



RESEARCH ON EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION IN COMPANIES ON THE TERRITORY OF BELGRADE

Ekatarina Randjelovic^{1}*

¹Faculty of Management, Sremski Karlovci, University Union Nikola Tesla, Beograd, e-mail: tinarandjelovic@gmail.com

Abstract: A necessary condition for motivating people well is knowing people and the human psyche, and for this very reason, managers must spend much time with employees to discover the best incentive methods for each employee's work. When it comes to motivation, it is based on the claim that if an employee is motivated to work and satisfied with his work environment, the customer will also be satisfied, and the company will operate successfully. Motivation is a subject area that has intrigued humanity since the earliest beginnings of the human species. Today, fortunately, we live in much better conditions, and at the same time, we face numerous new challenges in motivating our employees in their companies. Motivation is an internal driving force that drives us to achieve our goals and satisfy our needs. In order to operate successfully, all companies must find their optimal combination of material and non-material incentives for employees, which will depend on many factors: the sector in which they work, the competition in the market, the nature of work, and the structure of employees. The goal of every manager in a company should not be to motivate his people to perform averagely but to motivate his employees to perform above average.

Keywords: employee motivation, employee job satisfaction, efficiency.

Introduction

It is difficult to find an adequate job, but every supervisor knows it is even harder to retain a good and quality worker. Many studies have shown that only 1 in 4 employees is motivated and productive. Employee motivation is a critical factor influencing a company's success in today's business environment. When motivated, employees exhibit more significant commitment, job satisfaction, and productivity and achieve better results. However, a lack of motivation can lead to decreased productivity, employee dissatisfaction, and reduced efficiency and effectiveness of the company.

Considering all this, I must emphasize that no single strategy will magically motivate all employees and maintain their motivation within the company. Each worker is unique, with individual attitudes and ideas. If you want to motivate all employees successfully, you must apply multiple strategies to satisfy and motivate each employee individually.

This research aims to identify the motivators that drive employees in the Belgrade area and the motivators present in the organizations where the respondents are employed. This study aimed to determine whether there are statistically significant differences in the choice of work motivators among employees in companies in Belgrade based on socio-demographic characteristics. The results of this research will provide practical guidelines for organizations to improve employee motivation and create an encouraging work environment. It is expected that these findings will have a significant impact on the development of effective employee motivation management strategies in organizations within the Belgrade area, contributing to their success and competitive advantage.

Literature Review

Motivation and job satisfaction, as two factors that significantly impact the efficiency and effectiveness of an organization, have been subjects of study and research for years. It is essential to highlight that motivation and job satisfaction are two different factors and, as such, contribute differently to employee behavior. In their work, "Job satisfaction and motivation: What are the differences among these two?", authors Kian, T. S., Yusoff, W., and Rajah, S. (2014) emphasize that although job satisfaction and motivation are complementary and have similar dependent variables, their impact on employee behavior is different. Hence, the authors primarily focused on explaining these two concepts' differences. Authors

*Corresponding author: tinarandjelovic@gmail.com





Whiseand, P., and Rush, G. (1988) view motivation as the expected outcome for a job performed, which simultaneously influences the satisfaction of individual needs. Job satisfaction is defined by the author Locke, E. A. (1976) as a positive emotional state or feeling about the job performed. While motivation is influenced by the current interpretation of the relationship between behavior and reward, job satisfaction is directed toward how the individual feels about the rewards for the job. In other words, according to author Carr, G. (2005), motivation results from future expectations, while job satisfaction results from past events.

Numerous scholars have defined the term motivation. Authors Whiseand, P., and Rush, G. (1988) view motivation as the individual's will to achieve a specific goal conditioned by satisfying needs. Kian, T. S., Yusoff, W., and Rajah, S. (2014) define motivation as the individual's will to make decisions resulting from his/her goal-oriented behavior. Fuller M. A. et al. (2008) consider motivation as the strength, direction, and persistence of an individual in achieving specific goals, viewing strength as the individual's effort in achieving goals, direction as the path to a specific goal, and persistence as the time the individual is willing to invest. According to author Saraswathi, S. (2011), motivation is the will to exert effort towards achieving organizational goals conditioned by the satisfaction of individual needs. We can notice three critical elements in all definitions: effort, organizational goal, and need. Motivation relates to the reasons for human behavior, the factors that organize it, direct it and determine its duration (Bahtijarević Šiber, 1999). Motivation answers why someone behaves in a certain way, achieves or does not achieve a certain level of success. The simplest definition of motivation is the one that considers it as the search for what is missing or needed by the person, i.e., the satisfaction of needs (Maslow, 1982). From the aspect of work and in an organizational context, motivation is viewed as a complex set of forces that initiate and maintain a person in the workplace. More concisely, motivation starts and maintains activity in a specific direction (Dubin, 1961). From a process aspect, motivation is viewed as a series of related dependent and independent variables that explain the direction, magnitude, and duration of an individual's behavior. At the same time, the effects of abilities, skills, understanding of the task, and environmental constraints are constants (Campbell, Pritchard, 1976). Motivation relates to goal-directed behavior, i.e., all forms of conscious and voluntary behavior, although some authors (Bahtijarević Šiber, 1999) believe that motivation also implies unconsciously directed activities. Based on the above, author Bahtijarević Šiber F. (1999) concludes that motivation is a common term for all internal factors that consolidate intellectual and physical energy, initiate and organize individual activities, direct behavior, and determine its direction, intensity, and duration. In the context of an organization, motivation can be viewed from two aspects (Bahtijarević Šiber, 1999). From the individual's perspective, motivation is an internal state leading to achieving a goal. From the manager's aspect, motivation is an activity that ensures people strive towards set goals and achieve them. Both aspects have an ordinary meaning: the effort to achieve goals, viewing it as a process of initiating and directing efforts and activities to achieve individual and organizational goals.

