Student Work

4-1-1995

An Exploratory Study of the Relationships Between Goal Setting and Motivation in the I\1BO Process

David Rees Watkins Jr.
University of Nebraska at Omaha

Follow this and additional works at: https://digitalcommons.unomaha.edu/studentwork

An Exploratory Study of the Relationships

Between Goal Setting and Motivation

in the MBO Proccss

A Thesis

Presented to the

Department of Communication

and the Faculty of the Graduate College

University of Nebraska

In Partial Fulfillment

of the Requirements for the Degree

Master of Arts

University of Nebraska at Omaha

By David Rees Watkins, Jr.

April 1995

THESIS ACCEPTANCE

Accepted for the faculty of the Graduate College, University of

Nebraska, in partial fulfillment of the requirements for the degree

Master of Arts, University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Committee

Name	Department
(signature)	*Communication*
(signature)	*Psychology*
(signature)	*Communication*

(signature)

Chairman

4/18/95

Date

TABLE OF CONTENTS

LIST OF TABLES

Chapter I

Introduction

Motivating employees to be successful on the job is a primary goal of most organizations. Each organization takes its own unique approach in accomplishing this task. One aspect that may have some impact on whether an employee is motivated to be productive on the job is setting specific organizational goals for individuals. Another aspect that may have an impact on an employee's motivation may be personal goal setting by individual employees.

Perhaps the most popular current goal setting process is known in most business circles as Management by Objectives (MBO). Typical of organizations that enact some form of MBO is the organization that is the focus of this present study. In the inner circles of this specific organization, this program is referred to as Management by Commitment, but for the sake of this study it will be referred to as Management by Objectives, or MBO. In the studied organization, teamwork is stressed in meeting all assigned goals. Through this program, goals are set by the superior, and the subordinate is expected to meet these assigned goals. Teamwork results from superior and subordinate, as well as other organizational members, working together to meet all organizational goals. Each individual, from the top down, is assigned certain tasks to be accomplished over a set period of time.

Goals are set on monthly, quarterly and annual time schedules. The MBO program functions as the basis of achieving all assigned organizational goals. Productivity is tracked and documented on a daily, monthly and annual basis to allow for timely completion of assigned goals. This documentation is also used as a tool for keeping the employee accountable in completion of the assigned goal.

As goals are achieved on a monthly basis, the individual is given an overall percent effective rate to show if assigned goals are being properly reached. This rate is calculated by dividing the number of goals actually achieved by the number of goals that were expected to be achieved. Each individual must show some amount of initiative to be productive in meeting these assigned goals. Therefore, enacting the MBO process keeps each employee on a productive time table.

The goal of the Management by Objective program within this organization is to attain a rate of 100% effective. Employees are encouraged to meet all assigned goals through MBO. It is *assumed* by members of this organization that employees are generally motivated to meet the goals assigned by upper level management. But is motivation related to both assigned and personal goal setting? This is the issue explored in this present study.

Following is a review of literature. The purpose of this review is to offer background and insight to Management by Objectives and to examine those factors that contribute to a successful MBO program. Goal setting, planning, motivation, and motivation theories, as well as their relationship to MBO, will all be examined.

Literature Review

Background

In today's organizations, perhaps the most popular form of goal setting is Management by Objectives (MBO). The MBO process is an attempt to establish a better vertical fit between personal and organizational goals by increasing communication and shared perceptions between superior and subordinate, either individually or as a group, and by reconciling conflict where it exists (Roebuck, 1989).

According to Roebuck (1989), a successful organization establishes goals and objectives. Most managers have goals and objectives they would like to see accomplished. Management by Objectives is an approach to merging personal and organizational goals in a systematic way. MBO can be defined as a systematic and periodic manager-subordinate meeting designed to accomplish organizational goals by mutual planning of the work, periodic review of accomplishments, and mutual solving of problems that might arise in the process of accomplishing these tasks and getting the job done. White (1991) believes that the primary purpose of the MBO process is to identify and solve problems through an organized team approach.

Callamore (1989) states that the MBO approach is one of the oldest management tactics used today, with its roots dating as far back as the mid-1920s. In April of 1989, President George Bush announced a government wide policy to enforce Management by Objectives to track progress in the meeting of other key policy priorities.

Peter Drucker is generally credited with being the "father" of MBO. His work with General Electric in the 1950's made MBO principles the core of a managerial discipline for entire organizations--a philosophy which was capable of producing results by overcoming weaknesses inherent in the structure of organizations (Collamore, 1989). MBO was developed as a combination of a three component processes: goal setting, participation in decision making, and objective feedback (Rodgers, 1991). But the backbone of any MBO program is goal setting, both personal goals and an organization's assigned goals. Following is a synopsis of goal setting and its impact on the MBO process.

Goal Setting

Humphrey (1990) believes that in any organization, achieving set goals and meeting assigned objectives are the foundation. Management today is the art of getting things done through employees, usually by the use of planning strategies. Along with the planning process comes the idea of goal setting to meet certain objectives within the organization. According to Murphy (1987), goal setting has become a preferred means of directing organizational, supervisory and individual or personal achievement. Goal setting is the foundational building block in any MBO program. The organization's objectives cannot be presumed known, obvious, and given. Rather, setting objectives is a risk taking process (Rodgers, 1991).

Murphy (1987) also states that goal setting is accomplished through the process of planning. There are four hierarchical terms which provide finer distinction to the organization and the goal setting process. First is the mission statement. The purpose of this is to establish the reason the organization exists. Second is the idea of goals, which stem from the mission statement. Goals set out the major policies and purposes of the organization and inform of things needed to be accomplished. Third are objectives for the goals which are specifically action oriented and stated mainly in quantitative terms, with deadlines assigned. Fourth are programs, strategies or activities. These are the most specific units of formal planning and list the minute details that will allow implementation of the objectives in the near future. Programs always include action steps, quantitative measures and deadlines.

According to Fry (1991), goals must state in specific terms and with a specific timetable, those things to be improved upon. For example, to improve days sales outstanding (DSO) would not be a very specific goal. If, on the other hand, the stated

objective were to reduce DSO from 25 to 21 days within the next six months, that would be a specific objective.

Fry (1991) also argues that goals must factor into every organization where achievement or improvement is important. They must always be comprehensive to be effective. In the business world, most employers would agree that for goals to be truly effective they must be written down. When written down, the message of the goal is internalized. Writing the goal down on paper crystallizes the thought into a tangible item which can be acted upon. In conjunction with a working MBO system which translates organizational goals into individual work plans, the MBO/ performance standards approach, in theory, completes the circuit of individual performance to organization's goals by assuring appropriate individual intrinsic and extrinsic rewards for achievement (Daley, 1988; Pincus,1986).

Goals may also be used as a motivating tool for employees. Motivating employees is generally accepted as the most important function of supervisors and managers. Many agree that the organization directly benefits when all who are interested in accomplishing assigned tasks meet the goals set before them, in part because goal setting is believed to be a powerful motivating force (Murphy, 1987). "As the centerpiece of day-to-day communication, goal setting increases productivity because it directs the attention and action of all of the organization's members and mobilizes overall effort" (Rodgers, 1991, p.323).

Planning

In order for goals to be of help to employees, periodic reports and plans must be made to analyze the aims of management. The motivational factor of goal achievement is an important part of any goal program. "The progress approach, which focuses on

improvement or progress made from the employee's starting point, is the most desirable

approach. With this method, everyone is recognized for their individual improvements"

(Fry, 1991, p.37). The more input an employee may have on a project, the more

committed the person will be to see the task completed and goal achieved. The

successful implementation of the MBO philosophy is dependent on the motivated

employee, and the motivation comes from the employee's commitment which stems from

having a vested interest in a job.

Commitment to achieve assigned tasks is important as well. To obtain this

commitment from their employees, managers must search for, focus on, and emphasize

the accomplishments of their workers and not their failures. Management by Objectives

centers on the people and the impact they have on their surroundings. MBO is based on

the belief that employees are compatible, willing, and eager to accomplish a task, and

deserve to operate with sufficient autonomy in their own environment. The basic

fundamentals of MBO are founded on positive rewards and it is upper management's

responsibility to recognize the individual contributions of employees and the

achievement of attaining assigned goals (Fry, 1991).

In the goal setting process, two other terms need to be examined. Strategic

Planning is basically a type of long-term planning, where an organization typically

expresses in goals and objectives where it wants to go and where it would like to be in

three to five years. Tactical Planning is a type of short term planning. Tactical Planning

is used in setting up methods of achieving the strategic plan, and lays out the actions that

will ultimately achieve the long term goals. Tactical plans are formulated on an annual

basis and are also expressed as goals and objectives (Murphy, 1987).

Many times after a great deal of planning, it may be hard to accept the idea that

the best kind of planning may result in a process of sequentially aborting plans, as a

result of continuous change or redirection. Change is constant so assigned goals should reflect the changes immediately. Some may find these constant changes upsetting to the organization and the goal achieving process, but no manager or organization can find themselves finished with the planning process. Constant revision is necessary to complete the meeting of assigned tasks over years (Murphy, 1987).

