

FACTORS AFFECTING EMPLOYEE'S MOTIVATION IN THE FAST FOOD INDUSTRY: THE CASE OF KFC UK LTD.

Mohammad Kamal Hossain^I, Anowar Hossain^{II},

National University, Gazipur, Bangladesh;^I Brunel University, Uxbridge, United Kingdom^{II}

ABSTRACT

The study attempted to identify factors affecting and assess the level of motivation of employees working at KFC UK Ltd. The study was carried out based on both primary and secondary data. With a view to collect primary data, a structured questionnaire, mostly closed styled, was provided to 70 employees of three KFC's food shop located at London. The study identified six broad categories of motivation factors such as (1) work itself and environment, (2) supervisor relations, (3) company itself and matters, (4) recognition, (5) development and growth and finally (6) pay and benefits. The study finds that non-financial factors have a significantly higher impact on the employee's motivation than the financial factors. Moreover, there are identical sources of motivation and de-motivation, however, the extent of motivation provided by a factor is not the same extent of de-motivation for that factor i.e. the same factors have an effect on motivation and de-motivation of employees in different extent and manner. Finally, the study concluded that the employees working at KFC UK Ltd are adequately motivated, though a significant difference of level of motivation was noticed among gender, different age groups, working status, working position and length of employment comparison.

JEL CLASSIFICATION & KEYWORDS

■ L66 ■ M5M12 ■ M12 ■ FAST FOOD INDUSTRY ■ MOTIVATION ■ WORK SATISFACTION

INTRODUCTION

Employees are the key driving force of any organization who gives endless effort to put a company's decisions into action with a view to achieve the goals of the organization. Employees, therefore, are regarded as an unsurpassed vital resource of organization, and the issue of employee's motivation has become an indispensable part of the human resource strategy of an organization. "Motivation is the force that makes people chooses a particular job, stay with that job and work hard in that job" (Lin, 2007). Conventional theories of motivation suggest that people tend to be motivated with the intention of fulfilling their unsatisfied needs, i.e. they exert effort hoping that their needs will be satisfied (ibid). However, contemporary theorists do not focus only on the need-based concept but also they emphasize on long term goal, sense of fairness, and employee's values (Simons and Enz, 2006). However, both conventional and contemporary theories of motivation recognize the significance of employee motivation in the workplace. Providing excellent service can be possible by the motivated employees that "can create lasting positive experiences for customers" (Petcharak, 2002). The outcomes of motivated employees, in addition, include low turnover, loyalty and harmony, high performance that contribute significantly to the growth and development of the company (Lai, 2009). Conversely, lack of motivation among

the employees leads to poor performance, high employee turnover which makes the attainment of goals of organization unrealistic and unachievable.

Research indicates that every year organizations are investing plenty of money for incentive programs to motivate people work within, though all efforts have not achieved desired results. However, successful programs have been able to boost performance to the extent of 44% (Lia, 2009). The unsuccessful programs were attributed to the lack of knowledge, poor design and inappropriate incentives provided (ibid), but the importance of motivation did, by no means, not lessen rather the necessity of it retained undeniable.

Aims and Objectives of the Study

The purpose of the study is to identify factors affecting motivation of employees working at KFC UK Ltd and assess the level of their motivation. The study has been carried out on the employees working in the line position (operation level) who are directly involved in day-to-day food making and selling operations at KFC's food shops. Employees involved in staff management (strategic and tactical level) have not been included in the study. In order to gain an understanding and assess employees' motivation, this study emphasizes to explore results of a number of questions:

1. What are the reasons employees choose to work in KFC?
2. What are the most important factors that affect the willingness of the KFC's employees to exert more effort in the job? And finally
3. To what extent the KFC's employees are motivated to achieve the company's objectives?

Theoretical framework

Theories of motivation focused on explaining people's behavior (Lin, 2007), which affects their motivation. The study of work motivation was started by the Hawthorne's study (1927-1932), which showed that worker's productivity seemed to improve when changes were made with interest being shown on them (Latham, 2007).. The results led to the realization that the productivity, satisfaction, and motivation of workers were interrelated (Roethlisberger, 1977 in Latham, 2007). Since then, different theories of work motivation has emerged and changed time to time based on the changes of employee's attitude and needs of companies.

Defining Motivation

Motivation can be defined as a driving force within a person which stimulates the individual to do something up to the target level in order to fulfill some need or expectation (Mullins, 2007). It is a complex issue of human behavior which varies from person to a person; as a result, different people are motivated in different ways (Kressler, 2003). Everyone has motives inspired by certain factors that

^I karunu2003@yahoo.com

encourage the desire to enhance performance (ibid). People's behavior is determined by what motivates them and their performance is the product of both ability level and motivation (Mullins, 2007).

Sources of motivation can be intrinsic and extrinsic (Jones and George, 2004). Intrinsic motivated behavior is reinforcement of behavior which leads to feel the necessity of finding a job, find the job interesting, etc. Extrinsic sources of motivated behavior are referred to gain rewards as extra holiday and money or to avoid punishments.

Several theories of motivation were developed to identify the factors of motivation that influence human behavior in different ways. The theories of motivation can be divided into two broad categories, viz. content theories, and process theories.

Content Theories

Contents theories attempt to explain what drives individuals to act in a certain manner based on a universal understanding that all human beings have needs, which pursue them to satisfy these needs lead to motivation.

Maslow (1943) identified five human needs categorized them based on the priority of needs fulfillment. According to Maslow, the fulfillment of physiological needs chases to meet security needs, which chases to meet belongingness needs. Having met belongingness needs, individual drives to meet esteem needs, this chase to meet the self-actualization needs. Maslow stated that "lower level needs must be satisfied before the next higher level" (Petcharak, 2002). When lower level of need is satisfied only then next level of needs is created among them.

