter to investigate whether different leadership styles can influence these factors.

Chapter 4: The role of leadership in motivating employees

After explaining the two major forms of leadership and presenting hygiene factors and motivators in chapter three, this chapter will discuss how the two forms of leadership can influence the different factors that cause motivation. In paragraph 4.1, the hygiene factors will be discussed and checked how leadership affects these factors. In paragraph 4.2, the motivators will be discussed and checked as well how they can be stimulated by task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership.

In paragraph 4.3, a table is presented which shows the results of task- and relation-oriented leadership serving these factors.

4.1 How Hygiene factors are satisfied by task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership

The hygiene factors, according to Herzberg, Mausner and Bloch Snyderman (1959) are explained in this paragraph. While discussing, it will be checked whether leaders have the possibility to influence these factors within their scope.

Status

Status is described as the degree in which status is a factor in feelings about a job and in the organization. According to Van Dijke and De Cremer (2008) leaders can influence the thought of their employees' status in the organization. It should be noted that they state that it can only happen when subordinates believe in the fairness of their leader; because the believe in fairness leads to the fact that employees 'think higher of their own status in an organization' (Van Dijke & De Cremer, 2008, p.226). De Cremer, van Knippenberg, van Knippenberg, Mullenders and Stinglhamber (2005) also state that there is a higher esteem of status for employees 'when a leader ship style was high in rewarding behavior' (p.3).

According to Herzberg, Mausner and Bloch Snyderman (1959), when employees think higher of their status, this should lead to motivation. As the procedural fairness of leaders is not a feature of the leadership styles but is assumed to be a personal characteristic (De Cremer et al., 2005), it cannot be concluded in how relation-oriented and task-oriented leaders differ on motivating employees at this level. However, as a result from what is written above, it can be concluded that leaders can affect the feeling of status of their employees.

Furthermore, it should be noted that Herzberg, Mausner and Bloch Snyderman (1959) see fairness of a leader as a separate hygiene factor, which they categorize as 'Interpersonal supervision'. From this point, it can be concluded that there is a linkage between the hygiene factors 'Status' and 'Interpersonal supervision'.

The last thing that can be assumed is the fact of being responsible for several task implementations can

make employees as well think higher of their own status in the organization, which can lead to more motivation. This leads to the conclusion that status of employees is influenced by the motivator 'Responsibility' as well.

Salary

According to Morgan (1993), leaders are, in most organizations, not directly involved in the process of compensation decisions. However, they do participate in this process, if only indirectly by means as a performance appraisal. Hence, leaders can influence the wages of employees which drive motivation (Herzberg, Mausner & Bloch Snyderman, 1959). For example, when taking a job evaluation which shows that a certain employee performs better than his direct colleagues; a leader has the opportunity to take this into account when the focal manager decides about salary. Therefore, it can be concluded that leadership affects motivation by the aspect of salary. In the classification between task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership, salary or any other form of compensation is not a feature in which the two forms of leadership differ, which means that it cannot be said which leadership styles affect motivation more positively on this level.

Interpersonal relations

The factor 'Interpersonal relations' describes the form of interaction between leader and follower. Interaction can be purely social (interaction independent of the job activities) or sociotechnical (interaction in the performance of jobs). Herzberg, Mausner and Bloch Snyderman (1959) assume that employees are more satisfied with social interaction. In the classification of leadership styles, no distinction has been made in the process of interaction. However, looking at other characteristics of both styles, a major point in difference is that relation-oriented leaders communicate more with their subordinates and are more concerned with their needs than task-oriented leaders.

Task-oriented leaders do not communicate at this level with their subordinates. This suggests that there is a greater chance that relation-oriented leaders will interact purely social with their subordinates than task-oriented leaders. This leads to the conclusion that leadership affects motivation by the factor 'Interpersonal relations' and that relation-oriented leaders affect motivation more positively than task-oriented leaders.