Numerous factors influence individual motivation, which can be categorized into four groups (Bahtijarević Šiber, 1999): individual traits, job characteristics, organizational characteristics or work situations, and the broader social environment. Various theories aim to understand motivation, focusing on observing employee behavior and explaining the reasons behind it. These theories also examine the impact of rewards on fulfilling employee needs. If needs are met, employees will be motivated to work better. Therefore, managers are expected to understand the nature of employee motivation and apply it in the work environment (Moorhead, Griffin, 2004). One of the oldest theories of motivation is the drive theory. According to Allport, G. W. (1954), this theory is based on past hedonism, assuming that individual decisions are based on past rewarded behavior. Unfortunately, this theory does not explain the basis of hedonism and does not explain why specific actions were satisfying or unsatisfying. However, it has proven successful in predicting individuals' goals and their motivation to achieve them. Since the 1950s, research on motivation has advanced, and numerous workplace motivation theories have been categorized as process or content theories (Campbell, Pritchard, 1976). Need theories focus on internal factors within employees that influence their behavior (Whatmore, 2012). Motivation theories based on need theories view motivation as the result of internal drivers that direct individual behavior toward their achievement. These include Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Alderfer's ERG theory, Herzberg's two-factor theory, and McClelland's need theory. In short, need theories are based on numerous factors that influence job satisfaction. Motivation theories belonging to the process group of need theories are based on the assumption that all employees have the exact needs, allowing job characteristics to be predicted (Whatmore, 2012). Unlike need theories, process theories assume that their individual needs condition employee behavior. Process theories focus on the sources and reasons for employee behavior and the motives influencing their behavior. As mentioned, according to authors Campbell, J. P. et al. (1976), there are two groups of motivation theories: content theories of motivation and process theories of motivation.



According to Bloisi, W. (2003), job satisfaction refers to the attitude and level of satisfaction with all aspects of the job. Devadoss, P., and Pan, S. (2007) describe job satisfaction as an individual's attitude based on their subjective assessment and feelings towards the level of satisfaction with job-related factors. Locke, E. A. (1976) views job satisfaction as a positive feeling after completing a job that has met the individual's expectations. By defining job satisfaction this way, Locke suggested that there are both affective (emotional) and cognitive (recognition) components (Organ, Konovsky, 1989). The affective component reflects how an individual feels about the job (pleasant feeling because the job is deferred, completed, etc.). In contrast, the cognitive component is related to expectations and standards of comparison, i.e., satisfaction with specific aspects of the job. Individuals will evaluate the job based on all the important factors (Sempene, M. et al., 2002).

According to Armstrong, M. (2008), job satisfaction is primarily influenced by intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors, the quality of work supervision/control, social factors, and the degree of success/failure in the job. Purcell J. et al. (2003) identified advancement opportunities, job significance, teamwork, and job challenge as significant factors influencing job satisfaction in their research. Mullins, J. L. (2005) noted that numerous factors influence job satisfaction: Individual Factors – personality, education, and abilities; Social Factors – relationships with colleagues, group norms; Cultural Factors – basic attitudes, beliefs, and values; Organizational Factors – structure, policy, job nature, leadership; Environmental Factors – economic, social, government influence. Each factor can affect an individual and their job satisfaction differently, meaning that an individual might be satisfied with one factor and dissatisfied with another. To determine which aspects of the job an individual is satisfied or dissatisfied with, structured questionnaires, interviews, a combination of questionnaires and interviews, and focus groups are used.

Research Methodology

This research aims to determine the motivators that drive employees within the territory of Belgrade and the motivators present in the organizations where the respondents are employed. The research problem focuses on examining the motivation of employees in enterprises within the city of Belgrade. The research objectives were divided into two groups:

Objectives related to the theoretical part of the work:

- Analyzing the content of contemporary literature in the field of employee motivation,
- Defining the concept of employee motivation,
- Classifying types of motivation into intrinsic and extrinsic and providing a detailed explanation of each,
- Analyzing motivation theories,
- Examining the impact of motivation on organizational performance and providing advice for motivating employees,
- Identifying critical managerial tasks in employee motivation and the cultural differences in employee motivation worldwide,
- Discussing job satisfaction,
- Highlighting important characteristics of motivational techniques.

Objectives related to the empirical part of the work:

- To determine whether employees in the territory of Belgrade are motivated both extrinsically and intrinsically,
- To establish the influence of gender on the motivators important to employees in the territory of Belgrade,
- To ascertain the impact of job position on the motivators present in their organization,
- To determine the effect of years of work experience on the motivators present in their organization,
- To examine the influence of age on the motivators important to employees in the territory of Belgrade.

The research hypotheses are defined as follows:

- H1: Employees in enterprises within Belgrade territory are extrinsically and intrinsically motivated.
- H2: There are statistically significant differences between male and female respondents concerning



the motivators that are important to them at work.

H3: There are statistically significant differences between the positions held by respondents regarding the types of motivation present in their organization.

H4: There are statistically significant differences between the respondents' years of work experience regarding the types of motivation in their organization.

