

## A COMPARATIVE STUDY OF EMPLOYEE MOTIVATION AMONG WORKERS OF PUBLIC AND PRIVATE LIMITED TEA GARDEN IN JORHAT DISTRICT, ASSAM, INDIA

**Meghali Saikia**

Research Scholar, Department of Management and Humanities, National Institute of Technology, Arunachal Pradesh, India-791113, Email: meghalisaikia95@gmail.com

**Mihir Kumar Shome**

Professor, Department of Management and Humanities, National Institute of Technology, Arunachal Pradesh, India-791113, Email: mihir@nitap.ac.in

### **Abstract:**

*The study discusses the Employee Motivation level between public and private Ltd. tea garden workers of Jorhat district of Assam, India. Motivation positively affects work performance because if employees are not motivated to work, they will not exhibit positive work behavior. An organization can benefit from having motivated workers because their success closely correlates with the success of the company. Scale of employee motivation was used for data collection which was developed by Dr. A.K. Srivastava (1988). For this study, a total of 160 workers were chosen as respondents. Out of 160 respondents 90 respondents were chosen from public limited and 70 respondents were chosen from private limited tea garden of Assam. Out of 90 public tea garden workers, 41 were male and 49 were female. Similarly, out of 70 private tea garden workers, 32 were male and 38 were female. The main objective of this study is to find out the significant difference between public and private Ltd. tea garden workers. SPSS was employed for data analysis. Data were analyzed based on descriptive statistics including 't' test to see the significant differences between two public and private Ltd. tea garden workers, and Inferential statistics –ANOVA to see the significant differences among four groups of employees. ANOVA result shows the significant difference among the four groups. The findings were reviewed in the context of other pertinent investigations.*

**Keywords:** Employee motivation, tea garden workers, public and private limited Tea garden, Comparative Study.

### **Introduction:**

Each organization uses resources such as people, machines, materials, and money to carry out its tasks. The only resource that is alive and generating resources is personnel; all other resources are nonliving. Manpower makes use of other resources and produces. Other resources are useless and unable to produce anything if labor is not accessible. Out of all the production elements, labor has the highest priority, is the most important factor, and is crucial for both productivity and quality. If other nonliving aspects aren't taken into consideration, it could lead to a slight decline in profitability. But it can be dangerous to ignore the human resource. Enhancing

working environment and fostering staff integration both contribute to increasing employee productivity. Effective motivation at the various organizational levels is crucial for fostering employee satisfaction and commitment (Tella et al., 2007). Employee commitment and motivation are thought to be crucial for an organization's performance by Mohsen et al. (2004). Organizations consider highly engaged employees to be a valuable asset since they are driven to succeed (Denton, 1987). According to Denton (1987), maintaining employee excitement, dedication, and job engagement is always advantageous to a company since highly motivated employees are more productive.

### **Employee Motivation:**

Motivation is the primary force that drives someone to take action. It has a multiplier effect, enhancing a person's ability and willingness to work. Employee motivation has a favorable impact on work performance because unmotivated workers won't display productive conduct. Inspiring people to put forth their best effort and assisting in the accomplishment of organizational goals, motivation is an essential component. Dubin (1970), states that motivation is the combination of factors that propels and maintains an individual's employment inside an organization. A person needs motivation to get started and to stay on the route of previously started action. The state of an individual's perspective that shows how strongly inclined they are to put effort into a specific behavior is known as motivation (Gibson, 1980). Luthans (1995) defined motivation as a process that starts with an emotional or physical need or deficit and then ignites behavior or a drive that is focused toward a reward or goal. In the context of business, it refers to motivating staff to complete tasks that advance organizational objectives. Motivation makes people willing to carry out efforts that help them achieve their goals. Jucious (1975) defined motivation as the act of persuading a person or oneself to perform an activity or press a button in order to achieve desired results. Similar to this, Scott (1961) asserts that motivation is the process of inspiring individuals to perform in order to accomplish a goal. According to Lillis (1985), it is also the stimulation of any feeling or desire acting on a person's will and encouraging or driving it to action.

