

Research Article

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

Shiv Mangal Singh¹, Rahul Sharma^{2*}, Ankita Choudhary³

ABSTRACT

This study aims at accessing the difference in Work Motivation of leaders and subordinates at lower level of police personnel. 30 leaders and 210 subordinates were selected from the lower level of police organization. The 1:7 ratio was followed to select the sample. The Work Motivation scale developed by K.G. Aggarwal (1988) was used. Mean, SD and t-test was used to analyse the data. Lower level leaders were significantly higher on work motivation than their subordinates. Leaders were higher than their subordinates on organizational orientation, work group relations, psychological work incentives, material incentives and job situations. Social locations or socially important positions (leaders) play an important role for greater work motivation both lower and higher order needs fulfillment.

Keywords: *Work Motivation, Leaders, Subordinates.*

Motivation is a process that accounts for an individual's intensity, direction and persistence of efforts towards attaining a goal (Robbins, 2007). Work motivation initiates and maintains goal-directed performance. It energizes our thinking, fuels our enthusiasm and colours our positive and negative emotional reactions to work and life. Motivation generates the mental effort that drives us to apply our knowledge and skills. Without motivation, even the most capable person will refuse to work hard. Motivation prevents or nudges us to convert intention into action and start doing something new or to restart something we've done before. It also controls our decisions to persist at a specific work goal in the face of distractions and the press of other priorities. Finally, motivation leads us to invest more or less cognitive effort to enhance both the quality and quantity of our work performance. Thus, motivational performance gaps exist whenever people avoid starting something new, resist doing something familiar, stop doing something important and switch their attention to a less valued task, or refuse to "work smart" on a new challenge and instead use old, familiar but inadequate solutions to solve a new problem (Clark, 1998). It is crucial to note that

¹ Lecturer, Govt. P.G. College for Women, Jammu, India

² Research Scholar, University of Jammu, India

³ Research Scholar, Guru Nanak Dev University, AMRITSAR, India

*Responding Author

Received: November 01, 2017; Revision Received: November 06, 2017; Accepted: November 23, 2017

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

motivation does not directly influence work performance. Instead, motivation leads us to use our knowledge and skills and apply them effectively to work tasks. It is the force that initiates, starts, energizes and continues the application of our experience and expertise. Successful performance always involves the cooperation of motivation and knowledge in supportive work environments. Without adequate knowledge, motivation alone does not increase useful performance. Thus adequate motivation is necessary, but not sufficient for effective performance. Luthans (1998) asserts that motivation is the process that arouses, energizes, directs, and sustains behaviour and performance. That is, it is the process of stimulating people to action and to achieve a desired task. One way of stimulating people is to employ effective motivation, which makes workers more satisfied with and committed to their jobs. Money is not the only motivator. There are other incentives which can also serve as motivators. Luthans (1998) asserts that motivation should not be thought of as the only explanation of behaviour, since it interacts with and acts in conjunction with other mediating processes and with the environment. Luthan stressed that, like the other cognitive process, motivation cannot be seen. All that can be seen is behaviour, and this should not be equated with causes of behaviour. While recognizing the central role of motivation, Evans (1998) states that many recent theories of organizational behaviour find it important for the field to re-emphasize behaviour. Definitions of motivation abound. One thing these definitions have in common is the inclusion of words such as "desire", "want", "wishes", "aim", "goals", "needs", and "incentives". Luthans (1998) defines motivation as, "a process that starts with a physiological deficiency or need that activates a behaviour or a drive that is aimed at a goal incentive". Therefore, the key to understanding the process of motivation lies in the meaning of, and relationship among, needs, drives, and incentives. Relative to this, Minner, Ebrahimi, and Watchel, (1995) state that in a system sense, motivation consists of these three interacting and interdependent elements, i.e., needs, drives, and incentives. Motivational theories can be divided into two categories, content and process theories. Content theories assume that all individuals possess the same set of needs and therefore prescribe the characteristics that ought to be present in jobs. Process theories stress the difference in people's needs and focus on the cognitive processes that create these differences.