H5: There are statistically significant differences between the respondents' ages concerning the motivators important to them at work.

The survey was conducted from March 2023 to April 2023 and was carried out individually. Initially, the participants were informed that the survey was anonymous, conducted solely for scientific research purposes, and that no individual data would be processed. The task for the participants was to carefully read the instructions before filling out the questionnaire (instructions for properly completing the questionnaire were provided before each section in the questionnaire). On average, the survey lasted between 15 and 30 minutes, depending on the individual pace of the participants, although there was no time limit for completing the questionnaire.

In this study, the sample was random and consisted of 150 employees from various organizations in the territory of Belgrade. The population of this study included all employees in the private and public sectors with different levels of education and work experience. After selecting the sample, you conducted the survey using anonymous questionnaires that employees filled out electronically or on paper, depending on their availability and preferences. It is important to note that a sample of 150 employees represents a specific sample size with specific characteristics. Since the sample is limited to employees in specific organizations, the results of this study can be generalized to broader populations of employees in Serbia with caution. Further research with larger samples and different populations is recommended to achieve more excellent reliability and relevance of the results.

In this study, the following variables were used:

Motivation: This variable measures the level of employee motivation in their workplaces. The questionnaire used a rating scale from 1 to 5, where 1 indicated "low motivation" and 5 indicated "high motivation."

Job Satisfaction: Measures the satisfaction of employees with their current job. The questionnaire included questions about job tasks, work atmosphere, and relationships with colleagues and supervisors.

Type of Motivational Factors: Categorizes motivational factors that influence employees. Categories include financial incentives, advancement opportunities, job tasks, and teamwork.

Work Experience: Measures the work experience of employees in years. Employees were divided into five groups based on length of work experience.

Level of Education: Measures the educational level of employees. It was categorized into five groups.

Work Atmosphere: Measures employees' perception of the work atmosphere. The questionnaire included questions about communication, teamwork, and relationships within the organization.

Incentives: Measures the type and effectiveness of additional incentives the organization offers to employees, such as bonuses, recognition, and team events.

Advancement: Measures employees' perception of advancement opportunities within the organization.

The questionnaire was divided into three parts: the first part contained personal information about the respondents, the second part focused on motivators important to the respondents personally, and the third part was dedicated to the respondents' assessment of how certain forms of motivation are represented in their organization. Respondents rated the presence of motivators on a five-point Likert scale. Average values and the significance of differences among respondent groups were analyzed using statistical methods such as t-tests for independent samples, one-way analysis of variance, and calculation of mean response scores. Subsequently, the responses were analyzed to determine whether the hypotheses were true or false, i.e., accepted or rejected.

Results

We calculated the arithmetic mean based on the participants' responses to examine which motivators are essential to employees.

Table 1 shows the average values of motivators that are important to employees regarding their motivation for work.



Table 1: Average values of motivators important to employees

AVERAGE VALUES OF MOTIVATORS IMPORTANT TO EMPLOYEES		
	N	Mean
Performance-based pay	150	4.28
Salary level	150	4.26
Good communication and relationship with colleagues	150	4.31
Pension and health insurance	150	4.60
Good working conditions	150	4.39
Job security	150	4.51
Good relationship with supervisors	150	4.39
Interesting and creative job	150	3.96
Recognition for good performance	150	4.19
Opportunity for advancement	150	4.19
Opportunity for autonomy at work and independent decision-making	150	3.62
Opportunity for development and improvement	150	4.07
Valid N (listwise)	150	

The results showed that pension and health insurance are the most important motivators for employees in companies in Belgrade, followed by job security. Good relationships with supervisors and good working conditions are in third place. The least important motivator for them is the opportunity for autonomy at work and independent decision-making.

In the next section, we examined how these same motivators are represented in their organizations. To determine this, we also calculated the average value of motivators in the respondents' organizations. Their results can be seen in Table 2, which shows the average values of motivators present in the organizations where the respondents work.

Table 2: Average value of motivators present in their organization in terms of motivation

AVERAGE VALUE OF MOTIVATORS PRESENT IN THEIR ORGANIZATION IN TERMS OF MOTIVATION		
	N	Mean
Performance-based pay	150	4.03
Salary level	150	4.08
Good communication and good relationship with colleagues	150	4.30
Pension and health insurance	150	4.48
Good working conditions	150	4.26
Job security	150	4.65
Good relationship with supervisors	150	4.43
Interesting and creative job	150	4.56
Recognition for good performance	150	4.29
Opportunity for advancement	150	4.21
Opportunity for autonomy at work and independent decision-making	150	4.27
Opportunity for development and improvement	150	4.27
Valid N (listwise)	150	

The results showed that the most prevalent motivator in companies in the territory of Belgrade is job security, followed by an exciting and creative job, while in third place is pension and health insur-



ance. Performance-based pay is the least prevalent motivator in their organizations, followed by salary level. The study aimed to determine whether employees in the territory of Belgrade are more intrinsically or extrinsically motivated, which was enabled by calculating the average values of intrinsic and extrinsic motivators. The average value of extrinsic motivators present in companies in the territory of Belgrade is 4.39. (Table 3)

Table 3: Extrinsic Motivators

Extrinsic Motivators		
	N	Mean
Performance-based pay	150	4.28
Salary level	150	4.26
Good communication and relationship with colleagues	150	4.31
Pension and health insurance	150	4.60
Good working conditions	150	4.39
Job security	150	4.51
Good relationship with supervisors	150	4.39
Valid N (listwise)	150	

The average value of intrinsic motivators present in companies in the territory of Belgrade is 4.32. (Table 4)

Table 4: Intrinsic Motivators

INTRINSIC MOTIVATORS		
	N	Mean
Interesting and creative job	150	4.56
Recognition for a job well done	150	4.29
Opportunity for advancement	150	4.21
Opportunity for autonomy at work and independent decision-making	150	4.27
Opportunity for development and improvement	150	4.27
Valid N (listwise)	150	

Given that the average value for extrinsic motivators was 4.39, and for intrinsic motivators 4.32, we can conclude that hypothesis 1, which states:

“Employees in companies in the territory of Belgrade are both extrinsically and intrinsically motivated,” is confirmed.