According to Rodgers and Hunter (1991), not everyone agrees that participation in the MBO process alone will increase productivity. Rogers and Hunter also argue that participation is successful only when used with goal setting. In a typically successful MBO system, goal setting and participation are combined in the same management program. Therefore if participation works only when combined with goal setting, it still has potential to contribute to the positive effect that Management by Objectives has on the productivity of the whole organization.

Communication about management goals, policies, priorities, issues, and program status can be greatly enhanced--both vertically and horizontally--by the MBO system. Where communication improves, so does coordination. The MBO system has encouraged, and even forced, coordination and cooperation among and between management and employees (Callamore, 1989). Setting goals can greatly increase communication from the top down, from management to subordinate and vice versa. Murphy (1987) would say goals that are assigned to a person by a supervisor have an effect on behavior only to the extent to which they are accepted. There are several widely recognized ways of motivating, or gaining commitment to goals. Management by Objectives is one of the most popular means of both institutional and personal goal setting. MBO is an attempt of encouraging an individual to tie his or her professional and sometimes personal goals to organizational objectives.

In many larger organizations, the top administrator sets and disseminates goals. This is typically done on an annual basis. Many of these goals are assigned to lower level managers to be accomplished in the organization. Typically, these goals are often formulated with some or all of the staff. Each individual case is different. For the best results, goals should be difficult, but achievable. They should always be very specific. The supervisor's role is to help tailor a strong, realistic, and workable plan with the employee. The supervisor should also provide needed resources and training to assure that organizational policies do not block the employee's achievement. The supervisor can also assist in setting job priorities, in specifying how performance will be measured, and in establishing a reasonable timetable (Murphy, 1987).

Murphy would also argue that goal setting is not always appropriate for all places and times. Some situations may not be appropriate for goal setting and goal setting may even be seen as counterproductive. For example, management cannot accommodate goals that involve unnecessarily high risk taking. Goals should not increase stress to an unacceptable level for some individuals, for example, by introducing new levels of standards and responsibilities and creating different duties and deadlines where none existed before. Inexperience in the planning process may result in setting unrealistically high goals for individuals to achieve. This often times can lead to frustration and failure. Another limitation might be short term vision that might result when working toward short term goals.

Callomore (1989) argues that gaining commitments within the organization to follow through with the process of quality MBO is necessary for success. To achieve success using Management by Objectives requires a level of commitment first from management. Commitment does not just mean support in the form of confirming objectives and goals but also in making sure that these goals are being met.

Commitment also means that upper management follows through on the completion of their goals and encourage subordinates to follow through on theirs. Commitment also means that the organization's managers and subordinates know that MBO is a way of life in the organization-it is how top management gets certain things done and makes certain decisions. To get these objectives completed in the organization, management must not only achieve this state of MBO but also use it.

According to Rodgers and Hunter (1991), many researchers believe that Management by Objectives must be initiated from the top down--with full participation throughout--for a program to be implemented successfully. There needs to be a high commitment from management to the program and management must also be involved in the goal setting process. In a full fledged MBO system, management is involved in the process of goal setting as well as the decision making process. Michael Farmer, author of "Pumping Profit" (1989), would agree that management as high as Chief Executive Officers should participate in the MBO process. He states that there are a number of forces lined up against the establishment of objectives but all need to participate in the commitment of obtaining goals. Without the leadership and commitment of extraordinary chief executives to the achievement of higher performance levels themselves, the efforts from lower level employees would not be as great. Everything that the organization is trying to accomplish is brought forward, debated, discussed, and, hopefully, committed to (Brown, 1989).

Glatthorn (1987) believes we need to rethink the concept of supervision. He finds it useful to substitute the term professional development for the more restrictive term supervision. Supervisors need to learn how to give feedback to subordinates on goal achievements. Roebuck (1989) feels employees like and need to know how they are

doing. They want immediate feedback on evaluations and projects. It is important to them to know how they are doing.

Performance appraisals at all levels of the organization should be an integral part of any plan of action designed to improve productivity by targeting goals. According to Fry (1991), studies suggest that for performance feedback to be effective, it must function to help the individual understand his or her progress in moving toward clearly defined goals.

Performance appraisals are an important part of every organization, but even more so in one so goal oriented by MBO. In such an environment, it is easier for an appraisal to be both objective and constructive. The performance appraisal process should be viewed as a means for counseling employees and motivating them towards improvement. "The process of Management by Objectives, coupled with the process of goal setting, provides the basis for a systematic and objective appraisal of each employee's work performance" (Fry, 1991, p.37). Supervisors should constantly check progress and there should be constant follow through to ensure the objectives and goals are being met.

While goals and the issues of accomplishing or achieving them serve as a foundation for appraising the performance of an employee, the process can be a routine of combining any number of approaches. The first approach is the achievement approach. In this style, an employee is simply evaluated on his or her level of achievement. The assigned goal is simply achieved or it is not achieved. The motivational factor of goal achievement plays an important part in any goal program. It is both frustrating and demoralizing to always fall short.

The second approach, known as the progress approach, focuses on improvement or progress made from the employee's starting point. This is the most desirable approach.

With this method, each employe is recognized for his or her own individual improvements.

The final approach is known as the comparative test. The purpose of this approach is to compare performance with other individuals performing the same task. Whatever method is used, performance appraisal is a prerequisite to any process of goal setting (Fry, 1991).

It could be assumed that for individuals to obtain goals they must have some level of motivation, either motivated or unmotivated to obtain the goal. Motivation plays a large part in the goal setting process. Following is a review of motivation and motivation theories and its impact on the individual.

Motivation

Fowler (1984) defines motivation as to stimulate interest, or a motive that causes someone to act in a particular way. Benge and Hickey (1984) argue that employee motivation is an important aspect within many organizations. Levels of productivity, morale, and quality of employee relationships are all outcomes influenced by employee motivation. Rewards may have a direct impact on the level of motivation within an employee. Maehr & Braskamp (1984) believe that perhaps the most common assumption about motivation is that some employees have it and some do not. In other words, some people have a built in personality trait which is likely to lead them to exhibit a greater or lesser effort.

People differ greatly in their expectations for rewards and their success in different jobs. Human needs are an essential part of motivation. Thus, motivation is created when one or more of our human needs are not met (Benge & Hickey, 1984; Vroom, 1964). Sonnenberg (1991) believes there are two general types of motivation:

intrinsic and extrinsic. The general distinction is simple. Either the motivation is from within the person or the motivation comes from outside the person. Motivation, job satisfaction, and the need for achievement can be positively or negatively affected by the type of rewards given for certain accomplishments.

Murphy (1987) suggests that individuals are happier, generate more creative ideas, have more team spirit, and are generally more satisfied if they set personal work goals as well as goals for the larger organization. Murphy would also argue that satisfied employees are also more productive, especially over time. Fry (1991) argues that along with achieving personal satisfaction the tenets of Management by Objectives are founded on positive rewards and it is management's responsibility to recognize the individual contributions of employees.

Several theories have been established in an attempt to explain motivation and its impact on people. Several theories look at motivation as an attempt to simply survive while other theories look at more intricate aspects of motivation. Briefly presenting these theories will increase the understanding of motivation's impact on the goal setting and MBO process.

Motivation Theories

Psychologist Abraham Maslow developed a theory of human motivation which centered on a "Hierarchy of Needs." Maslow's hierarchy implies that humans have five different types of needs. The physical needs involve such things as food, water, shelter, and sex. Safety needs include protection from physical harm, sickness, eminent danger, and economic disaster. The next level is the need for belongingness and love such as a desire for relationships with other people. The next need, esteem or ego, relates to feelings of accomplishment or recognition. Self-actualization is the last of Maslow's

hierarchy of needs. This concept is the impulse to become all that one is capable of becoming by achieving one's full potential. These needs are arranged from the most basic (physiological) to the least basic (self-actualization). The upper levels of Maslow's hierarchy are an attempt to explain why people continue to strive for excellence even as lower level needs have already been met. (Conrad, 1990)

Douglas McGregor developed the concept of two theories, X and Y. Theory X is defined in terms of management being responsible for organizing elements such as money, materials, equipment, and people. Also, management is responsible for motivating people, directing their efforts, employee control, and developing better behavior. Finally, management must reward, persuade, punish, and control the activities of employees, otherwise employees would be resistant and passive to the organization. Theory X is viewed as an autocratic type, a close style of supervision (Rosenbaum, 134). Also, organizations who use Theory X view their employees as externals. Managers feel that subordinates must be supervised as closely as possible, either through direct oversight or by rigid reward and punishment systems (Conrad, 1990).

The assumptions of Theory Y suggest that human beings are complex, creative people who will expend substantial skill and effort in constructive work if they are given the opportunity to do so (Conrad, 1990). Challenging and rewarding tasks as well as specific supervisory behaviors create these opportunities. This theory also assumes motivation, potential for development, responsibility, and preparedness toward organizational goals are present in all employees. These characteristics are not put in place by management, therefore it is up to management to ensure that employees develop these characteristics for themselves. Theory Y is viewed as democratic and participative. Overall, McGregor favored Theory Y. Research shows that supervisors do communicate with their subordinates through either Theory X or Theory Y (Rosenbaum, 1982).