Company policy

Company policy refers to the entire company, divided into policy and administration characteristics. This is a factor that involves the top of organizational hierarchy and is assumed to be outside the range of the leadership characteristics as discussed in chapter two. A leader of a team does not necessarily need to deal with the entire company to decide whether to maintain task-related or relation-oriented leadership. For this reason, it is assumed that a leader cannot interfere in company policy to affect the

motivation of his subordinates in either task- or relation-oriented leadership.

Working conditions

Working conditions include physical conditions, the facilities and the amount of work employees face in their task. All of these characteristics have not been identified as features which differ at task- or relation-oriented leadership. The other features of the leadership styles discussed in chapter two do not suggest any facts that lead to different working conditions as well. From this point, it cannot be concluded that working conditions is a factor that can be affected by leadership styles.

This means also that working conditions cannot be influenced differently in task- or relation-oriented leadership.

Interpersonal supervision

According to Herzberg, Mausner and Bloch Snyderman (1959), interpersonal supervision includes the competence and fairness of a leader as main characteristics. The fairness of a leader is also discussed by the hygiene factor 'Status', where it was written that fairness of a leader drives employees to think higher of their own status (Van Dijke & De Cremer, 2008). Because the fairness of a leader drives employees to a higher esteem of status, it can be concluded that leaders can influence the motivation of their employees at this factor. Again, it should be noted that fairness of a leader is a personal characteristic, therefore it cannot be concluded in what way both forms of leadership contribute to an employees' motivation.

4.2 How Motivators are satisfied by task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership

As explained in chapter three, motivators are the intrinsic factors to the job itself. This paragraph elaborates on the motivators and how these can be encouraged by leaders.

Achievement

In both relation- and task-oriented leadership an employee is able to complete tasks successfully. However, an important difference between both leadership styles in finding solutions to problems is that it is more likely for an employee to interfere in the process that leads to finding that solution. According to Deci, Connell and Ryan (1989) this involves the self-determination theory, which describes how leaders support the sense of choice and personal initiatives their employees come up with. In chapter two, it is stated that relation-oriented leaders do support their employees in taking initiatives and making choices for themselves.

In contrary, task-oriented leadership states that leaders make decisions without any assistance of their followers and therefore it can be assumed that those leaders do not encourage employees to make their

own choices and take initiatives. In this context, it can be concluded that leadership can affect motivation by this factor, but it should be noticed that relation-oriented leaders motivate employees more positively than task-oriented leaders do.

Furthermore, it should be noted that the sense of achievement also influences the self-esteem and status of an employee (Deci, Connell & Ryan, 1989). Again, it can be concluded that there is a relation with the hygiene factor 'Status'.

Advancement

In Herzberg's model, advancement is only relevant when employees are transferred in an organization. In chapter two, advancement has not been seen as a feature of both leadership styles. Both styles do not take this factor into account. Therefore, it is not possible to conclude whether task- or relation-oriented leadership affects motivation at this point.

Possibility of growth

Possibility of growth represents the extent in which employees can move upwards in organizations and the extent in which the employee is able to advance in his own skill and in his profession (Herzberg, Mausner & Bloch Snyderman, 1959). Because of the fact that relation-oriented leaders give employees space to develop themselves it can be assumed that this makes an employee able to advance. This should lead to motivation.

Task-oriented leaders on the other hand let their employees work with strict guidelines without asking for their opinions or let them cooperate in work decisions. The fact that these two characteristics do not stimulate growth and the fact that task-oriented leaders do not give employees space for development suggest that employees will not be motivated in this context.

Responsibility

The satisfaction an employee derives from having own responsibilities in the fulfillment of tasks represents this motivator. Task-oriented leadership does not give employees any responsibilities because of the fact that a task-oriented leader directs his employees in a strict direction to fulfill a task. From this point, it is obvious that task-oriented leadership does not encourage responsibility and therefore does not influence an employees' motivation.

A relation-oriented leader on the other hand, wants to give his employees freedom in the implementation of tasks. This means that employees do receive the responsibility which causes motivation.

By discussing the hygiene factor 'Status' earlier, it is assumed that responsibility leads to a higher thought of an employees' status. In this case, relation-oriented leadership motivates employees more because status mediates the relation between responsibility and motivation.