The second hypothesis investigated whether there is a statistically significant difference in attitudes between male and female respondents regarding the motivators important to them at work. An independent samples t-test was used to test this hypothesis. In Tables 5 and 6, we can see that for the motivator “salary,” there is a statistically significant difference because $p < 0.05$ (.000). It was found that men (4.41) are more motivated by salary than women (3.91).

Even though for the motivator “good communication and good relationship with colleagues,” there is a statistically significant difference because $p < 0.05$ (.000), we can see that for women (4.82), good communication and a good relationship with colleagues are more essential motivators than for men (4.09).

It can also be observed that there is a statistically significant difference for the motivator “good working conditions” because $p < 0.05$ (.015). We conclude that men (4.48) are more motivated by good working conditions than women (4.18).

It should be noted that for the motivator “recognition for good performance,” there is a statistically significant difference because $p < 0.05$ (.003). This indicates that women (4.51) are more motivated by



recognition for good performance than men (4.06).

Indicating that for the motivator “opportunity for development and improvement.” there is also a statistically significant difference because $p < 0.05$ (.020), we find that women (4.33) consider the opportunity for development and improvement more important for motivation than men (3.96).

Table 5: Group Statistics

Group Statistics					
	Gender	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
Salary	male	105	4.41	.756	.074
	female	45	3.91	.668	.100
Good communication and good relationship with colleagues	male	105	4.09	.952	.093
	female	45	4.82	.490	.073
Good working conditions	male	105	4.48	.637	.062
	female	45	4.18	.777	.116
Recognition for good performance	male	105	4.06	.928	.091
	female	45	4.51	.589	.088
Opportunity for development and improvement	male	105	3.96	.919	.090
	female	45	4.33	.798	.119

Tabela 6: Independent Samples Test

		Levene's Test		t-test for Equality of Means						
		F	Sig.	t	df	Sig.	Mean	Std. Error	95% Confidence Interval	
									Lower	Upper
Salary	Equal variances assumed	10.707	.001	3.828	148	.000	.498	.130	.241	.756
	Equal variances not assumed			4.022	93.566	.000	.498	.124	.252	.745
Good communication and good relationship with colleagues	Equal variances assumed	40.223	.000	-4.912	148	.000	-.737	.150	-1.033	-.440
	Equal variances not assumed			-6.231	143.044	.000	-.737	.118	-.970	-.503
Good working conditions	Equal variances assumed	.520	.472	2.457	148	.015	.298	.121	.058	.538
	Equal variances not assumed			2.270	70.503	.026	.298	.131	.036	.561
Recognition for a job well done	Equal variances assumed	2.872	.092	-3.026	148	.003	-.454	.150	-.750	-.158
	Equal variances not assumed			-3.599	126.849	.000	-.454	.126	-.704	-.204
Opportunity for development and improvement	Equal variances assumed	.001	.975	-2.356	148	.020	-.371	.158	-.683	-.060
	Equal variances not assumed			-2.494	95.258	.014	-.371	.149	-.667	-.076

Based on all the aforementioned, it can be observed that certain motivators differ statistically, and the hypothesis that states, “There are statistically significant differences between male and female respondents regarding the motivators important to them at work,” is partially confirmed.

Using a one-way analysis of variance, we aimed to verify if there is a statistically significant difference between the positions held by employees in terms of the types of motivation present in their organization (Table 7). By applying a one-way analysis of variance, we conclude that there are statistically significant differences in the following motivators: salary, pension and health insurance, good working conditions, and job security, as $p < 0.05$ for these motivators.



Table 7: ANOVA

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Merit-based pay	Between Groups	4.599	2	2.300	2.656	.074
	Within Groups	127.294	147	.866		
	Total	131.893	149			
Salary level	Between Groups	9.612	2	4.806	8.895	.000
	Within Groups	79.428	147	.540		
	Total	89.040	149			
Good communication and good relationship with colleagues	Between Groups	2.705	2	1.353	1.828	.164
	Within Groups	108.795	147	.740		
	Total	111.500	149			
Pension and health insurance	Between Groups	3.330	2	1.665	3.593	.030
	Within Groups	68.110	147	.463		
	Total	71.440	149			
Good working conditions	Between Groups	7.368	2	3.684	8.024	.000
	Within Groups	67.492	147	.459		
	Total	74.860	149			
Job security	Between Groups	2.483	2	1.241	3.067	.050
	Within Groups	59.491	147	.405		
	Total	61.973	149			
Good relationship with supervisors	Between Groups	1.646	2	.823	1.656	.194
	Within Groups	73.047	147	.497		
	Total	74.693	149			
Interesting and creative job	Between Groups	.100	2	.050	.129	.879
	Within Groups	56.860	147	.387		
	Total	56.960	149			
Recognition for a job well done	Between Groups	1.825	2	.912	2.837	.062
	Within Groups	47.269	147	.322		
	Total	49.093	149			
Opportunity for advancement	Between Groups	2.297	2	1.148	2.999	.053
	Within Groups	56.296	147	.383		
	Total	58.593	149			
Ability to make decisions autonomously at work	Between Groups	.191	2	.095	.235	.790
	Within Groups	59.602	147	.405		
	Total	59.793	149			
Opportunity for development and improvement	Between Groups	.589	2	.295	.917	.402
	Within Groups	47.204	147	.321		
	Total	47.793	149			