Statement of Purpose

Setting goals through Management by Objectives and offering rewards for meeting or accomplishing these goals may have an impact on an individual's overall performance and productivity on the job. It is assumed that, when goals are set and people are challenged to meet these assigned goals, productivity, morale and quality of employee relationships are increased (Murphy, 1987).

Through past research, it is evident that goal setting is the fundamental process in any MBO program. Often times, goals are set by higher levels of management and given to lower levels of management to obtain. In an organization, the MBO process is also an accountability tool used to encourage management to achieve or meet their assigned goals. Communication plays a major role in setting these goals and may also have an impact on motivating these managers to achieve goals assigned by their superiors.

Management by Objectives, or setting goals, and communication amongst members of the management team go hand in hand in many organizations. When goals are set by those in the upper echelon of management, are lower level managers as motivated to meet these assigned goals than they would be having had the opportunity to set their own personal work goals?

The question that needs to be answered is: When goals are set by management, are lower level managers motivated to accomplish them? No tools, surveys, or questionnaires that can accurately answer this question have been found in the literature. Through my personal studies, I have also found no tool to accurately measure the elements of both personal and assigned goal setting and the elements of motivation and their impact on each other. There have been no tools developed that accurately measure the relationships these factors share with each other

The overall purpose of this research is to measure the relationships that personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation share. This study's four specific research questions relating to goal setting and motivation are:

1. Can a valid and reliable questionnaire be developed to measure personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation?

2. Is there a relationship between motivation and personal goal setting for managers in a company enacting the MBO process?

3. Is there a relationship between motivation and assigned goal setting for managers in a company enacting the MBO process?

4. For managers in a company enacting the MBO process, do personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation differ in relation to age, work department, length of time with the organization, length of time in management, and level of management?

Chapter II

Methodology

Measurement of Personal Goal Setting, Assigned Goal Setting and Motivation

Because no single instrument was in existence that measured goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation among employees in a business organization, selected elements of the Downs-Hazen Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire (Downs and Hazen, 1977), the Nevotti, Olsen and Stevenson's Employee Attitude Questionnaire (Nevotti, Olsen and Stevenson, 1969) and Philip C. Grant's Effort-Net Return Model of Motivation (Grant, 1981) questionnaire were adjusted and combined in a single questionnaire.

The Downs-Hazen Communication Satisfaction Questionnaire, Nevotti, Olsen and Stevenson's Employee Attitude Questionnaire, and Philip C. Grant's Effort-Net Return Model of Motivation were examined thoroughly with the intent of finding those questions that specifically addressed the topics of assigned goal setting, personal goal setting, and motivation.

Questions that dealt directly with personal and assigned goal setting, as well as motivation, were selected and re-worded in a Likert style format. The finalized questionnaire used in this research (see Appendix A) contains 30 Likert type scale items (10 each intended to measure personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation) and five demographic questions.

Subjects and Settings

To help members of the subject organization better understand what was being studied, the acronym MBO was changed to MBC. Members of this organization refer to the goal setting process commonly labeled Management by Objectives (MBO) as Management by Commitment (MBC).

The subjects used in this study were all levels of a management team, both part-time and full-time in employment status. These managers are all employed by an international package delivery service in a metropolitan area of a midwestern state. Approximately 125 managers were surveyed for this study. Subjects included various management members from several departments from within the company. Managers employed in Human Resources, Customer Service, Accounting and Finance, Engineering, Information Services, Operations, and any other departments had the option of participating in this study. The goal of this research was to have a 100% return rate on the assigned survey distributed.

Questionnaires (see Appendix A), with cover letters (see Appendix B), were distributed to all participating volunteers. These surveys were distributed to the volunteers either through the company's house mail system or by hand.

Procedures

The District Manager of the company agreed to have questionnaires distributed to the managers. The in-house management mailing list was provided by the company's Human Resources Department. This list contained names and locations of all managers within the organization. The only restriction placed on the researcher was the agreement that the actual title of the corporation would not be used in reporting results of the research. Volunteers were asked to anonymously complete and return the survey to a given house-mail address within one week of receiving it.

Chapter III

Results

Of the 125 questionnaires distributed, 81 were returned and usable for analysis. Only one questionnaire had a single question that was not answered. The other 80 were answered completely. The number and percentages of responses to the five demographic questions are shown in Table I.

Questionnaire Means, Standard Deviations, and Response Distribution

Questions 1-10 were intended to measure personal goal setting, questions 11-20 assigned goal setting, and questions 21-30 motivation. These questions were presented to respondents in a Likert style format with 1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neutral, 4 = Agree, and 5 = Strongly Agree. The means, standard deviations, and item response distributions for questions 1-30 are shown below in Table II.

Factor Analyses

A factor analysis was performed on each set of 10 questions. For each analysis, the subject:item ratio was 8:1. When questions 1-10 were factor analyzed by themselves, four factors emerged (eignvalue >1.0). When questions 11-20 were factor analyzed by themselves, three factors emerged, the same number of factors that were obtained from questions 21-30 by themselves (eigenvalue >1.0).

The individual factors that emerged from the three analyses are shown in Tables III, IV and V. Factor matrices and eigenvalues with percent of variance are contained in Appendix C.

Table I
Demographic Description for Respondents

Demographic Category	Respondent Total	% of Total Respondent Population
Current Age		
25 or Less	5	6.2
26-35 Years Old	32	39.5
36-45 Years Old	28	34.6
46-55 Years Old	15	18.5
56 or Older	1	1.2
Total	81	100
Assigned Department		
Operations	30	37.0
Accounting & Finance	7	8.6
Engineering	10	12.3
Human Resources	12	14.8
Customer Service	10	12.3
Information Services	5	6.2
Other	7	8.6
Total	81	100
Length of Service		
Less than 5 Years	9	11.1
6-10 Years	19	34.6
11-15 Years	22	27.2
16 -20 Years	17	21.0
21 - 25 Years	10	12.3
More than 25 Years	4	4.9
Total	81	100
Years In Management		
Less than 5 years	19	23.5
6 - 10 Years	35	43.2
11 - 15 Years	12	14.8
21 - 25 Years	12	14.8
More than 25 Years	3	3.7
Total	81	100
Job Description		
Division Manager or Above	14	17.3
Center Manager or Equivalent	19	43.2
Lower Level Manager	31	38.3
Part-time Supervisor	17	21.0
Total	81	100

Table II
Means, Standard Deviations, and Response Distributions for Personal Goal Setting, Assigned Goal Setting, and Motivation Questions

Personal Goal Setting	Mean	SD
Q1. The opportunity to set personal work goals is important to me.	4.407	.755
Q2. I set my own personal work goals.	4.099	.768
Q3. My job allows me the opportunity to set my own personal work goals.	3.790	.786
Q4. I feel better about myself when I reach my personal goals.	4.617	.538
Q5. I often fail to meet my personal work goals.	2.247	.845
Q6 When setting my personal work goals, I keep them to myself and tell no one.	2.469	1.073
Q7. My personal work goals involve making more money in the future.	4.111	1.012
Q8. Meeting all work deadlines is a personal goal of mine.	4.333	.707
Q9.My expectations of my personal work goals tend to be unrealistic.	2.790	1.148
Q10. My boss encourages me to set some personal goals.	3.360	1.089

Frequencies

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q1.	1	1	4	33	42
Q2.	0	2	14	39	26
Q3.	0	5	20	43	13
Q4.	0	0	2	27	52
Q5.	10	50	14	5	2
Q6.	13	36	17	11	4
Q7.	1	8	7	30	35
Q8.	0	3	2	41	35
Q9.	12	23	20	22	4
Q10.	6	7	11	44	13

Table II (Con't)

Assigned Goal Setting	Mean	SD
Q11. My assigned work goals are unrealistic.	2.543	.949
Q12. My assigned work goals are challenging.	4.062	.578
Q13. I am committed to obtaining all company goals.	4.198	.765
Q14. Many of my work goals conflict.	2.901	1.044
Q15. Rarely am I informed of my company goals.	2.741	1.034
Q16. Meeting assigned goals makes me feel valuable to the company.	4.210	.702
Q17. I am frequently informed of my company goals.	3.815	.792
Q18. Meeting my assigned goals requires too much time.	2.728	.975
Q19. I get recognized when I reach my assigned goals.	2.963	.968
Q20. I document my assigned goals on paper as I reach them.	3.321	1.138

Frequencies

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q11.	7	39	22	10	3
Q12.	0	1	8	57	15
Q13.	1	1	8	42	29
Q14.	2	34	23	14	8
Q15.	4	39	17	16	5
Q16.	1	1	4	49	26
Q17.	0	6	16	46	13
Q18.	2	40	23	10	6
Q19.	4	23	30	20	4
Q20.	5	17	17	31	11