Alderfer (1969), however, revised the hierarchy needs theory by revamping five human core needs into three broad groups, such as "existence", "relatedness", and "growth", which is known as ERG theory. The "existence need" is concerned with providing the basic materials similar to Maslow's physiological needs and security needs. The "relatedness need" refers to a personal relationship, which are similar to Maslow's belongingness and esteem needs and "growth needs" is about intrinsic desire for personal development, which is similar to Maslow's self-actualization need. ERG theory, however, contrast with hierarchy theory in few aspects. According to ERG theory, sometimes multiple needs might be acted as motivation drivers at the same time where one need appears to be more dominant than others (Lai, 2009), and higher levels of needs might come forward before fulfilling the lower level of needs.

Herzberg's (1959) two factor theory states that there are two distinct sets of factor viz. "motivational" and "hygiene" factors influence human behavior. Motivational factors (such as achievement, recognition, responsibility, work itself, advancement, personal growth) are related to work content while hygiene factors (such as company policies and administration, interpersonal relations, working conditions, salary, job security, status, benefits) are related to the work environment (Griffin, 2008). According to Herzberg, satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the job are based on different attributes and are independent of each other (Habib, et al., 2010). Herzberg considered hygiene factors as extrinsic factors, which have a disrupting effect on the employee's work attitude and make them ultimately dissatisfied in their jobs when these needs are not adequately met. On the other hand, motivational factors are known to be intrinsic factors, which make employees satisfied when these are met, however, do not make them dissatisfied in the absence of these (Wong, Siu and Tsang, 1999).

Process Theories

Process theories of motivation concentrate on how employee's needs influence their own behavior. In this perspective, "need" accounts for one component of the process through which individuals decides how to behave.

According to Vroom (1964), people are motivated to do things to reach a goal if they believe in the worth of that goal (Kootz et al, 2007). This theory suggests that employee's motivation depends on "expectancy", "instrumentality" and "valence". Expectancy theory explains how reward can lead one's behavior to achieve the company's goal. An employee is willing to perform with a high level of effort when he or she believes that this will lead to desired rewards (Robbins, 2005). The theory states that that motivation is present only when employees realize a positive correlation that effort leads to job performance and job performance leads to rewards (Griffin, 2008).

Locke Edwin (1968) suggests the Goal-setting theory of motivation. The theory emerged from the idea of expectancy theory where a goal setting is a vital tool, which acts as an "immediate regulator of human action" (Locke et al., 1981) that leads employees towards achieving the goal. "Goals affect performance by directing attention, mobilizing effort, increasing persistence, and motivating strategy development" (ibid). Setting a specific and challenging goal caused higher performance than no or not specific or did simple goal (ibid). Setting goal generally does not include motivational needs but enforce employees to be more productive to achieve the task they have given and as an obvious result it leads to some reward. In the case of complex tasks, however, this theory is not effective and if the goal set for individuals is not align with the goals of the organization, conflict may crop up, which causes lack of motivation and ultimately impair individuals' performance.

The equity theory (1963) of motivation presumes that an individual is strongly motivated by a balanced result of input (such as effort, loyalty, hard work, commitment, skill, ability, adaptability, tolerance, determination, personal sacrifice, etc.) and output (such as pay, salary, other benefits, recognition, reputation, praise and thanks, promotion, etc.) i.e. what an employee contributes and receives against of it. The theory is used to explain how employees judge the fairness of rewards received in proportion to resources invested for completing a task by assessing one's own investment-reward ratio, and comparing it against of another colleague holding a similar position (McShane et al., 2000).

Methodology

The study was carried out based on both primary and secondary data. Primary data was collected from three different KFC stores (sample unit) located at Brixton, Clapham and Victoria Station in London during the period of 20th September to 29th September 2011. A structured questionnaire, mostly closed styled, was provided to 70 employees of three stores to collect primary data. Out of them, only 57 sample respondents (81%) out of them participated by filling the questionnaire and sending it back to me. However, 48 out of 57 (68% of 70 sample respondents) sample respondents participated actively in survey activities by answering to all questions duly and rest of them answered partly and was excluded their responses from the study. There were two parts of the questionnaire; part one consisted of demographic information of the sample respondents. The second part comprised four questions in relation to employee's motivation.

Secondary data, on the other hand, was used as well to describe different motivation theories and factors. They were

collected from different books, journal articles, website, published dissertation papers of the graduates etc.

A combined approach (mix of qualitative and quantitative techniques) was used to achieve the objectives of the study. The qualitative approach was used to explore sample respondent's interpretations of events and the quantitative approach to quantify their attitudes, beliefs, feelings, behaviors that seemed immeasurable in qualitative techniques.

4-point Likert scale was used in all questions of the questionnaire ranging from 1 to 4-point, where point-1 represents negative responses (such as not important/ not motivated/ not de-motivated) of the sample respondents. On the other hand, point-2, 3 and 4 represents gradual ranking of positive answers (such as least, moderate and highly important/motivated/de-motivated respectively) of the sample respondents.

Primary data collected from field survey was tabulated using Microsoft Office Excel, and all data was recorded using numerical codes. Various statistical measures such as tally, frequency distribution, mean and standard deviation were used in describing the variables.

Results and Discussion

This section has been divided into five phases. In the first phase, demographic information of the sample respondents and reasons to choose work at KFC has been described in the second phase. Factors affecting the motivation and de-motivation of the respondents have been discussed in the third phase. In the final phase, the level of motivation of employees has been assessed based on the data collected from the field survey.