Since there are statistically significant differences in several forms of motivation based on the respondents' positions in relation to the motivators present in their organization, we confirm our hypothesis that states: There are statistically significant differences in the positions of the respondents in relation to the motivators present in their organization.

With the fourth hypothesis, we aimed to explore whether there is a statistically significant difference between the years of work experience of the respondents and the forms of motivation present in their organization. To prove this hypothesis, we used a one-way analysis of variance (Table 8). Through this analysis, we determined that there are statistically significant differences in the following forms of motivation: good working conditions, job security, good relationship with supervisors, recognition for good performance, opportunity for advancement, and autonomy in decision-making at work, as $p < 0.05$ for these motivators.



Table 8: ANOVA

		ANOVA				
		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Merit-based pay	Between Groups	2.963	4	.741	.833	.506
	Within Groups	128.930	145	.889		
	Total	131.893	149			
Salary level	Between Groups	4.633	4	1.158	1.990	.099
	Within Groups	84.407	145	.582		
	Total	89.040	149			
Good communication and good relationship with colleagues	Between Groups	6.603	4	1.651	2.282	.063
	Within Groups	104.897	145	.723		
	Total	111.500	149			
Pension and health insurance	Between Groups	2.894	4	.724	1.531	.196
	Within Groups	68.546	145	.473		
	Total	71.440	149			
Good working conditions	Between Groups	8.417	4	2.104	4.592	.002
	Within Groups	66.443	145	.458		
	Total	74.860	149			
Job security	Between Groups	5.294	4	1.323	3.386	.011
	Within Groups	56.680	145	.391		
	Total	61.973	149			
Good relationship with managers	Between Groups	6.063	4	1.516	3.202	.015
	Within Groups	68.630	145	.473		
	Total	74.693	149			
Interesting and creative job	Between Groups	2.611	4	.653	1.742	.144
	Within Groups	54.349	145	.375		
	Total	56.960	149			
Recognition for good performance	Between Groups	6.811	4	1.703	5.839	.000
	Within Groups	42.283	145	.292		
	Total	49.093	149			
Opportunity for advancement	Between Groups	5.635	4	1.409	3.857	.005
	Within Groups	52.959	145	.365		
	Total	58.593	149			
Opportunity for autonomy at work and independent decision-making	Between Groups	3.966	4	.992	2.575	.040
	Within Groups	55.827	145	.385		
	Total	59.793	149			
Opportunity for development and improvement	Between Groups	2.125	4	.531	1.687	.156
	Within Groups	45.669	145	.315		
	Total	47.793	149			

When we consider the highlighted motivators, we find a statistically significant difference among them. This confirms our hypothesis that there are statistically significant differences among the respondents' years of work experience regarding the types of motivation present in their organizations.

Using a one-way analysis of variance, we aimed to examine whether there is a statistically significant difference among the age groups of the respondents regarding the motivators important to employees in Belgrade (Table 9). The application of one-way analysis of variance reveals statistically significant differences among the following highlighted motivators: performance-based pay, salary, good communication and relationship with colleagues, pension and health insurance, good working conditions, good relationship with supervisors, recognition for good performance, opportunity for advancement, and opportunity for development and improvement, as the p-value is less than 0.05 for these motivators.



Tabel 9: ANOVA

ANOVA		Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Performance-based pay	Between Groups	13.918	4	3.480	7.175	.000
	Within Groups	70.322	145	.485		
	Total	84.240	149			
Salary	Between Groups	8.388	4	2.097	3.875	.005
	Within Groups	78.472	145	.541		
	Total	86.860	149			
Good communication and good relationship with colleagues	Between Groups	8.648	4	2.162	2.768	.030
	Within Groups	113.245	145	.781		
	Total	121.893	149			
Pension and health insurance	Between Groups	4.168	4	1.042	3.296	.013
	Within Groups	45.832	145	.316		
	Total	50.000	149			
Good working conditions	Between Groups	5.955	4	1.489	3.290	.013
	Within Groups	65.619	145	.453		
	Total	71.573	149			
Job security	Between Groups	4.622	4	1.155	2.238	.068
	Within Groups	74.852	145	.516		
	Total	79.473	149			
Good relationship with supervisors	Between Groups	13.901	4	3.475	4.861	.001
	Within Groups	103.672	145	.715		
	Total	117.573	149			
Interesting and creative job	Between Groups	4.614	4	1.154	.944	.440
	Within Groups	177.146	145	1.222		
	Total	181.760	149			
Recognition for a job well done	Between Groups	9.958	4	2.490	3.559	.008
	Within Groups	101.435	145	.700		
	Total	111.393	149			
Opportunities for advancement	Between Groups	17.863	4	4.466	6.255	.000
	Within Groups	103.530	145	.714		
	Total	121.393	149			
Autonomy in the workplace and decision-making	Between Groups	13.570	4	3.392	2.035	.093
	Within Groups	241.770	145	1.667		
	Total	255.340	149			
Opportunities for advancement	Between Groups	13.323	4	3.331	4.519	.002
	Within Groups	106.870	145	.737		
	Total	120.193	149			

At the end, it was determined that there is a statistically significant difference in certain motivators, from which we can conclude that our hypothesis stating: "There are statistically significant differences in the age of the respondents regarding the motivators that are important to them at work" has been confirmed.