Table II (Con't)

Motivation	Mean	SD
Q21. My job motivates me to perform well.	3.790	.945
Q22. Because of possible pay raises, I am motivated to produce more than required.	3.444	1.151
Q23. I enjoy being challenged on the job.	4.407	.648
Q24. I often come to work with little motivation to perform my best.	1.951	.986
Q25. Because of a lack of interest in my job, I am not motivated.	1.728	.775
Q26. My job is redundant and therefore it is not motivating to me.	1.840	.843
Q27. My job is boring and therefore I am not motivated to perform.	1.704	.766
Q28. I am motivated to work harder because I want to be promoted.	3.638	1.139
Q29. My boss says things that motivate me to perform at a higher level.	3.338	1.030
Q30. I am motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks.	2,375	1.162

Frequencies

	Strongly Disagree	Disagree	Neutral	Agree	Strongly Agree
Q21.	2	8	10	46	15
Q22.	5	13	19	29	15
Q23.	0	1	4	37	39
Q24.	29	37	7	6	2
Q25.	34	39	4	4	0
Q26.	31	37	8	5	0
Q27.	35	39	3	4	0
Q28.	4	10	17	29	21
Q29.	4	12	26	29	10
Q30.	19	33	11	13	5

Factor structures were not clear because many items loaded on more than one factor and other items did not load on any factor. Tables III, IV and V show item loadings, eigenvalues, and percentage of variance from the factor analyses with varimax rotation for questions 1-10, 11-20, and 21-30.

Factor analyses with oblimin rotation were also performed but the results were similar to the factor analyses with varimax rotation. When questions 1-10 were factor analyzed by themselves, four factors emerged. Factor analyzing questions 11-20 and questions 21-30 each resulted in three factors. Factor structures were not as clear as anticipated.

Since this was a preliminary study and a clear factor structure did not emerge, it was decided to simply calculate scores for personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation by summing the 10 items that were intended to measure each (items 1-10 for personal goal setting, 11-20 for assigned goal setting, and 21-30 for motivation). Scale reliabilities (Cronbach's alpha) were: personal goal setting, alpha = .15; assigned goal setting, alpha = .72; and motivation, alpha = .79. Analysis of item to total correlations revealed that for personal goal setting, if item 6 was removed, the scale reliability increased to .40; removal of additional items failed to significantly increase the overall reliability.

Although the reliability of the personal goal setting scale (referred to as PGS and containing items 1-5 and 7-10) was extremely low, and the reliabilities of the assigned goal setting scale (referred to as AGS and containing items 11-20) and the motivation scale (referred to as MOT and containing items 21-30) were marginally acceptable, it was decided to use these three scales to explore for possible differences based on demographic responses. In addition, the individual questionnaire items were each examined in analyses of differences based on demographics.

Table III

Factor Analysis Personal Goal Setting Questions

Question #   **Factor Loadings**

Factor 1
Questions 1-10

RECOGNITION

Q7. My personal work goals involve making more money in the future.	.75
Q6. When setting my personal work goals, I keep them to myself and tell no one.	-.66
Q8. Meeting all work deadlines is a personal goal of mine.	.55
Q1. The opportunity to set personal work goals is important to me.	.51

Factor 2
Questions 1-10

INDEPENDENCE

Q3. My job allows me the opportunity to set my own personal work goals.	.82
Q2. I set my own personal work goals.	.72
Q10. My boss encourages me to set some personal goals.	.60

Factor 3
Questions 1-10

FAILURE

Q5. I often fail to meet my personal work goals.	.84
Q9. My expectations of my personal work goals tend to be unrealistic.	.64
Q7. My personal work goals involve making more money in the future.	.37
Q1. The opportunity to set personal work goals is important to me.	-.34

Table III (Con't)

Personal Goal Setting

Question #	Factor Loadings
Factor 4	
Questions 1-10	

SATISFACTION

Q4. I feel better about myself when I reach my personal goals.   .76

Q10. My boss encourages me to set some personal goals.   .45

Q2. I set my own personal work goals.   -.42

Q9. My expectations of my personal goals tend to be unrealistic.   .33

Q1. The opportunity to set personal work goals is important to me.   .30

Table IV

Factor Analysis Assigned Goal Setting Questions

Question #   **Factor Loadings**
Factor 5
Questions 11-20

PERSONAL VALUE

Q12. My assigned work goals are challenging.   .78

Q13. I am committed to obtaining all company goals.   .74

Q16. Meeting assigned goals makes me feel valuable to the company.   .68

Q17. I am frequently informed of my companies goals.   .48

Factor 6
Questions 11-20

DEMANDS

Q14. Many of my work goals conflict.   .77

Q11. My assigned work goals are unrealistic.   .74

Q18. Meeting my assigned goals requires too much time.   .69

Q12. My assigned work goals are challenging.   -.36

Factor 7
Questions 11-20

FEEDBACK

Q19. I get recognized when I reach my assigned goals.   .74

Q15. Rarely am I informed on my performance of obtaining company goals.   -.74

Q17. I am frequently informed of my companies goals.   .54

Q20. I document my assigned goals on paper as I reach them.   .52

Q18. Meeting my assigned goals requires too much time.   -.31

Table V

Factor Analysis Motivation Questions

Question #	Factor Loadings
Factor 8	
Questions 21-30	

APATHY

Q24. I often come to work with little motivation to perform my best.	.88
Q25. Because of a lack of interest in my job, I am not motivated.	.80
Q27. My job is boring and therefore I am not motivated to perform.	.63
Q26. My job is redundant and therefore it is not motivating to me.	.57
Q30. I am motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks.	.55
Q21. My job motivates me to perform well.	-.37
Q29. My boss says things that motivate me to perform at a higher level.	-.36

Factor 9
Questions 21-30

REWARDS

Q22. Because of possible pay raises, I am motivated to produce more than required.	.84
Q21. My job motivates me to perform well.	.68
Q26. My job is redundant and therefore it is not motivating to me.	-.62
Q27. My job is boring and therefore I am not motivated to perform.	-.58
Q29. My boss says things that motivate me to perform at a higher level.	.50
Q23. I enjoy being challenged on the job.	-.30

Table V (Con't)

Motivation

Question #	Factor Loadings
Factor 10	
Questions 21-30	

RECOGNITION

Q28. I am motivated to work harder because I want to be promoted.   .86

Q30. I am motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks.   .54

Q23. I enjoy being challenged on the job.   .52

Question Differences Related to Demographics

Demographic question 31 (age) had subject groups combined prior to data analysis to better balance the number in each group. Those older than 56 years of age were added to those between the age of 46-55, to form a single group of 18 subjects, or 22 percent of the 81 respondents who answered the surveys.

Demographic question 34 (number of years in management) also had subject groups combined prior to the data analysis to better balance the number in each group. Those in management for more than 25 years were grouped with those members in management between 21 and 25 years. This group together combined to total 15 subjects, accounting for 19% of the total 81 respondents.

Pearson Correlation Coefficient tests were performed to determine if the scales (PGS, AGS, and MOT) were related. Table VI shows these results.

TABLE VI

Pearson Correlation Coefficients - PGS, AGS, MOT

	PGS	AGS	MOT
PGS	1.000	.5437**	.4573**
AGS	.5437**	1.000	.6006**
MOT	.4573**	.6006**	1.000

**Significance LE. .01

One-Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were performed on the five

demographic questions (age, working department, years of service, years in management,

and level of management) in relation to each scale: PGS, AGS, and MOT. In cases

where p< .05, Student-Newman-Keuls multiple comparison tests were run to identify

significant differences between groups. Out of 15 possible differences, there were four

instances of significant difference between scales and groups. Table VII shows which

groups had significant differences based on demographic responses.

TABLE VII
Significant Relationships
One-Way Analysis of Variance and Newman-Keuls Procedure
Demographics vs. PGS, AGS, MOT

Scale	Demographic Question	F Ratio	Level of Significance	Significant Difference Between Groups
AGS	Q32	2.57	.0253	(6) (1, 4, 2)
PGS	Q33.	3.49	.0068	(6) (2, 4, 5, 3, 1)
AGS	Q35	3.21	.0275	(1) (4, 3)
MOT	Q35	4.65	.0049	(4) (3, 2, 1)

Generalized groupings based on Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. Groups within same parentheses do not differ from each other (p < .05). These separated by parentheses show significant differences.

(PGS (Q1-10) =Personal Goal Setting) (AGS (Q11-20) =Assigned Goal Setting) (MOT (Q21-30) =Motivation)

Q32. The department I work in is: 1) Operations, 2) Accounting and Finance, 3) Engineering , 4) Human Resources, 5) Customer Service, 6) Information Systems, 7) Other

Q33. I have ben with this company 1) Less than 5 years, 2) Between 6 and ten years, 3) Between 11 and 15 years, 4) Between 16 and 20 years, 5) Between 21 and 25 years, 5) More than 25 years.

Q35. Which description best describes your job position: 1) division manager and above, 2) Center manager or equivalent, 3) Lower level management, 4) Part-time supervisor.