The biggest challenge is also how police leaders can develop police organizations that can effectively recognize, relate and assimilate the global shifts in culture, technology and information. The current and incoming generation of police leaders needs to understand and constructively manage the nuances of community expectations, workforce values, technological power, governmental arrangements, policing philosophies, and ethical standards for high quality service not only to the community but also to the subordinates/supporting staff. The subordinates constitute an important component of police organization; their satisfaction about leadership is vital for organizational effectiveness. The paradigm shift towards egalitarian policing philosophies at global level has also warranted change in the relationship between police leaders and subordinates. Thus, leadership is a service rather an imposition. The police leaders must develop an inspiring relationship with subordinates if

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

their subordinates are to accept their leadership. Lower level hierarchy includes the ranks of inspector, sub-inspector, assistant sub-inspector, head constable, selection grade constable and constable. Middle level consisted of Dy. SP, SP and SSP ranks where as high level hierarchy consisted of DIG, IGP, ADGP and DGP ranks.

Objective

1. To access the Work Motivation of leaders and subordinates at lower level of police hierarchy.
2. To study the difference between leaders and subordinates at lower level of police hierarchy on Work Motivation.

Sample Selection

The population from where the sample was being selected for the study was Jammu and Kashmir Police Organization. There were number of wings and sub-wings in this organization. This organization played an important role in the survival of the state. There were many leaders and the subordinates in this organization. The researcher was able to find the suitable sample from this organization. For the research purpose the researcher had considered only one wing of the Jammu and Kashmir Police i.e. Executive Police. The Executive Police wing constituted 50% of the total Police personal in Jammu and Kashmir Police's different wings.

The sample for the study consisted of 240 Executive Police personnel of J & K Police. Proportionate stratified multistage random sampling method was used to collect the data. Two types of samples were participated, one set was leaders and other was subordinates (subordinates). 30 leaders and 210 subordinates were selected from lower level of police hierarchy) were selected. Lower level leaders consisted of SHOs, Inspectors and Sub-Inspectors. Under each leader 7 immediate subordinates were selected. The ratio was 1:7, so the total numbers of subordinates at lower level were $30 \times 7 = 210$.

Tool Used

This scale was prepared by K.G. Aggarwal (1988). There were 26 items in this scale and the split-half reliability of this scale was .994 which is very high. The reliability of this scale for the population of this study was .73. All the items of this scale are Likert type which is rated on 5 point scale. It measures 62.12% of the construct of work motivation. Summated scoring was done by assigning 5 to the most positive and 1 to the extreme negative response. The scoring scheme thus is 5 Measures Work Motivation fully, 4 Measures Work Motivation to a great extent, 3 Measures Work Motivation to some extent, 2 Measures Work Motivation to a little extent and 1 Does not measures Work Motivation. There are six factors of this scale which are given below along with the items measuring those factors:

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

Factor No.	Factor Name	Item No.
Factor – 1	Dependence	15, 16, 17, 18, 20, 21, 22 & 23
Factor – 2	Organizational Orientation	1, 5, 8, 11, 12 & 13
Factor – 3	Work Group Relations	6, 14, 19 & 20
Factor – 4	Psychological Work Incentives	2, 23, 24, 25 & 26
Factor – 5	Material Incentives	2, 3, 4 & 5
Factor – 6	Job Situation	7, 9 & 10

RESULTS

Table 1 showed the mean, standard deviation and t-test analysis for work motivation of police personnel. Mean and SD values for Work motivation of police personnel at lower level of police hierarchy came out to be 83.0833 and 6.72917 (N=240).

The mean of 90.96 with a standard deviation of 6.127 of lower level leaders of police hierarchy was found. Table 1 demonstrated mean and standard deviations of subordinates of which came out to be 81.957 and 6.03 respectively. Significant differences were reported between 'lower level leaders & their subordinates ($t=7.638^*$ & 7.548^{**} , $p=.00$)' on work motivation (Table 1).