Demographic Information of the Sample Respondents

The culture of the United Kingdom (UK) is a diversified and multi-cultural. The evidence of the multi-cultured is observed in the job market where different country's people belonging to unlike cultured get assembled that develops an exceptional multifarious working environment. According to Thomas and Pekerti (2003) there is a moderate impact of national culture on the relationship between job satisfaction and employees' exchange behaviors. The study shows that 18 country's people are represented in the sample respondents (table-1), out of them, the male is dominant (56%) over female. The statistics (table-1) of the field survey study shows that a large portion (96%) of the employee's age lies between 21 to 35 years. An insignificant percent of lower or higher aged employee is seen to work at KFC. The study found that 67% of the employees are part time (table-1). In the case of work experience of employment, the study shows that (table-1) period of employment of the sample respondents is between <1 year to maximum 9 years. The table illustrates that a substantial portion (71%) of employees has been working between 1 to 6 years. However, nobody has been found working more than 9 years among the sample respondents.

There are three work stations in a food shop of KFC, such as kitchen (for cooking foods), middle (for packing foods), and front where cashier receives order from and deliver to customers. There is a management team in each shop that supervises, directs and guides the task of other sections and maintains liaison with corporate head office. The number of workers deployed in each section depends on the span of task related to each section. This study shows that 67% of the respondents (table-1) work in the front section as a cashier followed by the middle section (23%) and very minor portion (10%) works in the kitchen.

Reasons to choose the work at KFC

The study discovered 11 reasons to choose work at KFC (table-2) and the reasons have been ranked by the mean value. The most favorable reason (ranked 1) is the "opportunity to interact with different cultured people" followed by "best work place" (ranked 2) followed by "flexible working hours" (ranked 3). Interestingly, non-financial reasons were placed in the top of the ranking list rather than financial reasons. Accordingly, "salary" and "other fringe benefits" were ranked 4th and 10th respectively. On the other hand, "opportunity to develop a career at KFC permanently" was ranked 9th. "Providing free meals" is the most less important reason recognized by the sample respondents which is ranked bottom in the list.

Motivating Factors

Human beings are motivated by satisfying their different kind of needs. Needs depend on many factors and vary by the person, situation, organization, nature of works, risk, educational background of employees, experiences and skills, position of work etc. The factors affecting the employee's motivation working at KFC might be different from the factors of other categorized of organization; even these could be unlike to some extent from other fast food restaurants such as McDonalds, Burger King, Subway, Eat, Pret-A-Manger etc. All employees, therefore, have their own motivational factors to motivate them to perform their bests (Lin., 2007). In this study, the motivation factors have been categorized under six major headings and ranked by combined mean value (table-3) which indicates that unequal influence of factors on motivation.

Motivating Factor: Work itself and Environment

Nature of work and its surrounding environment is the factor that affects the level of motivation of employee significantly. Tylana (2005) suggests that three motivational factors such as achievement, recognition and work itself cause 88% job satisfaction. According to Maslow's Hierarchy of needs theory, safety and security needs come after fulfilling biological and physiological needs. Appropriate job security assurance, challenging work, work that yields a sense of personal accomplishment, increased responsibility are factors cause motivation (Daschler and Ninemeier 1989, in Petcharak, 2002)). However, "good working conditions cannot motivate the employees in themselves, but can determine the employee's performance and productivity" (Lin, 2007).

In this study, "work itself and environment" is identified as the factor that motivate employees highly (table-3) compare to other factors (ranked 1 in overall ranking list). The study identified nine issues under the heading of "work itself and environment" to determine how different issues relating to work and environment shakes motivation level of the sample respondents. The result suggests (table-4) that "overall job security" is ranked first that affects the level of motivation highly (mean value 3.37) followed by "availability of logistic support to carry out the work and the "work itself that makes a difference" are ranked jointly in second position (mean value 3.17). On the other hand, factors "flexible working hour", "involvement in decision making" and "enjoyable working condition" have an impact on motivation. However, "clear job requirements", "challenging work" and "reasonableness of work" affect the employee's motivation not as much of other factors, result suggests.

Motivating Factor: Supervisor Relations

Good relationship between supervisor and the worker is a convincing issue which causes work satisfaction.

employee's bad feelings to their immediate authority do impact on their job performance which leads to dissatisfaction and lack of motivation. According to Tyilana (2005) unfavorable supervision, company policy and administration and interpersonal relationship with supervisor cause 60% job dissatisfaction. There is a variety of ways to develop the relationship such as, through task (giving feedback, taking ideas from employee, giving consultation etc.) and non-task (showing respect, caring employees as individual etc.).

"Supervisor relation", in this study, is identified as another motivation factor ranked second (table-3) in overall ranking list. The sample respondents recognize some aspects relating to supervisor relationship (table-5) of these do have an impact on the employee's motivation. The result shows that the "supervisor's feedback" to the works of employees is an influential factor that helps them to improve their performance (ranked 1). Employees who receive performance feedback are willing to exert more effort at work because it makes them felt important and cared for (Lai, 2009). "Accepting mistakes positively" occurred during the course of work and giving emphasis on employees by accepting their "comments and suggestions" in relation to the job are identified other significant factors of motivation (ranked jointly 2). On the other hand, some non-task related issues contribute to develop a durable relationship between supervisors and employees. In this study, "showing respect" to employees by the supervisor is recognized to be another motivation factor. Likewise, "remembering something personal" about employees such birthday, "showing interest about their personal needs and problems" and "caring" them as an individual are recognized to be factors do have an impact on motivation but not as much of other factors (mean value lies between 2.0 -3.0).