Discussion

In this study, the topic was employee motivation. The sample consisted of participants working in organizations in the Belgrade area. The research aimed to determine whether employees in Belgrade are more intrinsically or extrinsically motivated. This hypothesis was confirmed because the average value of extrinsic motivators is 4.39, while intrinsic motivators is 4.32. The first hypothesis was calculated using the average values of extrinsic motivators, including performance-based pay, salary level, good communication and relationships with colleagues, pension and health insurance, good working conditions,



job security, and good relationships with supervisors, followed by intrinsic motivators: interesting and creative work, recognition for good performance, opportunities for advancement, autonomy in decision-making at work, and opportunities for development and advancement. The most important extrinsic motivators for employees are pension and health insurance, while salary level is the least important. The most important intrinsic motivator for employees is interesting and creative work, while opportunities for advancement are the least important.

The second hypothesis aimed to explore whether there is a significant difference in the attitudes of male and female respondents regarding motivators that are important to employees in Belgrade. This hypothesis was calculated and analyzed using the independent samples t-test, concluding that the hypothesis is partially confirmed. It was also found that men are more motivated by salary and good working conditions, while women are more motivated by recognition for good performance, good communication and relationships with colleagues, and opportunities for development and advancement. It can be concluded that men are more motivated by extrinsic motivators, while women are more motivated by intrinsic motivators.

The third hypothesis aimed to analyze the differences between the respondents' positions in relation to the motivators present in their organization, which was ultimately confirmed. The results showed that salary level, pension and health insurance, good working conditions, and job security are the motivators with significant differences. Managers are most motivated by personal growth and development aspirations, while other employees are motivated by job security or the work environment. It is also important to note that a manager is both a motivator and someone who needs to be motivated.

The fourth hypothesis examined whether there is a significant difference between the respondents' years of work experience and the motivators present in their organization. Significant differences were observed in many motivators, and the hypothesis was confirmed, particularly in motivators such as good working conditions, job security, good relationships with supervisors, recognition for good performance, opportunities for advancement, and autonomy in decision-making at work.

Finally, we wanted to verify whether there is a statistically significant difference in the age of the respondents in relation to the motivators important to employees in Belgrade. The hypothesis was confirmed, with differences observed in motivators such as performance-based pay, salary level, good communication and relationships with colleagues, pension and health insurance, good working conditions, good relationships with supervisors, recognition for good performance, opportunities for advancement, and opportunities for development and advancement. Different generations of employees may have different motivational factors. For example, younger generations (Millennials and Generation Z) often value flexibility, learning opportunities, and career development, while older generations (Baby Boomers and Generation X) may value stability, security, and recognition for work more. This was also confirmed by my research. Older workers have control over their work, increasing their loyalty to the organization. Younger people want flexible work, and one reason may be that they are at an earlier stage of life when they start a family, so flexibility and independent work organization are very important to them.

Conclusion

The results showed that the most important motivator for employees in companies in the Belgrade area is pension and health insurance, followed by job security, while good relationships with supervisors and good working conditions are ranked third, and the least important motivator for them is the possibility of autonomy at work and independent decision-making. Also, the results showed that the most prevalent motivator in organizations for employees in Belgrade is job security, followed by interesting and creative work, while pension and health insurance rank third. The least prevalent motivator in their organizations is performance-based pay, followed closely by salary level and opportunities for advancement. Quality construction of a motivational system enables the organization to strengthen its competitive ability and value. Some of the previous research in Serbia has yielded interesting results. Participants considered salary to be an important factor in motivation, but they would be happier if they were provided with free training, opportunities for advancement, reduced responsibilities, and if more attention were paid to them in the workplace. Employee dissatisfaction with motivation in Serbia indicates that managers in this region are still guided by a conservative approach, where workers are still considered merely as a labor force. This dissatisfaction is most evident in the desire for greater care for the employees. Another interesting fact is that despite the weak economy, employees in Serbia prioritize reducing responsibilities that cause them stress over higher salaries. In the research, we also concluded that men are more motivated by salary and good working conditions, while women are more motivated by recognition for good performance, good communication and relationships with colleagues, and opportunities for development and advancement.



This means that women are more motivated by non-material, while men by material motivators. By combining material and non-material forms of stimulation, the full potential of workers in the workplace is achieved, reflected in rationality, economy, productivity, and work efficiency. Managers have numerous financial and non-financial motivators at their disposal, and the combinations they choose depend on their knowledge of motivational theories, circumstances, and perseverance.

The results showed that there are statistically significant differences between the respondents' positions in relation to the motivators present in their organization regarding salary level, pension and health insurance, good working conditions, and job security. Subordinates perform best when they truly love the job they do. It is the manager's task to determine the knowledge and abilities of subordinates and, based on that, assign them to the position where their characteristics will be best expressed, where subordinates will be able to give their maximum and utilize all their knowledge, skills, and experience, thus contributing to the efficiency and success of the company's operations. It should not be forgotten that culture also plays a major role in understanding the interlocutor, directly influencing the personality and behavior of the individual. The main challenges supervisors face worldwide, which represent a major problem, are cultural barriers in communication with employees.