One-Way Analyses of Variance were also performed on the 30 individual questions of the survey to identify significant differences among individual employee groups in each of the five demographic areas. In cases where $p < .05$, Student-Newman-Keuls multiple comparison tests were made on the means of each group within that demographic area to determine specific differences. Tables VIII, IX, X, XI, and XII show the questions for which differences ($p < .05$) were found based on the demographic variables.

Since multiple analyses of variance resulted from this procedure and several could be expected to show significance at $p < .05$ simply due to chance, it was decided to follow the Bonferroni convention to lower the acceptable probability level. The traditional probability level (.05) was divided by the number of items (30) resulting in a probability level of .0017.

Differences that met this stricter criteria ($p < .0017$) are starred (*) and explored in the discussion; other significant differences ($.05 > p > .0017$) are simply noted here.

Table VIII
Significant Relationships
One-Way Analysis of Variance and Newman-Keuls Procedure
Question 31 (Age)

Question	F Ratio	Level of Significance	Significant Difference Between Groups*
Q2.	3.78	.0138	(1) (2,3,4)
Q8.	2.80	.0452	(3) (4)
Q28.	3.07	.0324	(2) (4)

*Group 1 = 25 yrs. old and under, Group 2 = 26-35 yrs. old, Group 3 = 36-45 yrs. old, Group 4 = 46+ yrs. old.

Generalized groupings based on Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. Groups within same parentheses do not differ from each other ($p < .05$). Those separated by parentheses show significant differences.

Q2. The opportunity to set personal work goals is important to me.
Q8. Meeting all work deadlines is a personal goal of mine.
Q28. I am motivated to work harder because I want to be promoted.

TABLE IX
Significant Relationships
One-Way Analysis of Variance and Newman-Keuls Procedure
Question 32 (Department)

Question	F Ratio	Level of Significance	Significant Difference Between Groups*
Q13.	2.51	.0286	(4) (6)

*Group 1 = Operations, Group 2 = Accounting and Finance, Group 3 = Engineering, Group 4 = Human Resources, Group 5 = Customer Service, Group 6 = Information Systems, Group 7 = Other

Generalized groupings based on Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. Groups within same parentheses do not differ from each other ($p < .05$). Those separated by parentheses show significant differences.

Q13. I am committed to obtaining all company goals.

TABLE X
Significant Relationships
One-Way Analysis of Variance and Newman-Keuls Procedure
Question 33 (Length of Service)

Question	F Ratio	Level of Significance	Significant Difference Between Groups*
Q8.	3.63	.0309	(4) (3)
Q28.	4.62	.0127	(4) (2)

*Group 1 = < 5 yrs., Group 2 = 6-10 yrs., Group 3 = 11-15 yrs., Group 4 = 16-20 yrs., Group 5 = 21-25 yrs., Group 6 = 25+ yrs.

Generalized groupings based on Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. Groups within same parentheses do not differ from each other (p< .05). Those separated by parentheses show significant differences.

Q8. Meeting all work deadlines is a personal goal of mine.
Q28. I am motivated to work harder because I want o be promoted.

TABLE XI
Significant Relationships
One-Way Analysis of Variance and Newman-Keuls Procedure
Question 34 (Years in Management)

Question	F Ratio	Level of Significance	Significant Difference Between Groups*
Q28.	6.18	.0008*	(4) (2,1,3)
Q30.	8.52	.0001*	(2) (1,3)
			(4) (1,3)

*Group 1 = < 5 yrs., Group 2 = 6-10 yrs., Group 3 = 11-15 yrs., Group 4 = 16-20 yrs., Group 5 = 25+ yrs.

Generalized groupings based on Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. Groups within same parentheses do not differ from each other (p< .05). Those separated by parentheses show significant differences.

Q28. I am motivated to work harder because I want o be promoted.
Q30. I am motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks.

TABLE XII
Significant Relationships
One-Way Analysis of Variance and Newman-Keuls Procedure
Question 35 (Management Level)

Question	F Ratio	Level of Significance	Significant Difference Between Groups*
Q15.	3.38	.0224	(1) (4)
Q17.	4.02	.0103	(3) (2,1)
Q19.	3.25	.0260	(4) (1)
Q21.	3.85	.0126	(4) (3,2,1)
Q22.	2.73	.0491	(4) (2,3)
Q25.	3.50	.0192	(4) (1,2)
Q26.	4.92	.0035	(1) (2,3,4)
Q27.	6.20	.0008*	(1) (3,4) (2) (4)

Group 1 = Division Manager and above, Group2 = Center Manager and equivalent,
Group 3 = Lower-level Manager, group 4 = Part-time supervisor.

Generalized groupings based on Student-Newman-Keuls procedure. Groups within same parentheses do not differ from each other (p< .05). Those groups separated by parentheses show significant differences.

Q15. Rarely am I informed on my performance of obtaining company goals.
Q17. I am frequently informed of my company goals.
Q19. I get recognized when I reach my assigned goals.
Q21. My job motivates me to perform well.
Q22. Because of possible pay raises, I am motivated to produce more than required.
Q25. Because of a lack of interest in my job, I am not motivated.
Q26. My job is redundant and therefore it is not motivating to me.
Q27. My job is boring and therefore I am not motivated to perform.

Chapter IV
Discussion

Motivation and its relationship to assigned goal setting and personal goal setting in a corporation such as the one in this study is very intricate and complex. The network of dimensions which come together to create motivation, as goals are set both by the individual and the supervisor, may often have an impact on how members of the organization perceive their present and their future state within the organization. This study attempts to look at the relationships between motivation, assigned goal setting and personal goal setting within an organization, as well as attempt to find a tool to measure elements shared between the three.

Demographics

Of the 81 survey respondent population, 75 fell between the ages of 26 to 55. Five of those surveyed were 25 years old and younger. Only 1 manager was older than 55 years old.

Operations accounted for 30 of the managers surveyed, equalling 37 percent of the respondent total. Twelve respondents were from Human Resources, accounting for 14.8 percent of those surveyed. Ten each were from both Engineering and Customer Service departments, accounting for 10.3 percent respectively. Seven respondents each came from Accounting & Finance and Other areas, accounting for 8.6 percent of the respondent total, respectively, and five respondents were from Information Systems, accounting for 6.2 percent of the respondent total.

Most of the managers surveyed had been with the company between 6 and 25 years. These managers accounted or 86 percent of the total respondent population. Eleven percent were with the company less than five years, and four percent have been with the company for more than 25 years.

Forty-three percent of those surveyed have been a member of management for six to ten years. These managers account for 43 percent of the respondent total. Nineteen individuals, or 24 percent, have been in management for less than five years. Twelve respondents represent both those who have been in management between 11 and 15 years and 15 to 20 years, accounting for 15 percent respectively. Only three of the 81 respondents have been in management for more than 25 years.

Lower-level managers accounted for the highest percentage of all job descriptions. Lower-level managers accounted for 38 percent of the respondent total, with 31 of the 81 respondents falling into this category. Center Managers accounted for 24 percent of the total managers, with 19 respondents falling into this category. Part-time supervisors accounted for 21 percent, with 17 respondents and division managers had 14 respondents accounting for 17 percent of the entire population.

Personal Goal Setting

Several other key findings resulted from this survey. It was found that having the opportunity to set personal work goals is important to managers within this organization. Of the 81 respondents, 75, or 91 percent, felt that the opportunity to set personal work goals was important. A mean of 4.40 on question 1 indicates that managers want the opportunity to set some of their own personal goals.

In addition, managers feel much better about themselves when they achieve their personal goals. Question 4 is also skewed highly on the agree/strongly agree side of the scale. A mean of 3.79 was found on this question and there were no respondents who disagreed or strongly disagreed with this question. From this, it appears that managers within this organization want to set their own personal work goals and also feel good about themselves when they accomplish these personally assigned tasks.

Of the 81 managers, 65, or 80 percent of the respondents, actually do set some of their own personal work goals. Seventeen percent of the respondent population responded neutral to the question of actually setting personal work goals, and 2 percent of the surveyed population stated they did not set their own personal work goals.

Of the 81 respondents, 75 said that their jobs allowed them the opportunity to set their own personal work goals. From the responses to the first three questions, it is concluded that when the opportunity is given to set goals, these managers generally do so. When managers set their own personal work goals and accomplished the tasks, they reported feeling much better about themselves. Ninety-eight percent of the survey respondents said that they felt better about themselves when they attained their own personal goals. The other two percent were neutral in their response to their feelings of self gratification when they met their own personal work goals.

When these goals were set, 75 percent of the respondents actually completed and obtained their own personal work goals. Seventeen percent of those surveyed were neutral in their response and the remaining eight percent felt that they did not meet their own personal work goals.

When setting personal work goals, 60 percent of the managers would express their goals to others. They would share their goals with other managers within the organization. Twenty-one percent of the respondent total were neutral in their response to whether or not they would tell others of their goals. The other 19 percent of the managers tend to keep their personal goals a personal matter and tell no one. From this study, the conclusion can be drawn that managers within this organization have personal work goals but generally do not keep them personal in nature.