Employees attempt to find the meaning of their jobs and the reasons for being at work (Lin, 2007). When managers treat employees as an individual, they begin to care for employees with respect (Glanz, 2002). When employees realize that they are being treated as human beings, company are caring for their personal needs or lacking and helping to fulfill these needs, employees become loyal to the company and therefore, become more motivated toward their works.

Motivating Factor: Company itself and Matters relating to the Company

"Company itself and matters" relating to the company have an effect on the employee's motivation. Employees usually feel proud being a part of a market leader and financially sound company, which lead them to be satisfied. Basically, satisfaction comes, in this case, having felt secured in their job, long term existence of the company and been sound financially. According to Herzberg's theory, company policy and administration is considered to be hygienic factors (extrinsic factors), which have a disrupting effect on employees work attitude and make them ultimately dissatisfied in their jobs when these needs are not adequately met.

The study finds that "Company itself and matters", is a factor that affects KFC's employee's motivation following the factors of "work itself and environment" and "Supervisor relation" (ranked 3 in overall ranking list, table-3). The study explored few aspects relation to the company and its policies (table-6) do have an impact on motivation. Results show that employees become motivated highly as they see "success of the company" (ranked 1); company clearly "communicates its goals and strategies" to them (ranked 2). On the other hand, aspects such as, "company's market

position, financial performance" and understanding the "company's mission statement, vision & values" affect the employee's motivation as well.

Motivating Factor: Recognition

Appreciation is one of the most top desires of employees which motivate and keep them productive (Glanz, 2002) by enhancing the employee's morale, which "allows them to think better of themselves and their ability to contribute towards organization goals. Employees with high self-esteem are more intrinsically motivated, optimistic, willing to work harder, participative at work, work efficiently, have lower absenteeism rate and are generally more satisfied with their jobs" (Lai, 2009). Herzberg two factors theory described the recognition as a motivating factor that makes employees satisfied.

There are several ways to recognize employees including greeting for better jobs, attach thanks to their paychecks, acknowledge employee milestones, staff gathering outside the organization, highly appreciation for coming up with new ideas, holding celebrations for success, arranging frequent contests and other team building activities etc. However, few important matters should be kept in mind when recognizing employees such as equal recognition for all, recognize immediate after they deserve it, exaggeration is unexpected (McConnell, 2006).

The study spotted "Recognition" to be a factor does have an impact on the KFC's employee's motivation ranked fourth (table-3) in overall ranking list of motivation factors. The sample respondents assessed how some events in relation to recognition affect their motivation. Result (table-7) suggests that "management appreciation as employee comes up with new and better ideas," "holding celebrations for success", and "informal praise and appreciation for better performance" have a significant effect on their motivation (mean values are 3.27, 3.27 and 3.10 respectively). On the other hand, factors such as, "holding regular social events, supporting frequent contests & team building activities and evaluating performance fairly" by the company leads them to become motivated as well.

Motivating Factor: Development and Growth

Skills development, training, growth opportunities and promotion are considered to be powerful motivation factors for employees to satisfy their need for esteem and self-actualization (Lai, 2009). According to the Herzberg two factor theory, personal growth and advancement are known to be intrinsic factors, which make employees satisfied when these are met, and they, thereafter, become motivated. However, criteria must be set correctly for the purpose of promotion and growth, so that employees become motivated by fulfilling those (Brewster et al., 2003). Promotion and growth policy should be matched to the need of employees (Hoag and Cooper, 2006), and there should be a positive correlation between good performance and promotion and growth (Cummings and Worley, 2001 in Lin, 2007).

"Development and Growth", in this study, is identified as another motivating factor that does have effect on the employee's satisfaction ranked fifth (table-3) in the overall ranking of motivating factors. The sample respondents were asked to answer to five questions in relation to training, development and growth. Result (table-8) indicates that factors "training of the employee" (ranked 1) and "opportunities for growth and development" (ranked 2) make employees highly motivated. Moreover, factors "willingness of the managers and immediate supervisors to invest in the development" and "growth of employees"

have an impact on their motivation as well (ranked 3 & 4 respectively). On the other hand, having "promotion and development policy" of the company also make employees motivated (ranked 6).

Motivating Factor: Pay and Benefits

Money is considered to be a panacea used to have solved to the most problems. Money, therefore, is the most motivating factor to all. It is a part of the total incentive package of an organization. Salary is thought to be one of the key factors influencing career choices (Lai, 2009). One employee describe salary as, "the salary paid me is what the company thinks of me. The lower salary, the less appreciated" (Bokorney, 2007). Good incentives, therefore, should provide with the aim of attracting and retaining qualified people and motivating them to achieve goals of the organization. However, organization should not rely solely on salary, bonus or other monetary and non-monetary incentives to motivate the diverse workforce due to the limitations it brings (Lai, 2009).

"Pay and benefits", in this study, is spotted as a least motivating factor (ranked 6) lies in the bottom of the overall ranking list of motivating factors (table-3). It is, however, not a most powerful factor like others that do have higher effect on the employee's motivation, the study revealed. This result substantiate Herzberg's two-factor theory which states that salary and benefits are the hygiene factor which can prevent employee's dissatisfaction only but do not necessarily motivate them. However, job security is classified by Maslow as a basic need to guarantee an employee's safety.