There are statistically significant differences between the years of work experience of the respondents in relation to the motivators present in their organization regarding good working conditions, job security, good relationships with supervisors, recognition for good performance, opportunities for advancement, and autonomy in decision-making at work. One thing is certain: no matter how much work experience we have, job satisfaction is crucial to motivation. Job satisfaction represents the assessment of job characteristics and emotional experiences at work. Satisfied employees give a positive job rating based on their explanations and emotional experiences. Lastly, what we found from the research is that there are statistically significant differences in the age of the respondents in relation to the motivators important to employees in Belgrade regarding performance-based pay, salary level, good communication and relationships with colleagues, pension and health insurance, good working conditions, good relationships with supervisors, recognition for good performance, opportunities for advancement, and opportunities for development and advancement.

References

- Adams, J. S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, 2, 267-299.
- Adigun, I.O. and Stephenson, G.M. (1992), "Sources of job motivation and satisfaction among British and Nigerian employees", *Journal of Social Psychology*, Vol. 132 No. 3, pp. 369-376.
- Ahmed, I. (2011): Relationship between Motivation and Job Satisfaction. A study of higher educational institution, *Journal of Economics and Behavioral Studies*, Vol. 3, No. 2, pp. 94-100.
- Alderfer, C.P. (1972). Existence, relatedness and growth: Human needs in organisational Settings. New York: Free Press 183-189.
- Armstrong, M. (2002). Employee reward, Trowbridge: Cromwell Press.
- Arnold, H.J. & Feldman, D.C. (1986). Organizational behavior. New York: McGraw Hill.
- Carton, R., & Hofer, Ch. (2008). Measuring Organizational Performance: Metrics for Entrepreneurshi, Camberley: Edward Elgar Publishing Limited.
- Daftuar, C.N. (2001). Job satisfaction among government officers: A comparison of three measures. *Abhigyan*, Vol.19, No.3, p. 33 – 39.
- Deci, E. L. & Ryan, R. M. (1985). Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behaviour. New York: Plenum Press.
- Deci, E. L., Ryan, R. M. (2002). Handbook of Self-Determination Research. Rochester: The University of Rochester Press.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (2000). The "what" and "why" of goal pursuits: Human needs and the self-determination of behavior. *Psychological Inquiry*, 11(4), 227-268.
- Deckop, J. R., & Cirka, C. C. (2000). The risk and reward of a double edged sword: effects of merit-pay programs on intrinsic motivation. *Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly*, 29, 400-418.
- Dobrijević G. (2011). Poslovno Komuniciranje i Pregovaranje, Univerzitet Singidunum, Beograd.
- Dr Subotić D. (2005) ,Upravljanje ljudskim resursima, Beograd
- Eden, D. (1975). Intrinsic and extrinsic rewards and motives: replication and extension with Kibbutz workers. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 5, 348-361.
- Fisher, Y. (1998). What motivates employees? A comparison of U.S. and Chinese responses. *International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 9(3), 516-528.
- Gagné, M., & Deci, E. L. (2005). Self-determination theory and work motivation. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 26(4), 331-362.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Hacman, R., Lawler, E., & Porter, L. (1977). Perspectives on Behavior in Organizations, New York: McGraw Hill.
- Heldon, K. M., & Elliot, A. J. (1998). Not all personal goals are 'personal': comparing autonomous and controlling goals on effort and attainment. *Personality and Social Psychology Bulletin*, 24, 546-557.
- Herzberg, F.(1968). One more time: how do you motivate employees?, *Harvard Business Review*, vol. 46, iss. 1, pp. 53-62.
- Iguisi O. (2009). Motivation-related values across cultures, *African Journal of Business Management*, Vol. 3, No.4, p. 141-150.