Generally speaking, managers within this organization seem to have a personal work goal of making more money in the future. Eighty percent of the respondent

population felt that making money was a personal goal of theirs. Eight percent of the 81 surveyed were indifferent in their desires to make more money as a personal goal. The remaining 11 percent felt as though making more money was not one of their personal goals.

As well as making more money, these managers felt that meeting all work goals in a timely manner was critical. Of those surveyed, 94 percent felt that meeting all work deadlines was a personal goal of theirs. Being timely in their work is of great importance to these managers. Only four percent of those surveyed felt as though timeliness in their deadlines was not a priority.

Question 9 received mix responses. A mean of 2.79 was scored on the expectation of managers within the organization. Several managers felt that their personal work goals were unrealistic and they expected too much of themselves. Those who leaned towards the disagreement side of this question were similar in number. Twenty-five percent of the respondents were neutral in their response to their own personal expectation in meeting their personal work goals. Forty-three percent of the respondents felt that their goals were realistic and their personal expectations of themselves were not too high.

The majority of those surveyed stated that their boss encouraged them to set some personal work goals. Of the 81 respondents 59, or 70 percent said that their boss encouraged them to set some personal work goals. Sixteen percent of the respondents stated that their boss did not encourage them to set some personal work goals.

In summary, examination of the response distributions and means for the 10 questions regarding personal goal setting lends to the following conclusions:

(a) Managers want the opportunity to set personal work goals.

(b) When given the opportunity to set personal goals managers generally take

advantage of the opportunity.

(c) Managers within this organization feel that their job gives them the opportunity to set some personal goals.

(d) Managers feel better about themselves when they set these goals and meet them.

(e) Managers are timely in their meeting of their assigned goals.

(f) Making more money in the future is a goal of most managers in this organization.

(g) Having the opportunity to set personal work goals is encouraged by the majority of these manager's superiors.

Assigned Goal Setting

Examination of the response distribution and means also gives us some valuable information regarding assigned goal setting amongst management members within this organization. Assigned work goals differ from that of personal work goals in that upper management sets goals for lower levels of management.

When asked if the managers assigned work goals were unrealistic, a mixed response was given. Fifty-seven percent of the 81 respondents felt that their assigned work goals were unrealistic. Only 16 percent of the respondent population felt that their assigned work goals were realistic. Twenty-seven percent of the surveyed population were neutral in their response to the reality of their assigned work goals.

When asked whether management's assigned goals were challenging, an overwhelming response felt that this was the case. Of the 81 managers surveyed, 72, or 89 percent, felt that they were challenged by their assigned goals. Only one respondent felt that his or her assigned goals were not challenging..

Even though many managers felt their assigned goals were unrealistic and most felt they were challenging, the managers were still committed to obtaining all company goals. Seventy-seven of the 81 respondent population, or 95 percent, stated they were committed to obtaining their company goals. Only two percent were not committed to obtaining all company goals.

A mixed response was found when asked if assigned work goals conflict with each other. Question 14 showed a mean of 2.90. The response to this question may have a direct link with question 15. When asked if managers are informed on their progress of company goals, a neutral response (mean = 2.74) was also given. Perhaps a lack of feedback by one's supervisor may have a direct impact on how a manager views the clarity of the goal. Generally speaking, management members were seldom informed on their performance of obtaining company goals. Slightly under 50 percent felt they were informed on their performance of meeting these company goals.

From this study, it was found that managers want to accomplish all company goals and feel good about themselves when they accomplish them. Of the 81 respondents, 75 stated that they felt valuable to the company when they accomplished their company's goals. Two percent did not feel valuable to the company when goals were met and four respondents were indifferent.

Managers within this organization felt they were frequently informed of their company goals. Seventy-three percent of those surveyed were informed of their companies goals. Six respondents felt that they were not informed of their company goals.

As well as perceiving assigned goals as being challenging and at times unrealistic, many managers felt that achieving their assigned company goals required too much time. Fifty-two percent of those surveyed felt that accomplishing their company goals was too

time consuming. Twenty percent of the respondent population felt that time was not a factor when it came to meeting assigned goals. Recognition for obtaining company goals drew a neutral response. A mean of 2.93 was found when managers were asked if they were recognized when they reached their assigned goals. Approximately one-half of those surveyed felt that they were recognized and the other half felt they were not.

As part of the MBO process, members of this management team were required to document assigned goals on paper. Finding improvement in the accomplishment of these assigned goals is the basis of the MBO program. Responses to question 20 (mean = 3.32) indicate the majority of managers surveyed document their assigned goals as they obtain them. Fifty-two percent of those surveyed do document on paper accomplished assigned goals.

In summary, examination of the response distribution and means for the 10 questions regarding personal goal setting, lends to the following conclusions being drawn:

(a) Managers tend to feel that their assigned goals are unrealistic.

(b) Managers tend to feel that their assigned goals are challenging.

(c) Though unrealistic and challenging, members of this organization's management team are committed to obtaining assigned company goals. Though committed to meeting assigned goals, managers generally felt that their assigned goals required too much time.

(d) Management was neutral in response to the question of assigned goals conflicting with one another.

(e) Managers were frequently informed on their performance of meeting assigned goals.

(f) When members of management meet their assigned goals they felt valuable to

the company.

(g) Managers are informed of what their company goals are.

(h) Roughly half of all manager get recognized when they reach their company goals and actually document them on paper as they reach them.

Motivation

The thrust of this study was to find a relationship between motivation and both personal and assigned goals setting. If managers set their own personal goals or have members of upper management set goals for them, are they motivated to meet them? How does motivation affect the performance of accomplishing both personal and assigned tasks? The following results were found from the 10 questions relating to motivation.

A mean of 3.79 was found when managers were asked if they were motivated by their job. Fifty-one of the 81 respondents agreed that their job motivates them to perform well. Only 12 percent of the respondent population were not motivated to perform well in their job. The other 12 percent of the respondent population were neutral in their feelings.

Money was a motivator to over one-half of the managers surveyed. Fifty-three percent of those surveyed were motivated to produce more than required because of possible pay raises. Twenty-two percent of those surveyed would not produce more than required because of money, and 23 percent were neutral in their response to money and its motivation factors.

An overwhelming positive response to question 23 was found (mean = 4.40). Of the 81 respondents, 76 enjoyed being challenged on the job. Only six percent of the respondent population did not enjoy being challenged.

In similar manner, the majority of managers in this organization come to work motivated to perform their best. Eighty-one percent of the respondent population report coming to work motivated to perform their best. Roughly 10 percent of those surveyed felt unmotivated to perform their best at work. The managers within this organization also tend to feel that their jobs are interesting, which in turn creates a sense of motivation. Ninety percent of those surveyed had an interest in their jobs. Five percent are not interested in their jobs.

A similar response was found when managers were asked if their jobs were redundant and therefore not motivating. Eighty-four percent of those surveyed felt their jobs were not redundant. Because of a limited amount of redundancy, managers tend to be motivated to perform on the job. Once again, five percent of the respondent total felt that their jobs were redundant. When asked if managers felt that their jobs were boring, the same results were found. Ninety-one percent of the total survey felt that their jobs were not boring; five percent felt that their jobs were boring.

Generally speaking, money seems to be a motivator amongst mangers within this organization. Fifty percent of the managers surveyed felt motivated to work harder because they want to be promoted. Twenty-two percent are not motivated because of promotions and 38 percent are indifferent to this factor.

Twenty percent of those studied felt their bosses do not say things to motivate them to perform at a higher level. Forty-eight percent of those surveyed felt their bosses are a factor in their motivation to perform at a higher level. Sixty-five percent of the respondent population were motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks. Twenty-two percent of those surveyed felt that proving co-workers wrong is not important to them on the job.

In summary, examination of the response distribution and means for the 10 questions regarding personal goal setting, leads to the following conclusions being drawn:

(a) These managers are motivated to perform well on the job.

(b) Pay raises are a motivating factor.

(c) Managers within this organization enjoy being challenged on the job.

(d) Generally speaking, managers come to work motivated.

(e) Managers are interested in their jobs and felt that their jobs are neither

redundant nor boring. Therefore, they are motivated to perform

on the job.

(f) Promotions motivate managers to work harder.

(g) One's boss says things to motivate the managers in this organization roughly

50 percent of the time.

(h) Managers are motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks.

Factor Analysis

It was hoped that each set of 10 questions, 10 relating to personal goal setting, 10 relating to assigned goal setting, and 10 relating to motivation, would show a distinct factor. Factor analyzing each set of ten questions proved that more than one factor was present in each. Questions 1 - 10 (PGS) proved to have loadings on four separate factors. Factor 1 (Recognition) had 20.4 percent of the variance, Factor 2 (Independence) - 14.7 percent of the variance, Factor 3 (Failure) - 13.2 percent of the variance, and Factor 4 (Satisfaction) - 11.4 percent of the variance.