Recognition

Recognition presents the fact that employees experience 'recognition to the person speaking' (Herzberg, Mausner & Bloch Snyderman, 1959, p.44). The recognition employees have with their leader can be influenced by the extent of social distance (Shamir, 1995). Relation-oriented leaders have smaller distances with their employees. Because of the fact that a smaller distance makes leaders more human (Shamir, 1995) it is more likely that employees have recognition with their leader than what they can have when task-oriented leadership is enhanced. Where task-oriented leaders have bigger social distances with their employees, it can be assumed that those employees feel less recognition towards their leaders. Hence, it can be concluded that leadership impacts work motivation at this level and that relation-oriented leadership motivates employees more than task-oriented leaders.

Work itself

The work itself represents good or bad feelings employees have while implementing their tasks. These feelings can be caused by the extent of routines and easiness of a task and the creativity needed for implementation. Both leadership styles do not see work itself as a separate characteristic. It is not stated that task-oriented or relation-oriented leadership involves the content of certain tasks. For this reason, it cannot be concluded that different forms of leadership affect work motivation and that they cause different levels of motivation by the work itself.

4.3 Overview of factors and how they are satisfied by task-oriented and relation-oriented leadership

This paragraph includes a summary of the conclusions drawn in the previous two paragraphs. The influence leadership has on the hygiene factors and motivators is presented in table 3. When an (X) is given, this means that the leadership style can affect motivation on the factor concerned (whether this is positively or negatively is not presented in this table but explained in paragraph 4.1 and 4.2). When an (-) is presented, this means that leadership does not affect motivation by this factor.

	Task-oriented leadership	Relation-oriented leadership
Status	X	X
Salary	X	X
Interpersonal relations	X	X
Company policy	-	-
Working conditions	-	-
Interpersonal supervision	X	X
Achievement	X	X
Advancement	-	-
Possibility of growth	X	X
Responsibility	X	X
Recognition	X	X
Work itself	-	-

Table 3: Overview of the linkages between leadership and hygiene factors and motivators

Chapter 5: Conclusion and recommendations

In this chapter, a conclusion will be drawn and limitations and recommendations will be given. To answer the problem statement, three different research questions have been answered in the previous chapters. Paragraph 5.1 will discuss the answers on these sub questions shortly and end with the answer on the main question of this thesis. Paragraph 5.2 discusses the limitations that are involved. Paragraph 5.3 describes recommendations for future research.

5.1 Conclusion

The problem statement which had to be answered in this thesis is *What the impact of leadership is on work motivation*. To answer this problem statement, this thesis started to elaborate on the concepts of leadership and motivation. In chapter two, it is decided to define the concept of leadership into two different styles: task-oriented and relation-oriented. Both styles have their own characteristics at different dimensions. For example the way leader and follower communicate and the distance between leader and follower. In chapter three, research has been done to determine which factors have influence on work motivation. It was decided to use Herzberg's two factor model, which encloses hygiene factors and motivators to explain what drives the motivation of employees.

In chapter four, the two leadership styles are linked with the hygiene factors and motivators in order to give information that helps answering the main question. For each leadership style it was presented how this could affect the elements that drive motivation according to Herzberg's theory. After evaluating all these elements, it can be concluded that both forms can not influence all of the aspects Herzberg's theory include. Factors as for example 'Working conditions', 'Advancement' and 'Company policy' are outside the range of a leaders' capabilities and are not features of the two styles as discussed in chapter two. Furthermore, it is important to notice that it is seen that some motivators and hygiene factors are connected with each other. For example, 'Status' is assumed to be higher when an employee has more responsibility (this is a motivator) and 'Achievement' also has an impact on the status of an employee. Hence, it should be noted that some of the elements of Herzberg's model mutually intensify each other. Because of this, leadership also has an indirect impact on motivation. Another interesting conclusion is that by the factors that can be influenced by leadership, relation-oriented leadership stimulates motivation of employees more positive than task-oriented leadership does. As been seen for the factors 'Interpersonal relations', 'Achievement', 'Possibility of growth', 'Responsibility' and 'Recognition', the model of leadership points out that relation-oriented leadership supports these aspects for employees more positively than task-oriented leadership. Hence, it can be concluded that in this context, the overall conclusion of this thesis is that leadership affects motivation in several ways, and to maximize an employees' motivation it is best to enhance relation-oriented leadership. By drawing this conclusion, it must be said that there can be other factors that determine

the level of motivation, for example task- and employee characteristics. These factors are not taken into account when drawing this conclusion.