- Judge, T.A. & Watanabe, S. (1993). Another look at the job satisfaction-life satisfaction relationship. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, No. 78, p.939–948.
- Kanfer, R. (1990). Motivation theory and industrial and organizational psychology. *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, 1, 75-170.
- Kanfer, R., & Ackerman, P. L. (1989). Motivation and cognitive abilities: An integrative/aptitude-treatment interaction approach to skill acquisition. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74(4), 657-690.
- Koestner, R., & Losier, G. F. (2002). Distinguishing three ways of being internally motivated: a closer look at introjection, identification, and intrinsic motivation. In E. L., 101-121.
- Kulić, Ž. (2003) , Upravljanje ljudskim resursima sa organizacionim ponašanjem, Megatrend univerzitet primenjenih nauka, Beograd, str. 208
- Locke, E.A. & Lathan, G.P. (1990). *Theory of goal setting and task performance*. Englewood Cliffs, New York: Prentice-Hall.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*. Chicago: Rand McNally College Publishing Company.
- Lynn, M. T., Riddle, T. A., & Morsella, E. (2012). The phenomenology of quitting: Effects from repetition and cognitive effort, *Korean Journal of Cognitive Science*, No. 23, p. 25-46
- Majstorović, N. (2007). *The Mediating Role of Self Orientations on the Relationship between Psychological Needs Satisfaction and Values*. PhD thesis, University of Ottawa, Ottawa, Canada.
- Maslow, A. H. (1954). *Motivation and personality*, New York: Harper
- Matteson, M. T., & Ivancevich, J. M. (1987). *Controlling work stress: Effective human resource and management strategies*. San Francisco, CA: Jossey-Bass Inc.
- McShane & von Glinow M.A. (2003) *Organizational Behaviour*. International Edition, McGraw-Hill Education, New York.
- Mustafa, H. (1992). The contributions of psychology to the study of administrative behavior. *International Journal of Public Sector Management*, Vol. 5(4), 15-27
- Nikolić M. (2014). *Strategijski menadžment*, Zrenjanin, Tehnički fakultet «Mihailo Pupin».
- Petković T., Stanković R. (2011). *Strategijski menadžment*, Čačak, Visoka poslovna škola strukovnih studija.
- Pinder, C.C., (1998). *Work Motivation in Organizational Behaviour*, Upper Saddle River, New York, Prentice Hall.
- Porter, L. W., & Lawler, E. E. III. (1968). Managerial attitudes and performance. *Homewood, IL: Irwin-Dorsey*.
- Prof.dr. Jovanovic Bozinov M., dr.Kulić Ž., dr. Cvetkovski, T.(2004), *Menadžment ljudskih resursa*, Fakultet Megatrend.
- Ristić, D. (1995). *Menadžment upravljanja i rukovođenja*, Novi Sad, CEKOM
- Ryan, R. M., & Deci, E. L. (2000). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivations: Classic definitions and new directions. *Contemporary Educational Psychology*, 25(1), 54-67.
- Sempañe, M.E., Rieger, H.S. & Roodt, G. (2002). Job satisfaction in relation to organisational culture, *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, Vol. 28, No.2, p. 23–30.
- Skinner, B.F. (1950). Are theories of learning necessary?, *Psychological Review*, 57(4), 193-216.
- Spector, P.E. (2003). *Industrial and organizational psychology: Research and practice*, New York: John Wiley & Sons, Inc, 178-252.
- Stone,Meltz (1991) *Human Resource Management in Canada*. Holt.Rinehart and Winston of Canad, Toronto.
- Vesić, D. (2010). Uloga menadžmenta u motivaciji zaposlenih, *Međunarodna naučna konferencija „Menadžment 2010“*, Kurševac, str. 264-270
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York, NY: Wiley.
- Vroom, V.H. (1995). *Work and Motivation*, San Francisco, Jossey Bass Publishers.
- Warr, P. (2001). Age and work behavior: Physical attributes, cognitive abilities, knowledge, personality traits and motives, *London: John Wiley*,33-39.
- Kian, T. S., Yusoff W., Rajah S., (2014): „Job satisfaction and motivation: what are the difference among these two?“ *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, 3(2), str. 94-102
- Whiseand, P., Rush, G., (1988): *Supervising Police Personnel: Back to Basics*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey
- Locke, E. A., (1976): „The Nature and Causes of Job Satisfaction“, navedeno prema: Dunnette M. D., (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, str. 1297-1343. Chicago: Rand McNally
- Carr, G., (2005): *Investigating the motivation of retail managers at a retail organization in the Western Cape*, Unpublished minithesis, University of the Western Cape, South Africa
- Saraswathi, S., (2011): „A Study on Factors that Motivate IT and Non-IT Sector Employees: A Comparison“, *International Journal of Research in Computer Application and Management*, 1 (2), str. 72-77
- Maslow, A. H., (1982): *The journals of Abraham Maslow*, navedeno prema: Lowry R. J., (1982): *In the A. H. Maslow series*, International Study Project, Chicago, IL
- Dubin, R., (1961): *Human Relations in Administration*, Prentice-Hall
- Campbell, J. P., Pritchard, R. D., (1976): „Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology“, navedeno prema: Dunnette M.D., (1976): *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*, Chicago: Rand McNally
- Moorhead, G., Griffin, R. W., (2004): *Organizational Behavior: Managing People and Organizations*, Boston: Houghton Mifflin
- Allport, G. W., (1954): „The historical background of modern psychology“, navedeno prema Lindzey G., (Ed.), *Handbook of social psychology*. Cambridge, MA: Addison-Wesley
- Campbell, J. P., Pritchard, R. D., (1976): „Motivation theory in industrial and organizational psychology“, navedeno prema: Dunnette M. D., (Ed), *Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology*: str. 63–130, Chicago: Rand McNally
- Whatmore, L., (2012): *Raising Performance through Motivation Part One: Content Theories*, Michael Heath
- Bloisi, W., (2003): *Management and organizational behavior*, Mc Graw-Hill companies
- Devadoss, P., Pan, S., (2007): „Enterprise Systems Use: Towards a Structural Analysis of Enterprise Systems Induced Organizational Transformation,“ *Communications of the Association for Information Systems*, br. 19., str. 352-385
- Organ, D. W., Konovsky, M., (1989): „Cognitive versus affective determinants of organizational citizenship behavior“, *Journal of Applied Psychology*, br. 74., str.157-164
- Sempañe, M., Rieger, H., Roodt, G., (2002): „Job satisfaction in relation to organizational culture“, *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), str. 23–30



Mullins, J. L., (2007): Management and organizational behavior, Seventh Edition, Pearson Education Limited, Essex, str, 700
Purcell, J., Kinne, N., Hutchinson, S., (2003): Understanding the people and performance link: unlocking the black box, London:
CIPD, str.88
Armstrong, M., (2008): Strategic Human Resource Management-A Guide to Action, 4 ed., Kogan Page Limited, London