Questions 11-10 (AGS) had three distinct factors. Factor 1 (Personal Value) had 29.3 percent of the variance, Factor 2 (Demands) - 14.7 percent of the variance, and Factor 3 (Feedback) - 12.9 percent of the variance.

Questions 21-30 (MOT) also consisted of three factors. Factor 1 (Apathy) had 41.4 percent of the variance, Factor 2 (Rewards) - 14.2 percent of the variance, and Factor 3 (Recognition) - 11.1 percent of the variance.

Each of the three intended single factor scales actually had multiple factors. To isolate these factors and construct an acceptable factor scoring system would require revision of the questionnaire and addition testing which was beyond the scope of this thesis. Thus, the decision was made to treat each of the three scales as initially intended, i.e. as a unified scale.

PGS, AGS, and MOT Differences and Relationships

Reliability tests were performed to determine if each scale (PGS, AGS, and MOT) was accurate in measuring personal goal setting, assigned goal setting and motivation. Personal goal setting proved to be unreliable (Cronbach's alpha = .15). When question 6 was removed from the PGS instrument, the scale reliability increased to .40. Removing other items from this instrument failed to significantly increase the overall reliability.

The AGS scale proved to be a much more reliable scale (Cronbach's alpha = .72). Removing select items did not significantly increase the overall reliability of this instrument. The MOT scale also proved to be more reliable (Cronbach's alpha = .79). Much like the AGS scale, removing select items from the MOT scale did not significantly increase the overall reliability of the instrument. Because these scales

scored over .70 (Cronbach's alpha), these scales have minimum acceptable reliability for measuring assigned goal setting and motivation.

Relationships between PGS, AGS, and MOT scales were examined. All three scales had significant (p < .01) relationships with one another. Correlations were: AGS and MOT, r = .60; AGS and PGS, r = .54; and PGS and MOT, r = .45.

One-Way Analyses of Variance were performed to determine significant differences in PGS, AGS, and MOT scores based on the five demographic questions (age, working department, years of service, years in management, and position). Four significant differences were discovered.

Question 32, department worked, showed significant differences between Information Systems and Accounting/Finance, Human Resources, and Operations in respect to assigned goal setting (AGS). Those managers in Information Systems tend to be less active in the assigned goal setting process (mean = 27.00) than those in Accounting/Finance (mean = 35.00), Human Resources (mean = 34.41), and Operations (mean = 31.83).

Length of service (question 33) showed several significant differences between its respondents in relation to personal goal setting (PGS). Those managers with more than 25 years of service tend to be less involved in the personal goal setting process (mean = 30.50) than other managers [i.e. those with less than 5 years service (mean = 37.22), 11-15 years service (mean = 36.72), 21-25 years of service (mean=36.50), 16-20 years of service (mean = 35.70), and 6-10 years of service (mean = 35.52)].

Both motivation (MOT) and personal goal setting (PGS) showed significant differences to question 35, job description. Division managers tend to be more involved in the assigned goal setting process (mean = 34.78) than part-time supervisor's (mean = 30.64) and lower level managers (mean = 31.51). In contrast, part-time supervisors tend

to be less motivated (mean = 35.05) than lower level managers (mean = 39.06), center managers (mean = 40.42), and division managers (mean = 41.57). Differences in individual scale items based on demographic responses were also examined to gain further insight.

Individual Questionnaire Item Differences and Relationships

The decision was made to examine individual questionnaire items in an attempt to provide further insight into the research questions. One-Way Analyses of Variance (ANOVA) were performed to determine any differences between the dependent variables (measured by the personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation questions) and the independent variables (measured by the demographic questions). Those instances where $p < .05$ are identified but only those items with significant differences of $p < .0017$ or less are discussed.

Analysis according to years in management showed a significant difference in response to question 28 ($p = .0008$). Managers with 21 to 25 years seniority felt less motivated to perform because of promotions. Those managers with 11 to 15 years experience felt most motivated to perform because of possible promotions (mean = 4.33). Those managers with 10 years and less also felt motivated to perform at higher levels because of promotions.

Years in management was also significant when examining responses to question 30 ($p = .0001$), "I am motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks." Those with less than five years in management were more motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks (mean = 3.25). Those with 6 to 10 years and 15-20 years of management experience scored means of 1.88 and 2.00 respectively. Those managers

with 6 to 10 and 15 to 20 years seniority felt that proving co-workers wrong was not a motivating factor.

Job position was the basis for significant differences in response to question 27 (p = .0008), "My job is boring and therefore I am not motivated to perform." Managers felt that their jobs were not boring and felt motivated to perform. Part-time supervisors scored the highest (mean = 2.17) and division managers scored the lowest (means = 1.14). All managers felt their jobs were not boring and were motivated because there was a lack of boredom in their jobs. The higher the level of management, the more motivated the manager was to perform.

Chapter V

Conclusions

In today's organizations, goal setting and motivation are often assumed to be present, but levels may vary within and between organizations. Motivation to one manager may not be motivation for another. In the present study, subject managers were thoroughly aware of MBO and the goal setting process. All levels of management within this organization are held accountable on a weekly basis for results. The success of each individual manager was built on his or her results. Total support of MBO must come first from upper management and filter down to the manager with the least amount of responsibility. It is assumed that MBO is a team effort, each manager forced to pull his or her own weight.

As stated earlier, Humphrey (1990) believes that in any organization, achieving set goals and meeting assigned objectives are the foundation for success. Management today is the art of getting things done through employees, usually by the use of planning strategies. Along with the planning process comes the idea of goal setting to meet certain objectives within the organization. Goal setting is the foundational building block in any MBO program (Rodgers, 1991). In response to the four research questions, the following results were found:

1. Can a valid and reliable questionnaire be developed to measure personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation.

The questionnaire developed for this survey was found to have three scales of multiple factors. The questions intended to measure personal goal setting accounted for four factors; the ten questions addressing assigned goal setting were found to have three different factors; and the ten questions concerning motivation accounted for three factors.

Revision and retesting would be required before acceptable factor scaling and scoring could be attained.

If the three scales were treated as intended (three distinct unified constructs), it was found that the first ten questions did not create a reliable questionnaire to measure personal goal setting (Cronbach's alpha = .40) for the sum of the nine best items. Summing questions 11-20 did prove to be reliable in measuring assigned goal setting (Chronbach's alpha = .72). Questions 21-30 also proved to be reliable for the measurement of motivation (Chronbach's alpha = .78).

Relationships between personal goal setting, assigned goal setting and motivation were evident from this questionnaire and study. These relationships are worthy of further study with refined instrumentation.

2. Is there a relationship between motivation and personal goal setting for managers in a company enacting the MBO process?

Analyses of individual questionnaire items revealed setting personal work goals is important to managers within this organization. These mangers were also motivated by their jobs and were motivated by challenge. Meeting these personal work goals was also important to these managers and the research shows that they felt much better about themselves when these personal goals were accomplished. When these managers were given the opportunity to set their own personal work goals there was a high chance that this would happen -- 75 percent of the managers reported actually meeting these goals.

Managers intend to meet their assigned goals because an overwhelming number of managers come to work motivated to perform their best. Managers also felt that their jobs were not boring and were not a cause for a lack of motivation. Eighty-four percent of the respondent population felt that their jobs were not redundant.

A major relational finding between personal goal setting and motivation was the lure of more money. Eighty percent of the respondent population said that making more money was a personal goal. Fifty percent of the managers felt that money was cause to work harder. Being promoted was motivation to meet personal work related goals and more money was cause for the motivation.

Managers within this organization want to set personal work goals and when given the opportunity, generally do so. These managers also feel that their job allows them the opportunity to set some personal work goals. When given this opportunity to set personal goals, motivation to met these goals is evident by the timeliness in the completion of these goals.

Several managers share their personal work goals with co-workers. Sixty percent of those managers surveyed expressed their goals to others. Eighty percent of those surveyed actually set personal work goals. Only two percent of the survey population did not set personal work goals.

Because these managers feel good about themselves when they meet their personal work goals, the motivation to meet these goals is present. Setting personal work goals directly relates to the motivation to complete these personal work goals.

Personal goals of making more money or receiving promotions resulted in higher levels of motivation for managers. If managers knew that a promotion was evident for task or goal completion, the more motivated they were to perform.

3. Is there a relationship between motivation and assigned goal setting for managers in a company enacting the MBO process?

Several relationships were shown to exist between assigned goal setting and motivation. Managers within this organization felt their assigned work goals were unrealistic. These managers also felt their assigned goals were challenging and they reported being motivated on the job. Though these managers stated they believe their assigned work goals tended to be unrealistic, they were still motivated and committed to obtain these goals. These managers were generally motivated to accomplish all company goals.

These managers believe that many of their work goals conflict. These managers also believe their superiors do not say things to motivate them to perform at higher levels. These managers did require their subordinates to document their goals on paper. Even though goals tend to conflict, these managers were still motivated to perform at higher levels, especially when promotions and monetary rewards were available. The relationships between assigned goal setting and motivation give valuable insight to the heart of this organization. The factors involved and the results from the study help to further understand what motivates today's managers and see what is really valuable to them.