In the beginning, a person works on business activities not out of concern for the success of the firm, but rather because he will be rewarded financially, allowing him to fulfill his own needs and desires. Therefore, the motivation behind human conduct is need. Therefore, human needs are what drive behavior, and motivation is the process that makes someone aware of these requirements. According to Steers & Porter (1975), motivation is the force that drives behavior, provides behavior direction, and underlying the propensity to persist. According to Viteles (1953), motivation is an unmet need that results in tension or disequilibrium and drives a person to act in a goal-directed manner in an effort. Inspiring people to put forth their best effort and assisting in the accomplishment of organizational goals, motivation is an essential component. Strong positive motivation will increase employee productivity while strong negative motivation will decrease it. Staff management is critically dependent on motivation. The essence of management, according to Likert (1993), "shows that every human being offers him a sense of worth in face-to-face groups which are most significant to him." A manager should make an effort to treat staff members with respect and acknowledge their worth. regain balance by sating the need.

Motivation is one of the most crucial elements that influences everyone to understand their goals. Indeed, motivation is the principle that enables people to maintain their attention on the road to achievement despite potential obstacles. This encompasses both personal and professional objectives (Baumeister & Vohs, 2004). Some researchers in the field contend that without this motivation, people would have slept through the monotony and no significant discoveries or interventions would have been made. In line with Vroom (1964), motivation is a process that influences an individual's decision among many types of voluntary actions. To address the topic of why people behave as they do, the field of motivation emerged. Employee commitment to the company is influenced by motivation, which encourages employees to invest time and effort there (Mowday et al. 1979). It is one of the crucial elements that raise employees' levels of dedication in any firm. An organization can benefit from having motivated workers because their success closely correlates with the success of the company. Although motivation is elusive, difficult to measure, and difficult to manage, it is comparatively easy to help when done correctly. It all comes down to focus, fervor, and persistence. In a tea garden, motivation is a powerful tool that can enhance employee productivity. In this context of motivation, it is possible to say that practice and a person's level of motivation both negatively affect a person's ability to perform skilled jobs. The effectiveness of the workforce will advance the tea sector, increasing the dedication to the garden and job satisfaction over time.

### **Objectives:**

The aim of this study is to compare between public and private limited tea garden workers of Assam. In particular, the research aims to achieve the following objectives:

1. To find out the significant differences between public and private limited tea garden workers on the variables of employee motivation in Assam.
2. To find out the significant differences among four groups of public and private limited male and female workers of tea garden on the variables of employee motivation in Assam.

### **Hypothesis of the study:**

#### **Hypothesis-1:**

**(H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant difference between public and private limited tea garden workers on the variables of employee motivation in Assam.

**(H<sub>1</sub>):** There is significant difference between public and private limited tea garden workers on the variables of employee motivation in Assam.

#### **Hypothesis-2:**

**(H<sub>0</sub>):** There is no significant difference among four groups of public and private limited male and female workers of tea garden on the variables of employee motivation in Assam.

**(H<sub>1</sub>):** There is significant difference among four groups of public and private limited male and female workers of tea garden on the variables of employee motivation in Assam.

### **Methods of Study**

By goal, this research aims to do a comparative analysis of employee motivation of public and private limited tea garden workers of Assam. The research is primarily analytical and descriptive in character. Both primary and secondary data are used in the investigation. Primary data were collected from four gardens (two from public limited and two from private limited garden) of Jorhat district.

For this study, a total of 160 workers were chosen as respondents. Out of 160 respondents 90 respondents were chosen from public limited and 70 respondents were chosen from private limited tea garden of Assam. Out of 90 public tea garden workers, 41 were male and 49 were female. Similarly, out of 70 private tea garden workers, 32 were male and 38 were female. Random sampling method was followed for collecting data. The age group of the respondents varied from 22 - 52 years.