Table-1 Mean, SD and t-test for Work Motivation of lower level leaders and subordinates

Work Motivation	Leader-subordinate	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig. (2-tailed)
	Lower Level Police Personnel	240	83.0833	6.72917		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	90.9667	6.12785	7.638*	.000*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	81.9571	6.03126		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	90.9667	6.12785	5.281	.000
	Subordinates of lower level	30	80.3000	8.68669		

* Equal variances assumed. ** Equal variances not assumed

Table 1 also showed the mean, standard deviation and t-test analysis for the paired sample of leaders and subordinates for work motivation. Pair sample calculations (N=30) showed the mean and standard deviations for lower level leaders (Mean=90.96, SD=6.127) and their subordinates (Mean=80.30, SD=8.68). Lower level leaders were found to be highly motivated for their job whereas their subordinates were lower on work motivation. A significant difference was found between lower level leaders and their subordinates ($t=5.281$, $p=.00$).

Results for dimensions of work motivation

Mean, standard deviation and significance level of t-test values for dimensions of work motivation for leaders and subordinates of lower level of police hierarchy were calculated (Table 2) and found that for 'dependence' dimension of work motivation lower level leaders showed highest mean (Mean=25.4000 & SD=3.23345), followed by lower level police

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

personnel (Mean=24.1917, SD=3.23629) and subordinates of lower level (Mean=24.0190 & SD=3.20729). Significant differences were found between lower level leaders & their subordinates ($t=2.204^*$ & 2.190^{**} , $p=.02^*$ & $.03^{**}$). The highest mean value for 'organizational orientation' dimension of work motivation was of leaders of lower level (Mean=20.6333, SD=2.41380) and the lowest mean value was of subordinates of lower level (Mean=19.1190 & SD=2.57149). Lower level police personnel showed the Mean=19.3083 and SD=2.59641 for 'organizational orientation' dimension of work motivation. The differences on 'organizational orientation' were found to be significant between lower level leaders & their subordinates ($t=3.039^*$ & 3.187^{**} , $p=.00$). The table 2 also showed that lower level leaders have highest mean (Mean=14.4000 & SD=1.92264), followed by lower level police personnel (Mean=13.0250, SD=1.79708) and subordinates of lower level (Mean=12.8286 & SD=1.69411) for the 'work group relation' dimension of work motivation. The differences on 'work group relation' were found to be significant between lower level leaders & their subordinates ($t=4.671^*$ & 4.247^{**} , $p=.00$). For 'psychological work incentives' dimension of work motivation, subordinates of lower level were having lowest mean (Mean=16.9286 & SD=2.23064). Lower level leaders showed the Mean=19.1000 & SD=2.92846 followed by lower level police personnel (Mean=17.2000, SD=2.43097). The differences on 'psychological work incentives' were found to be significant between lower level leaders & their subordinates ($t=4.781^*$ & 3.903^{**} , $p=.00$).

Table-2 Mean, SD and t-test of Work Motivation dimensions for leaders and subordinates of lower level of police hierarchy

Dimensions of Work Motivation	Leader-Subordinate Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig (2-tailed)
Dependence	Lower level police personnel	240	24.1917	3.23629		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	25.4000	3.23345	2.204*	.028*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	24.0190	3.20729	2.190**	.035**
Organizational Orientation	Lower level police personnel	240	19.3083	2.59641		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	20.6333	2.41380	3.039*	.003*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	19.1190	2.57149	3.187**	.003**
Work Group Relations	Lower level police personnel	240	13.0250	1.79708		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	14.4000	1.92264	4.671*	.000*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	12.8286	1.69411	4.247**	.000**
Psychological Work Incentives	Lower level police personnel	240	17.2000	2.43097		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	19.1000	2.92846	4.781*	.000*
	Subordinates of Lower	210	16.9286	2.23064	3.903**	.000**

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

Dimensions of Work Motivation	Leader-Subordinate Type	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	t	Sig (2-tailed)
	Level					
Material Incentives	Lower level police personnel	240	12.9375	2.88414		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	15.0333	3.05674	4.417*	.000*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	12.6381	2.73773	4.065**	.000**
Job Situations	Lower level police personnel	240	9.6375	1.61771		
	Lower Level Leaders	30	11.0333	1.84733	5.335*	.000*
	Subordinates of Lower Level	210	9.4381	1.48307	4.526**	.000**

* *Equal variances assumed.* ** *Equal variances not assumed*

The calculated mean and standard deviation for ‘material incentive’ dimension of work motivation in table 2 showed the highest value of mean for lower level leaders (Mean=15.0333 & SD=3.05674), lowest for subordinates of lower level leaders (Mean=12.6381 & SD=2.73773), and lower level police personnel (Mean=12.9375, SD=2.88414). The differences on ‘material incentives’ were found to be significant between lower level leaders & their subordinates (t=4.417* & 4.065**, p=.00).