5.2 Limitations

The answer on the problem statement involves some important limitations. First, it should be noted that this thesis is written, based on secondary data. No primary data are collected to draw conclusions. Furthermore, due to some time constraints, it was not possible to take all the possible variables that can moderate the relation between leadership and motivation into account. For example, characteristics of employees can influence the degree in which motivation is driven by the several factors. Another variable that should be taken into consideration to describe the impact of leadership on motivation is the characteristics of the task an employee has to complete. When a task is for example unambiguous and routine, it is expected that the leader adapts his style to this characteristics and this can determine the most appropriate form of leadership. The factors mentioned above are not taken into consideration in this thesis, but they do have influence on the results.

5.3 Academic and practical recommendations

As mentioned in the limitations, this thesis is based on secondary data. Research in the future should be focused on primary data, to ensure a valid conclusion. Furthermore, in the limitations some variables are mentioned which can also influence the impact leadership has on motivation. In future research that examines the relation between leadership and motivation, it is recommended to take these variables into consideration. Because of the several critics Herzberg has received on the classification on motivators and hygiene factors (a motivator for one can be a hygiene factor for another one) it would be interesting to take this classification into consideration. Task characteristics and personal characteristics might be investigated in relation to all the elements of Herzberg's model to determine which elements are motivators and which are hygiene factors. When research is done on this subject, it is possible to give a valid conclusion which leadership style can maximize employees' motivation in a certain situation.

Managers who try to motivate their employees should not always maintain relation-oriented leadership because this thesis suggests that it's the best way to motivate employees. They should look at situational variables as for example the characteristics of the tasks that need to be completed and the personal characteristics of their followers as well.

References

- Benabou, R. & Tirole, J. (2002). Self –confidence and personal motivation. *The Quarterly Journal of Economics*, 117, pp. 871-915.
- Benabou, R. & Tirole, J. (2003). Intrinsic and Extrinsic motivation. *Review of Economic Studies*, 70, pp. 489-520.
- De Cremer, D., van Knippenberg, B., van Knippenberg, D., Mullenders, D., & Stinglhamber, F. (2005). Rewarding leadership and fair procedures as determinants of self-esteem. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 90, pp. 3-12.
- Deci, E.L., Connell, J.P. & Ryan, R.M. (1989). Self-Determination in a Work Organization. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74, pp. 580-590.
- Fulk.J. & Wendler, E.R. (1982). Dimensionality of leader – Subordinate interactions: A path-goal investigation. *Organizational behavior and Human Performance*, 30, pp.241-263.
- Furnham, A. & Eracleous, A. (2009). Personality, motivation and job satisfaction: Hertzberg meets the Big Five. *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, 24, pp.765-779.
- Furnham, A., Forde, L. & Ferrari, K. (1999). Personality and work motivation. *Personality and individual differences*, 26, pp.1035-1043.
- Graeff, C.L. (1983). The situational leadership theory: A critical review. *Academy of Management Review*, 8, pp.285-291.
- Grojean, M.W., Resick, C. Dickson, M.W. & Smith, D.B. (2004). Leaders, Values, and Organizational Climate: Examining Leadership Strategies for Establishing an Organizational Climate Regarding Ethics. *Journal of Business Ethics*, 55, pp. 223-241.
- Hackman, J.R. & Oldman, G.R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 16, pp. 250-279.
- Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. (1969). Life-cycle theory of leadership. *Training and Development Journal*, 23, pp. 26-34.
- Herzberg, F. (2003). One more time, how do you motivate employees? *Harvard Business Review*, 81, pp.87.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Bloch Snyderman, B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York, United States of America: John Wiley & Sons, Inc.