### Tool for data collection:

Scale of employee motivation was used for data collection which was developed by Dr. A.K. Srivastava (1988). The questionnaire consists of 70 items relating to needs being manifested in work. Each item in the scale was measured by a 4 point Likert scale in which 4 is for 'Always' and 1 is for 'Never.'

### Data Analysis:

Data were analyzed by using SPSS, which comprises of Descriptive and Inferential Statistics. Descriptive statistics includes 't' test and inferential statistics includes 'ANOVA'.

To see the significance difference between public and private limited tea garden workers in relation to their employee motivation 't' test were employed. Table-1 depicts the significance of mean values between public and private limited tea garden workers on the variables of employee motivation.

Table -1: Shows Mean values between Public and Private limited tea garden workers.

Name of the Variables	Public limited tea garden workers (N= 90)		Private limited tea garden workers (N= 70)		't' Value	Level of Significance
	Mean	SD	Mean	SD		
Employee Motivation	206.52	12.44	210.10	14.31	2.06*	S

\*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001 S-Significance, NS- Not Significance

The table depicts that the value of mean and SD of employee motivation of public ltd. workers were 206.52 and 12.44 respectively and those of private ltd. workers were 210.10 and 14.31 respectively. From the mean scores it has been observed that private limited tea garden workers are more motivated in contrast to public limited tea garden workers. The 't' value came out to be 2.06 which is significant because the significant level is 0.04 which is less than the P value 0.05, which implies that there is a significant difference between the public ltd. and private ltd. tea garden workers in relation to employee motivation. Private tea garden workers believe that

increase work efficiency leads to the development of work efficiency leads to the development of positive job attitude towards the job. They do not consider any work very difficult, because they like to do work. They always do their job very well despite the obstacles or challenges they faced. Private workers like to get more salary than position and prestige. They believe that money is an important means of freedom from all kinds of concerns. Hence the null hypothesis that stated that there is no significant difference between public and private limited tea garden workers on the variables of employee motivation in Assam is rejected and alternative hypothesis is accepted.

Table 2: Showing the Summary of ANOVA for Employee Motivation variables among four groups of tea garden workers.

Name of the variables	Source of Variation	Sum of Squares (SS)	Df	Mean Square (MS)	F	Level of Significance
Employee Motivation	Between Groups	5830.29	3	1943.43	11.87***	S
	Within Groups	38304.99	234	163.69		
	Total	44135.28	237			

\*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001, S-Significance, NS- Not Significance

The second objective is to find out the significant differences among four groups of workers (i.e. Public male and female, Private male and female) in relation to employee motivation in Assam. To see the significant differences among four groups ANOVA was done. The ANOVA results indicate significant difference among the means of the four groups in relation to employee motivation. The significance level is less than.001, and the F ratio is 11.87, as can be seen from the aforementioned ANOVA table. The decision rule is that if the significance level is less than 0.001, we accept the alternate hypothesis and reject the null hypothesis (H0) (H1). There is a significant difference between four groups of public and private limited male and female workers of tea gardens on the variables of employee motivation in Assam, according to the large value of the F ratio and the low value of the significance level, which means we must reject the null hypothesis and accept the alternate hypothesis.

Table 3: Showing Duncan's multiple range tests among four groups on the variables of Employee Motivation.