Lower level leaders showed highest men (Mean=11.0333 & SD=1.84733) followed by lower level police personnel (Mean=9.6375, SD=1.61771) and subordinates of lower level (Mean=9.4381 & SD=1.48307) for ‘job situation’ dimension of work motivation. The differences on ‘job situation’ were found to be significant between lower level leaders & their subordinates (t=5.335* & 4.526**, p=.00).

CONCLUSIONS AND DISCUSSION

Lower level leaders were significantly higher on work motivation than their subordinates. Leaders were higher than their subordinates on organizational orientation, work group relations, psychological work incentives, material incentives and job situations. Social locations or socially important positions (leaders) play an important role for greater work motivation both lower and higher order needs fulfilment.

As revealed from the findings, higher work motivation among police personnel at higher occupational level and leadership position were due to the organizational orientation which include job satisfaction, benefit to the employees, policies of the organization, and well planned work assignments. Job satisfaction is directly associated with internal work motivation of employees that enhances as the satisfaction of employees increases (Salman et al, 2010). Another possible reason was the relations with their groups. Group’s help to improve one’s performance, able to discuss personal problem with immediate superior, and

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

ones confidence and trust in the people in work group are positively related to work motivation. Trust is defined as the perception of one about others, decision to act based on speech, behaviour and their decision (Hassan et al, 2010). If an organization wants to improve and be successful, trust plays a significant role so it should always be preserved to ensure an organizations existence and to enhance employees' motivation (Annamalai. T, 2010). It can make intrapersonal and interpersonal effects and influence on the relations inside and out the organization (Hassan et al, 2010). Psychological work incentives are also positively related to work motivation. Recognition of the work done, responsibility of the work, freedom to plan the work and feeling of doing a useful work are all psychological work incentives and are responsible for high level of work motivation. Empowered employees focus their job and work-life with additional importance and this leads to constant progress in coordination and work procedures. Employees execute their finest novelties and thoughts with the sense of belonging, enthusiasm, and delight, in empowered organizations. Bhatti and Qureshi (2007) propose that employee participation in organization measures develop motivation and job-satisfaction level (Reena et al, 2009). Employee participation and empowerment not only direct to efficiency, effectiveness and innovation but they also boost employee gratification, work motivation and trust in the organization (Constant et al, 2001). He wrote that it's fundamental to our humanity that everyone needs to be recognized about how and what work they have done and next time they do it more efficiently for the sake of more recognition. Serasinghe, 1994; Dehigama. 1996; Karunaratna, 2000; Perera, 2003) concluded that people do respond well to monetary rewards. Diverse literature on the effectiveness of monetary rewards suggests the need for proper design and sound execution (Dharmasiri & Wickremasinghe, 2006). Money is the fundamental inducement, no other incentive or motivational technique comes even close to it with respect to its influential value (Sara et al, 2004). It has the supremacy to magnetize, maintain and motivate individuals towards higher performance. Smithers & Walker (2000) proved that workers' environments do affect their level of motivation, for instance, long hours of work, non-recognition for work done and colleagues' aggressive management style. In order to motivate employees to perform their best, there is a need to provide a work environment that provides achievement, recognition, meaningful work, advancement and growth (Musselwhite, 2007:4). Generally, in the workplace, recognition is considered as the most powerful tool for employee motivation (ibid). Job situations which include nature of work and the development of one's skills and abilities is also responsible for high level of work motivation. Robbins (2004) reported that rewarding professionals with educational opportunities – training, workshops, and attending conferences allow them to keep current in their field and motivate them. Staff training is an indispensable strategy for motivating workers (Tella et al. 2007).

Acknowledgments

The author appreciates all those who participated in the study and helped to facilitate the research process.

Conflict of Interests: The author declared no conflict of interests.