The sample respondents graded how different kind of incentives affects their motivation. Result (table-9) suggests that the factor "good wages along with other benefits" does have a significant effect on the employee's motivation followed by the factor "matching payment with responsibilities" (ranked 1 & 2 respectively). The factor "providing free meals", however, does not significantly affect the motivation level of employees and lies in the bottom of the list. This is the factor which identified by employees as the least ranked reason to choose work at KFC (table-8).

Demotivating Factors

Factors that cause de-motivation can be referred as the opposite of motivation factors. That is, employees become motivated when their needs are fulfilled, and conversely, they become de-motivated when their needs are not fulfilled. Therefore, the source of motivation and demotivation are same i.e. needs fulfillment. Herzberg's two factor theory, however, described different sources of job satisfaction and dissatisfaction and both sources are independent of each other. Hygiene factors therefore reduce job dissatisfaction but do not encourage job satisfaction whereas motivating factors result in job satisfaction.

The study identified thirteen factors (table-10) that caused de-motivation and weighed them thereafter as being "highly", "moderately", "least" or "not at all" demotivating factor. Result shows that factors that causes de-motivation as their presence is insignificant in the employee's work and the same factors make them motivated as well when their presence are significant in work. However, it is perceived that the ranking position of factors based on the mean value might be or not identical as demotivating and motivating factors. That is, the extent of motivation for a specific factor might be same or varied from the extent of de-motivation for the same factor. For instance, "lower

scale of salary" (table-10) causes de-motivation and "good wages and other benefits" causes motivation (table-9) significantly high (both ranked 1) as well. On the other hand, "less interesting & challenging job" (table-10) do not have as much impact on motivation as (ranked 7) it causes de-motivation (ranked 2), as the result suggests.

Other demotivating factors are identified as "absence of equal opportunity (ranked 3), "less recognition of good work" and "less job security" (ranked 4), "less fringe benefits" (ranked 5), lack of training (ranked 6), less flexible working hours (ranked 7), "huge pressure of work" (ranked 8), "unequal treatment of management" (ranked 9), "unconstructive criticism of work performed" (ranked 10), "insufficient logistic support" and "unfriendly colleagues" (ranked 11), and the factor that makes them least demotivated is identified "less opportunity to develop career at KFC". However, the same factors do not motivate them in the same extent or manner when these are present in work, result suggests. This indicates that job security, fringe benefits, work pressure, lack of flexibility in working hours and unfriendly colleagues are not strong motivators and can prevent dissatisfaction but do not always result in satisfaction. This means that employees who feel their colleagues are friendly will not necessarily perform better than employees who do not feel their colleagues are friendly. In order to motivate employees, it is, therefore, essential to concentrate on providing employees with the opportunity for career progression at KFC and consequently a sense of achievement, recognition, and responsibility.

Extent of Motivation of Employees Working at KFC UK Ltd

Assessment of the employee's motivation of an organization is a quite complex matter. Because, a wide variety of issues have an impact on motivation such as, nature of job, employees personal perception and values, local and international regulations, risk of work, how different motivation factors identified and met and so on. As such, the motivation level of employees working at KFC might not be same the motivation level of its competitors such as McDonald's, Burger King or Eat.

Result of the study in relation to what extent employees were motivated to assist KFC in achieving its objectives aiming to ascertain their motivation level shows (table-11) that overall mean value and standard deviation of motivation level of employees is 3.60 and 0.568 (based on Likert 4-point scale) respectively. Table-11 illustrates that 65% (31 out of 48) respondents are highly motivated (Likert scale 4-point), 31% (15 out of 48) are moderately (Likert scale 3-point), only 4% (2 out of 48) are least motivated (Likert scale 2-point), however, nobody is found to be not motivated (Likert scale 1-point) at all.

Further analysis of results, however, suggests that a significant difference in the level of motivation between genders, different age groups, working status, working position and length of employment (table-12). By gender comparison, female employees are more motivated compare to male employees. By age group comparison, 41- 45 age group employees are more motivated (though only 1 respondent reports as highly motivated), followed by 31-35 age group followed by 26-30 and then 21-25 age group. The least motivated age group employee is 36- 40 (based on 1 respondent's report as moderately motivated).

By working status comparison, full time employees are more motivated compared to part time. By working position comparison, employees working at the middle position of the shop are more motivated followed by cashiers (till).

However, employees working at kitchen section are least motivated compare to employee's workings other sections. Meanwhile, by length of employment comparison, employees working 7-9 years are more motivated followed by 4-6 years followed by employees working less than one year (<1). However, employees working 1-3 years length are less motivated compare to other.

Conclusion

The study attempted to identify key factors and indicators that affect the employee's motivation working at KFC UK Ltd and assess their motivation level. Results suggest that there are eleven reasons choose to work at KFC; however, financial benefits such as salary and other fringe benefits do not receive as much of priority as non-financial benefits. On the other hand, the study identified six broad categories of motivation factors such as (1) work itself and environment, (2) supervisor relations, (3) company itself and matters, (4) recognition, (5) development and growth and finally (6) pay and benefits. The research reveals that non-financial factors have a significantly higher impact on the employee's motivation than the financial factors such as pay and benefits which substantiate the result in relation to reasons choose to work at KFC. This indicates that KFC needs to focus on non-financial factors along with financial factors to ensure that its workforce is effectively engaged and consequently motivated. Employees at KFC are more motivated by factors relating to the work itself and the environment. This means that KFC needs to create a good working environment and employees receive recognition and feel valued. As the need for development and growth is also identified as a motivating factor, KFC should provide adequate training and development to ensure employees are motivated. The study also indicates that there are identical sources of motivation and de-motivation which contrast with the result of Herzberg two-factor theory where motivation and de-motivation sources as being different and independent. However, the extent of motivation provided by a factor is not the same extent of de-motivation for that factor i.e. the same factors have an effect on motivation and de-motivation of employees in different extent and manner. For example, lower scale of salary results in high level of de-motivation but good wages of salary causes motivation employees not as much as de-motivate them.