Hofstede, G. (1980). Motivation, Leadership and Organizations: do American theories apply abroad? *Organizational Dynamics*, 9, pp.42-63.

Houkes, I., Janssen, P. M., deJonge, J., & Nijhuis, F. J. N. (2001). Work and individual determinants of intrinsic work motivation, emotional exhaustion, and turnover intention: A multi-sample. *International Journal of Stress Management*, 8, pp. 257-283.

House, R.J. (1996). Path-goal theory of leadership: Lessons, legacy, and a reformulated theory. *The Leadership Quarterly*, 7, pp. 323-352.

House, R.J. & Wigdor, L.A. (1967). Herzbergs Dual Factor Theory of job satisfaction and motivation – review of evidence and a criticism. *Personnel Psychology*, 20, 4, pp.369-389.

Huang, X., Iun, J., Liu, A. & Gong, Y. (2009). Does participative leadership enhance work performance by inducing empowerment or trust? The differential effects on managerial and non-managerial subordinates. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 31, pp. 122-143.

Justis, R.T. (1975). Leadership effectiveness: A contingency approach. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, pp. 160-167.

Kerr, S. & Jermier, M. (1978). Substitutes for leadership – Their meaning and measurement. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 22, pp. 375-403.

Kovach, A.K. (2005). Employee Motivation: Addressing a crucial factor in your organization's performance. *Employment Relations today*, 22, pp.93-108.

Locke, E.A. & Latham, G.P. (2002). Building a practically useful theory of goal setting and task motivation – A 35 year odyssey. *American Psychologist*, 57, pp. 705-717.

Lundberg, C., Gudmundson, A. & Andersson, T.D. (2009). Herzberg's two factor theory of work motivation tested empirically on seasonal workers in hospitality and tourism. *Tourism Management*, 30, pp. 890-899.

Lyons, J.B. & Schneider, T.R. (2009). The effects of leadership style on stress outcomes. *Leadership Quarterly*, 20, pp. 737 -748.

Maidani, E.A. (1991). Comparative study of Herzberg's two factor theory of job satisfaction among public and private sectors. *Public Personnel Management*, 20, pp. 441-448.

Meyer, J.P., Becker, T.E. & Vandenberghe, C. (2004). Employee commitment and motivation: A conceptual analysis and integrative model. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 89, pp. 991-1007.

Morgan, R. B. (1993). Self- and coworker perceptions of ethics and their relationship to leadership and salary. *Academy of Management Journal*, 36, pp. 200–214.

Rollinson, D. (1998). *Organizational behaviour and analysis: An integrated approach*. Essex, England: Pearson Education Limited.

Schaffer, B. (2008). Leadership and motivation. *Supervision*, 69, pp.6-9.

Shamir, B. (1995). Social distance and charisma: Theoretical notes and an exploratory study. *Leadership Quarterly*, 6, pp. 19–47.

Stinson, J.E. & Johnson, T.W. (1975). The path-goal theory of leadership: A partial test and suggested refinement. *Academy of Management Journal*, 18, pp. 242.

Van Dijke, M. & De Cremer, D. (2008). How leader prototypicality affects followers' status: The role of procedural fairness. *European Journal of work and organizational psychology*, 17, pp. 226-250.

Van Herpen, M., van Praag, M. & Cools, K. (2005). The effects of performance measurement and compensation on motivation: An empirical study. *De Economist*, 3, pp. 303-329.

Vechhio, R.P. (1987). Situational Leadership Theory: An examination of a descriptive theory. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 72, pp.444-451.

Vroom, J.H. & Jago, A.G. (2007). The role of the situation in leadership. *American Psychologist*, 62, pp.17-24.

Yukl, G. (1989). Managerial Leadership: A review of theory and research. *Journal of Management*, 15, pp.251-289.

Zaccaro, S.J. & Klimoski, R. (2002). Special issue Introduction: The Interface of Leadership and Team Processes. *Group & organizational management: an international journal*, 27, pp. 4-13.