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

REFERENCES

- Annamalai, T., Abdullah, A. G. K., & Alasidiyeen, N. J., (2010). The Mediating Effects of Perceived Organizational Support on the Relationships between Organizational Justice, Trust and Performance Appraisal in Malaysian Secondary Schools. *European Journal of Social Sciences*, 13 (4), 623-632.
- Bhatti, K., & Qureshi, T. (2007). Impact of employee participation on job satisfaction, employee commitment and employee productivity. *International Review of Business Research Papers*, Vol. 3(2): 54 – 68.
- Clark, A.E., Georgellis, Y. and Sanfey, P. (1998), "Job Satisfaction, Wages and Quits: Evidence from German Panel Data". *Research in Labor Economics*, forthcoming.
- Constant, D., & Offodile, O. F., (2001). Managing for Organizational Effectiveness in Sub-Saharan Africa: A Culture-Fit Model. *The International Journal of Human Resources Management*, 12 (4), 535-550.
- Dehigama N.D.P. (1996), Relationship Between Monetary Incentives Employee Satisfaction and Employee Productivity, MBA Thesis, Colombo, PIM, p. 191.
- Dharmasiri, A.S. & Wickermasinghe, S.M. (2006). The Effectiveness of Monetary Rewards in Motivating Police Officer. *Sri Lankan Journal of Management*, Volume 11 Numbers 1 & 2, January – June.
- Evans L (1998) Teacher Morale, Job Satisfaction and Motivation. *London: Paul Chapman/Sage*.
- Hassan R. A., Fuwad B. A., Rauf A. I. (2010). *Academy of Strategic Management Journal* 9(2) 123-131.
- Karunaratna, W.M., (2000), Employee Preference for Monetary Rewards in Sri Lankan Organisations, Unpublished MBA Research, Colombo, PIM.
- Luthans, F. (1998). *Organisational Behaviour*. 8th ed. Boston: Irwin McGraw-Hill.
- Minner, J.B., Ebrahimi, B., & Wachtel, J.M. (1995). How deficiency in management contributes to the United States' competitiveness problem and what can be done about it? *Human Resource Management*. Fall, p. 363.
- Musselwhite C (2007). Motivation at work: Motivation = Empowerment. *Newsletter Inc. Today's small Business News*.
- Perera, D.M.S. (2003), The Effectiveness of Performance Based Reward Systems in Motivating Senior Managers in the Commercial Banking Sector In Sri Lanka, Unpublished MBA Research, Colombo, PIM.
- Reena Ali and M.Shakil Ahmed (2009). The Impact Of Reward And Recognition Programs on Employee's Motivation And Satisfaction, *International Review of Business Research Papers* Vol. 5 No. 4 June 2009 Pp.270-279.
- Robbins, S. P. (2007), *Essentials of Organizational Behavior* (9 ed.), Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
- Robbins, S.P. (2004). *Organizational Behavior*. Prentice-Hall of India Pvt. Ltd, 10th edition.
- Salman K., Irshad M. Z. (2010). Job satisfaction among bank employees in Punjab, Pakistan: A comparative study. *European Journals of Social Sciences*, 17, 570-577.

Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation

- Sara L. Rynes, Barry Gerhart and Kathleen A. Minette (2004): The importance of pay in employee motivation: Discrepancies between what people say and what they do, *Human Resource Management* Volume 43 Issue 4 pp. 381-394.
- Serasinghe D, (1994), Monetary Rewards and Employee Motivation in Sri Lanka, Unpublished MBA Research, Colombo, PIM.
- Smithers GL, Walker DHT (2000). The effect of the workplace on motivation and demotivation of construction professionals. *Construction Management and Economics*. Australia: Melbourne. 18(7): 833-847.
- Tella, A., Ayeni, C. O., & Popoola, S. O., (2007). Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Organizational commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, 1-16.

How to cite this article: Singh M S, Sharma R, & Choudhary A (2017). Difference between Leaders and Subordinates of Lower Level Employees in Police on Work Motivation. *International Journal of Indian Psychology*, Vol. 5, (1), DIP: 18.01.050/20170501, DOI: 10.25215/0501.050