Finally, the results show that overall mean value and standard deviation of motivation level of employees is 3.60 and 0.568 (based on 4-point Likert scale) respectively; which indicates that the motivation level of employees working at KFC UK Ltd lies in between moderate and high level. However, a significant difference of level of motivation is noticed between gender, different age groups, working status, working position and length of employment comparison. Results indicate that female employees are more motivated compare to male employees, employees in the 41-45 year age group are more motivated than other age groups, full time employees are more motivated compare to part time, employees working at the middle position of the shop are more motivated than working at till and kitchen, and employees working 7-9 years are more motivated than shorter length of employment. This indicates that there are differences in perception of motivation based on demographic factors and that not all job-related factors promote employees to have satisfied in their jobs. According to Herzberg's theory, jobs related factors that only prevent dissatisfaction are, therefore, called hygiene factors. Therefore, KFC should ensure that intrinsic and extrinsic rewards are related to specific preferences. The

research results also indicate that motivation is dynamic and is affected by personal circumstances and situational and social factors such as gender, age, working full time or part time. Employees at KFC are motivated by needs, preferences and thought processes as well as expectations. Results, based on the restricted sample size of the employees working at the operational level, suggest that 65% of respondents are highly motivated, 31% are moderately, 4% are least motivated, and, nobody is found to be not motivated at all. It can, therefore, be concluded that the employees working at KFC UK Ltd. are adequately motivated.

References

1. Alderfer, Clayton P., (1969). An Empirical Test of a New Theory of Human Needs; *Organizational Behaviour and Human Performance*, vol.-4, no.-2, retrieved from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(69\)90004-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90004-X), (Accessed on: 23/10/2012)
2. Bokorney, J. (2007). Salaries Still Rising, retrieved from: <http://www.archive.evaluationengineering.com/archive/articles/0407/0407salaries.asp>, (Accessed on 11/10/2011)
3. Brewster, L. Carey, P. Dowling, P. Grobler, P. Holland and S. Warnich (2003). *Contemporary Issues in Human Resource Management: Gaining a Competitive Advantage*. 2nd edition. Cape Town: Oxford University Press.
4. Glanz, B. A., (2002). *Handle with CARE: motivating and retaining employees*, New York: McGraw-Hill
5. Griffin, R. (2008), *Management*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin Company
6. Habib, M.N., Mukhtar, S., Jamal, W. (2010). Factors Influencing the Teachers Intentions to Quite in Private Sector Higher Educational Institutions of Pakistan. *Interdisciplinary Journal of Contemporary Research Business*, vol.-1, p.-12.
7. Herzberg, Frederick (1959). *The Motivation to Work*, New York: John Wiley and Sons
8. Hoag, B., & Cooper, C. L. (2006). *Managing value-based organisations: it's not what you think*. (New horizons in management). Cheltenham: Edward Elgar.
9. Jones, G. and George, J. (2004), *Contemporary Management*, Boston: McGraw-Hill
10. Koontz, H., and Weihrich, H. (2007). *Essentials of Management*. New Delhi: Tata McGraw-Hill.
11. Kressler, H. (2003). *Motivate and Reward: Performance Appraisal and Incentive System for Business Success*. New York: Palgrave Macmillan.
12. Lai, C. (2009), *Motivating Employees through Incentive programmes*, Dissertation Thesis of Bachelor Degree, Jyväskylä University of Applied Sciences, retrieved from: https://publications.theseus.fi/bitstream/handle/10024/17561/jamk_1237444488_5.pdf?sequence=2, (Accessed on: 11/09/2011)
13. Latham, G. (2007). *Work Motivation: History, Theory, Research, and Practice*. California: Sage Publications
14. Lin P Y (2007). *The Correlation Between Management and Employee Motivation in SASOL Polypropylene in Business, South Africa*, Dissertation Thesis of Master Degree, University of Pretoria, South Africa, retrieved from: <http://upetd.up.ac.za/thesis/available/etd-08042008-92827/unrestricted/dissertation.pdf>, (Accessed on: 10/09/2011)
15. Locke, Edwin A. (1968). Toward a Theory of Task Motivation and Incentives; *Organizational behavior and human performance*, vol.-3, No. -2, retrieved from: [http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073\(69\)90004-X](http://dx.doi.org/10.1016/0030-5073(69)90004-X), (Accessed on: 23/10/2012)
16. Locke, Edwin A.; Shaw, Karyll N.; Saari, Lise M.; Latham, Gary P. (1981). Goal Setting and Task Performance: 1969-1980, *Psychological Bulletin (American Psychological Association)*, vol.-90, no.-1, pp. 125-152, retrieved from: http://datause.cse.ucla.edu/DOCS/eal_goa_1981.pdf, (Accessed on 22/06/2012).
17. Maslow, A.H. (1943). A Theory of Human Motivation (online), <http://psychclassics.yorku.ca/Maslow/motivation.htm>, (Accessed on 23/10/2012)