Groups Mean Value	Mean Value	1	2	3	4
		213.87	200.26	212.18	208.41
Groups					
1(Public Limited Male Tea Garden Workers)	213.87	0			
2(Public Limited Female Tea Garden Workers)	200.26	13.61***	0		
3(Private Limited Male Tea Garden Workers)	212.18	1.69	11.92***	0	

4(Private Limited Female Tea Garden Workers)	208.41	5.46	8.15***	3.77	0
--	--------	------	---------	------	---

\*P<.05, \*\*P<.01, \*\*\*P<.001

From the Duncan’s multiple range test table we have seen specific differences between first, fourth and fifth pairs of means. If we see the means of the first pair then it is observed that the public male mean is 213.87, while the public female mean is 200.26 and the mean difference is 13.61. Since it was significant, this indicates that public male has high employee motivation than public female. There is an also significant difference between public female and private male tea garden workers. Private male workers have high motivation compared to Public female workers. And then difference between public female and private female is also significant. These pairs have also mean differences of 8.15, which show that private female have high motivation in contrast to public female. Significant differences have also observed between public and private female and private male and female also.

**Conclusion:**

The main objective of this study is to find out the differences between public and private limited tea garden workers on the variables of employee motivation in Assam. The t test result shows that private limited tea garden workers have high motivation compared to public limited tea garden workers. From the study it is seen that the public limited tea garden workers do not get any fringe benefits such as ration, firewood, medical reimbursement, EPF etc. The wage rate that is paid to the workers very low compared to their hard work. The result also shows high motivation in relation to male tea garden workers compared to female workers. The result of ANOVA depicts a significant difference between the four groups. Workplace motivation is vital in every situation involving a company, thus many motivational tactics are employed to raise staff productivity and improve results. On this basis, it promotes work motivation and performance.

When ensuring strong employee performance, the management of the tea garden should take this variable into account. Employees who are motivated are upbeat, focused, and proud of their work. They are productive, independent, and determined to achieve for both themselves and the business. The tea business faces a critical problem with motivation.

**References:**

Baumeister, R.F., & Vohs, K.D. (2004). Handbook of self-regulation: Research, theory and applications. *The Guilford Press*

Denton, K. (1987), Effective Appraisals: Key to Employee Motivation. *Industrial Engineering*, 19, 12, 24.

Dubin, R.(1970) *Human Relations in Administration*, p.53



- Gibson, F. (1980). *Managing Organisational Behaviour: Homewood II*: Irwin.
- Jucious, M.J. (1975). *Personal Management*. Irwin series of management and the behavioral sciences.(8<sup>th</sup> ed) Published by R.D. Irwin, University of Virginia. 544 pages.
- Likert.(1993) *Motivation, the core of management*, American Management association, Personnel Series, No. 155, p.16
- Lillis, J.C. (1985). *What makes Sumnry Run?* *Advanced Management Journal*, July, p.5
- Luthans, F. (1995). *Organizational Behaviour*, Mc Graw-Hill Company, New Delhi, Seventh Edition, p.203.
- Mohsan, F., Nawaz, M.M., khan, M., Shaukat, Z., & Aslam, N. (2004). *Are Employee Motivation, Commitment and Job Involvement Inter-related: Evidence from Banking Sector of Pakistan. International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 2,17,226-233.
- Mowday, R.T., Steers, R.M., &Porter, L.W. (1979). *The measurement of organizational commitment. Journal of Vocational Behavior*,14, 2, 224-247.
- Srivastava, A.K. (1988). *Employee Motivation Schedule*. Agra: National Psychological Corporation.
- Scott, W.G. (1961). *Organization Theory: An Overview and an Appraisal. The Journal of the Academy of Management*. 4(1).pp7-26. <https://doi.org/10.2307/254584>
- Steers, R.M., & Porter, L.W. (1975). *Motivation and work behavior. New York: McGraw- Hill* , McGraw-Hill series in management.
- Tella, A., Ayeni, C.O., & Popoola, S. O. (2007). *Work Motivation, Job satisfaction, and Organisational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. Library Philosophy and Practice (e-journal)*.118. <https://digitalcommons.unl.edu/libphilprac/118>
- Viteles, M. (1953). *Motivation and Moral in Industry*, W.W. Norton & Co., New York, p.73
- Vroom, V.H. (1964). *Work and motivation*, John Wiley and Sons, New York, p.99