18. Maslow's need hierarchy (1954). [Online] retrieve from: www.union.umd.edu/GH/basic_needs/index.html (Accessed on: 02/01/2012)
19. McConnell, C. (2006). Employee Recognition: What, Why and How, retrieve from: http://www.nfib.com/object/IO_31334.html, (Accessed on 21/04/2012)
20. MCSHane, S. L., and Von Glinow, M. A., (2000), *Organizational Behavior*, New York, McGraw-Hill
21. Mullins, J. (2007). *Management and Organizational Behavior*. New Jersey: FT Prentice Hall.
22. Petcharak, P. (2002), *The Assessment of Motivation in the saint Paul Hotel Employees*, Thesis paper of Master Degree, University of Wisconsin- Stout, retrieved from: <http://www2.uwstout.edu/content/lib/thesis/2002/2002petcharakp.pdf>, (Accessed on: 12/09/2011)
23. Robbins, S. (2005). *Organizational behavior*, 11th edition, Pearson Educational Institution.
24. Simons, T and Enz, C.A (2006), *Motivating Hotel Employees: Beyond the Carrot and the Sticks*, retrieved from: www.allbusiness.com/periodicals/articles/489873-1.html, (Accessed on: 12/09/2011)
25. Thomas, D.C., and Perkerti, A. A. (2003). Effect of culture on Situational Determinants of Exchange Behavior in Organization- A Comparison of New Zealand and Indonesia. *Journal of Cross-Cultural Psychology*, Vol.-34 (3), retrieved from: <http://dx.doi.org/10.1177/0022022103034003002>. (Accessed on 06/07/2012)
26. Tyilana X (2005), *The Impact of Motivation on Job Satisfaction among Employees of a National Broadcaster*, Dissertation Thesis of Master Degree, University of Johannesburg, South Africa, retrieved from: <http://elmurobbie.files.wordpress.com/2009/01/the-impact-of-motivation-on-job-satisfaction.pdf>, (Accessed on: 15/10/2011)
27. Wong, S., Siu, V., & Tsang, N., (1999). The impact of demographic factors on Hong Kong hotel employees' choice of job-related motivators. *International Journal of Contemporary Hospitality Management*, vol.-11 (5), pp.230-241. Retrieved from: <http://www.cabdirect.org/abstracts/20001804674.html;jsessionid=56B0080542E23B43C3FDBFC62637D55A>, (accessed on: 02/01/2012)

Appendix - Tables (numbers are rounded to the nearest whole number)

Table 1: Demographic Information - table of the sample Respondents							
Nationalities	Frequency - number of respondents	%	Cumulative percentage	Gender	Frequency - number of respondents	%	Cumulative percentage
Armenian	1	2	2	Male	27	56	56
Bangladeshi	12	25	27	Female	21	44	100
Chadian	1	2	29	Total	48	100	
French	1	2	31	Age Group			
Greek	1	2	33	21-25	14	29	29
India	5	11	44	26-30	20	42	71
Malaysia	1	2	46	31-35	12	25	96
Nepali	1	2	48	36-40	1	2	98
Nigerian	2	4	52	41-45	1	2	100
Norwegian	1	2	54	Total	48	100	
Pakistani	6	13	67	Workplace			
Polish	6	13	80	Kitchen	5	10	10
Sierra Leonean	1	2	82	Middle	23	48	58
South African	1	2	84	Cashier	20	42	100
South Korean	1	2	86	Total	48	100	
Spanish	1	2	88	Length of Employment in years			
Sri-Lankan	5	10	98	<1	10	20	20
Sudanese	1	2	100	1.3	19	39	59
Working Status				4.6	15	31	90
Full Time	16	33	33	7.9	5	10	100
Part Time	32	67	100	Total	48	100	
Total	48	100					

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)

Table 2: Reasons to choose work at KFC			
Reasons to choose	Mean value	Standard Deviation	Mean Ranking
Opportunity to interact with different cultured people	3.33	0.59	1
Best work place	2.9	0.94	2
Flexible working hours	2.69	1	3
Salary/wages	2.29	0.78	4
I could not find any other job	2.29	1.07	5
Close to my house	2.21	0.93	6
Interesting Job	2.13	0.99	7
Friend/relative works here	1.92	1.67	8
Opportunity to develop my career at KFC	1.85	1.14	9
Fringe benefit (other financial benefits)	1.81	1.01	10
Free meals are provided	1.42	0.81	11

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)

Table 3: Major Heading of Motivation Factors and their Ranking			
Major Headings of Motivation Factors	Combined Mean Value	Combined Standard Deviation	Combined Mean Ranking
Work itself and Environment	3.01	0.905	1
Supervisor Relation	2.98	0.923	2
Company itself and Matters	2.97	0.936	3
Recognition	2.88	0.969	4
Development and Growth	2.81	0.993	5
Pay and Benefits	2.8	1.08	6
Source: Results of Questionnaire 2011			

Table 4: Motivating factor: Work itself and Environment			
Factors	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Mean Ranking
Overall job security.	3.37	0.857	1
Work makes a difference	3.17	0.656	2
Available of logistic support	3.17	0.874	2
Flexible working hour	3.1	0.963	3
Involvement in decisions making	3.06	1.049	4
Enjoyable working environment	3.05	1.117	5
Clear job requirements	2.94	0.689	6
Challenging work	2.83	1.178	7
Reasonableness in work (not high/low pressure)	2.4	0.729	8
Source: Results of Questionnaire 2011			

Table 5: Motivation factor: Relations with supervisor(s)			
Factors	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Mean Ranking
Giving feedback to work	3.37	0.725	1
Accepts mistakes positively	3.23	0.714	2
Accepts comments and suggestions	3.23	0.941	2
Understands the problem facing at work	3.15	0.707	3
Shows respect to employees	3.15	0.54	3
Available for consultation	3.02	0.595	4
Remembers something personal, such as birthdays	2.98	0.989	5
Shows interest about my personal needs and problems	2.75	1.164	6
Allow time to meet and listen to me	2.62	0.999	7
Caring employees as an individual	2.27	1.047	8
Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)			

Table 6: Major Heading of Motivation Factors and their Ranking			
Factors	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Mean Ranking
Success of the company	3.52	0.645	1
Communication of company's goals and strategies	3.4	0.784	2
Informed company's, market position	2.67	0.825	3
Achievement of company's target profit	2.46	0.789	4
Understand the company's mission statement, vision and values	2.46	1.098	5
Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)			

Table 7: Motivation factor: Recognition			
Factors	Combined Mean Value	Combined Standard Deviation	Combined Mean Ranking
Management appreciate as employee come up with new and better ideas	3.27	0.499	1
Holds celebrations for success	3.27	0.699	1
Receive informal praise and appreciation for better performance	3.1	0.918	2
Holding monthly or yearly social events	2.77	1.065	3
Evaluating performance fairly	2.48	1.112	4
Supporting frequent contests, and team building activities	2.37	0.949	5

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)

Table 8: Motivation factor: Development and Growth			
Factors	Combined Mean Value	Combined Standard Deviation	Combined Mean Ranking
Training of employees	3.37	0.841	1
Opportunity for growth and development e.g. promotion	3.29	0.826	2
Managers willingness of manager to invest in the development	2.81	0.858	3
Willingness of supervisor to promote me	2.54	0.84	4
Having promotion or development policy of company	2.06	0.852	5

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)

Table 9: Motivation factor: Pay and Benefits			
Factors	Combined Mean Value	Combined Standard Deviation	Combined Mean Ranking
Good wages and other benefits	3.08	1.037	1
Matching payment with responsibilities	2.98	1.163	2
Providing free meals	2.35	0.878	3

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)

Table 10: Comparative Ranking of Factors Causes De-motivation and Motivation					
Demotivating factors	Mean Value	Standard Deviation	Ranking as <i>de-motivating</i> factor	Motivating Factors	Ranking as <i>motivating</i> factor
Lower scale of Salary/ wages compare to hard work	3.12	1.13	1	Good wages	1
Less Interesting and challenging job	3	1	2	Challenging work	7
Less recognition of good work	2.96	1.12	2	Recognition (overall)	4
Less job security	2.96	1.31	4	Overall job security	1
Less fringe benefits (e.g. pension, bonus etc.)	2.94	1.21	5	Other benefits	1
Lack of training	2.9	1.12	6	Training of employees	1
Less flexible working hours	2.83	1.04	7	Flexible working hour	3
Huge pressure of work	2.8	1.06	8	Reasonableness in work (not high/low pressure)	8
Unequal treatment by management	2.69	1.38	9	Evaluating performance fairly	4
Unconstructive criticism of work performed	2.67	1.18	10	Accepts mistakes positively	2
Insufficient logistic support	2.65	1.13	11	Availability of logistics support	2
Unfriendly colleagues (co-workers)	2.65	1.44	11	N/A	-
Less Opportunity to develop career at KFC	1.92	1.06	12	Opportunity for growth and development e.g. promotion	2

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)

Table 11: Overall Motivation Level of the Employees Working at KFC UK

Level of Motivation	Frequency - number of respondents	%	Cumulative Percent	Overall Mean	Overall Standard Deviation
Not Motivated	0	0	0	3.6	0.568
Least Motivated	2	4	4		
Moderately Motivated	15	31	35		
Highly Motivated	31	65	100		
Total	48	100			

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)

Table 12: Motivation Level Based on Demographic Factors

Motivation Level of the Employees by Gender Comparison							
Gender	Level of Motivation				Mean Ranking	Standard Deviation	Ranking
	Not motivated	Least motivated	Moderately motivated	Highly motivated			
Male	0	1(4%)	9(33%)	17(63%)	3.59	0.562	2
Female	0	1(5%)	6(28%)	14(67%)	3.62	0.575	1
Total	0	2(4%)	15(31%)	31(65%)			
Motivation Level of the Employees by Age Group Comparison							
Age Group							
21-25	0	2(15%)	4(31%)	7(54%)	3.38	0.738	4
26-30	0	0	7(33%)	14(67%)	3.67	0.471	3
31-35	0	0	3(25%)	9(75%)	3.75	0.433	2
36-40	0	0	1(100%)	0	2	1	5
Total	0	2(4%)	15(31%)	31(65%)	4	0	1
Motivation Level of the Employees by Working Status Comparison							
Working Status							
Full time	0	0	3(19%)	13(81%)	3.81	0.39	1
Part time	0	2(6%)	12(38%)	18(56%)	3.5	0.612	2
Total	0	2(4%)	15(31%)	31(65%)			
Motivation Level of the Employees by Working Position Comparison							
Working Position							
Cashier	0	0	7(35%)	13(65%)	3.65	0.477	2
Middle	0	0	7(30%)	16(70%)	3.7	0.46	1
Kitchen	0	2(40%)	1(20%)	2(40%)	3	0.894	3
Total	0	2(4%)	15(31%)	31(65%)			
Motivation Level of the Employees by Length of Employment Comparison							
Length of Employment (years)							
<1	0	0	4(44%)	5(56%)	3.55	0.45	3
1.3	0	1(5%)	7(37%)	11(58%)	3.53	0.595	4
4.6	0	1(7%)	3(20%)	11(73%)	3.67	0.596	2
7.9	0	0	1(20%)	4(80%)	3.8	0.4	1
Total	0(0%)	2(4%)	15(31%)	31(65%)			

Source: Authors (Questionnaire 2011 results)