Assigned goal setting directly relates to motivation. From this study, we could conclude that MBO is a successful goal setting program for this organization. Goal setting, which is a large portion of MBO, is directly related to motivation. Managers are highly motivated to meet their assigned goals, although managers within this organization feel their assigned company goal tend to be unrealistic and tend to conflict. Managers generally complete all assigned tasks and feel that their jobs are motivating and not boring nor redundant. This would lead to the argument that MBO is a successful

goal setting program to this organization and to all levels of management within this organization.

Managers are more apt to work harder if monetary rewards are possible. Managers tend to be more motivated to complete assigned goals when a possible promotion or pay raise was given.

4. For managers in a company enacting the MBO process, do personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation differ in relation to age, work department, length of time with the organization, length of time in management, and level of management?

Demographics had an impact on personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation, although, differences found were few. Those managers in Information Systems tend to be more apt to accomplish assigned goals than members of management assigned to other departments (Operations, Accounting & Finance, Engineering, Human Resources, Customer Service, and others). Other work departments did not have any significant impact on personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, or motivation.

Those managers with more than 25 years of service were more apt to meet personal work goals than other members of management. These managers may have the motivation needed to meet their own personal goals. Division managers were more apt to accomplish assigned goals than both lower level managers and part-time supervisors. The level of accountability by the division manager's superior, as compared to the level of accountability given other levels of management, may explain the accomplishment of assigned goals.

Part-time supervisors were less motivated than all other managers. Part-time supervisors tend to be managers with the least amount of time and experience with this

organization. Because less time or effort may be required to complete their day to day tasks, these managers may require less motivation to complete their daily tasks.

Limitations

Perhaps the most critical limitation of this study was the lack of reliable and valid scales to measure personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation. The questionnaire did, though, serve some purposes of this study. To accurately answer the first research question with a "yes" would require the questionnaire be streamlined and fine tuned until three distinct factors (personal goal setting, assigned goal setting, and motivation) were found.

A further limitation was the one shot case study nature of the research. Measurements over time might prove revealing. However, since the survey was exploratory in nature, the single run of this survey did provide some insight into the research questions. This study indicates motivation and both types of goal setting are related.

Questions used in the survey were not thoroughly pretested. The initial survey was given a simple pretest by using a graduate class at the University of Nebraska at Omaha. Only 16 communication students were used for the pre-test. The lack of a large survey respondent population limited determination of whether or not the questions actually target the dimensions intended to be studied.

It would have been beneficial to have combined the questionnaire method of data collection with other methods, particularly observation of employee group discussions, content analysis of employee goal setting tools, and one-on-one interviews with various levels of management within the organization.

Caution must also be taken when drawing conclusions from single variables evaluated through One-Way Analysis of Variance. No single dependent variable can fully represent the complex organizational situation. The analysis is, however, somewhat valuable in looking at overall tendencies of the demographic areas and in making generalized statements about answering patterns. However, it is risky to view with complete confidence individual items through the ANOVA.

Finally, information contained within this study must be understood only within the context of the particular organization at hand, and results are specific only to the employees who responded to the survey. Care must be taken when extrapolating conclusions to analyze or provide insight into the attitudes and behaviors of employees who work for other large organizations.

Recommendations

Since an underlying goal of this study was to find how motivation is effected by goal setting, it is only appropriate that a follow-up study be performed at a later date to see if the same results would be found. Finding significant changes over time or finding consistent patterns would prove to be valuable information for this organization. Finding consistent patterns may serve as positive in this organization's management philosophy.

If further studies were to be performed, refinement of the questionnaire would allow for more definite results when looking at the elements of goal setting and motivation. The reliability and validity of the instrument would need to be improved.

Discovering the forces that play on motivation in similar organizations and comparing them with this organization would be valuable information. The comparison factor might help us further understand this organization's mode of management. It would be beneficial to identify employee's personal feelings about goal setting and

motivation by one-on-one interviews. Discovering a manager's personal feelings as compared to his or her "corporate " feelings would allow the questionnaire to be streamlined.

Finally, concerning recommendations for this organization, upper management must be more specific in their assigned goal setting process. Upper management must relay important corporate goals with all levels of management. Communication gaps may play a part in the motivation of meeting assigned goals. As upper management becomes more involved in the goal setting process through Management by Objectives and stresses its importance to those managers at lower, less responsible management positions, the motivation to produce and meet those goals would probably increase.

APPENDIX A

MBC Questionnaire

Please circle the most appropriate response to each question. Make responses directly on this questionnaire.

The following ten questions relate strictly to <u>personal goal setting</u> as it pertains to your particular job.

1) The opportunity to set personal work goals is important to me.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

2) I set my own personal work goals.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

3) My job allows me the opportunity to set my personal work goals.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

4) I feel better about myself when I reach my personal goals.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

5) I often fail to meet my personal work goals.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

6) When setting my personal work goals, I keep them to myself and tell no one.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

7) My personal work goals involve making more money in the future.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

8) Meeting all work deadlines is a personal goal of mine.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

9) My expectations of my personal work goals tend to be unrealistic. I expect too much of myself.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

10) My boss encourages me to set some personal goals.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

The following ten questions relate strictly to <u>assigned goal setting</u> as it relates to your present job.

11) My assigned work goals are unrealistic.
       1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

12) My assigned work goals are challenging.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

13) I am committed to obtaining all company goals.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

14) Many of my work goals conflict.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

15) Rarely am I informed on my performance of obtaining company goals.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

16) Meeting assigned goals makes me feel valuable to the company.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

17) I am frequently informed of my companies goals.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

18) Meeting my assigned goals requires too much time.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

19) I get recognized when I reach my assigned goals.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

20) I document my assigned goals on paper as I reach them.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

The following ten questions relate strictly to motivation on your present job.
21) My job motivates me to perform well.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

22) Because of possible pay raises, I am motivated to produce more than required.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

23) I enjoy being challenged on the job.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

24) I often come to work with little motivation to perform my best.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

25) Because of a lack of interest in my job, I am not motivated.
     1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

26) My job is redundant and therefore it is not motivating to me.
    1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

27) My job is boring and therefore I am not motivated to perform.
    1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

28) I am motivated to work harder because I want to be promoted.
    1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

29) My boss says things that motivate me to perform at a higher level.
    1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

30) I am motivated to prove co-workers wrong on job related tasks.
    1) Strongly Disagree   2) Disagree   3) Neutral   4) Agree   5) Strongly Agree

Demographic Questions   **(To be used only for classification of data.)**

31) My age is:
  1) 25 or under
  2) 26-35
  3) 36-45
  4) 46-55
  5) 56 or over

34) I have been a member of the management for:
  1) Less than 5 years
  2) between 6 and 10 years
  3) between 11 and 15 years
  4) between 16 and 25 years
  5) more than 25 years

32) The department I work in is:
  1) Operations
  2) Accounting & Finance
  3) Engineering
  4) Human Resources
  5) Customer Service
  6) Information Systems
  7) Other

35) Which description best describes your job position:
  1) Division manager and above
  2) Center manager or equivalent
  3) Lower level management
  4) Part-time supervisor

33) I have been with this company for:
  1) Less than 5 years
  2) between 6 and 10 years
  3) between 11 and 15 years
  4) between 16 and 20 years
  5) between 21 and 25 years
  6) more than 25 years

APPENDIX B

March 7, 1994

Fr: David Watkins, Internal Communications Supervisor

To: All Management Personnel (both full-time and part-time)

Re: MBC Study

Dear Manager,

You are being asked to participate in a study of the MBC process. In addition to providing information concerning the effectiveness of our MBC process, your involvement will assist me in reaching a personal goal--that of writing a thesis as required to receive a master's degree in communication from the University of Nebraska at Omaha.

Attached you will find a questionnaire which asks you for information about your experiences on the job. May I ask you to take a few minutes of your time to answer the questions and return the survey by March 14? Upon completion, simply return the survey through our house mail to: David Watkins, Internal Communications Supervisor, Human Resources Department.

Please answer all questions as carefully and as correctly as you can. Don't think about the question too long; but rather, put down the first thing which comes to your mind. Remember, there are no right or wrong answers. DO NOT put your name on this questionnaire. Responses will in no way be used to identify survey respondents. You are assured that everyone completing this survey will remain completely anonymous, both to me and the company.

Thank you very much for participating in this project.

Sincerely,

David Watkins
Internal Communications Supervisor

Attachments

<u>APPENDIX C</u>

Table III
Factor Analysis Varimax - Rotated Factor Matrix
Questions 1 - 10
Personal Goal Setting

Question #	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3	Factor 4
Q1	.51	.10	-.34	.30
Q2.	.18	.72	-.03	-.42
Q3.	-.13	.82	.06	.16
Q4.	.07	.05	.06	.16
Q5.	-.01	.06	.84	-.09
Q6.	-.66	-.09	-.02	-.13
Q7.	.75	.05	.37	-.09
Q8.	.55	-.06	-.15	-.03
Q9.	-.01	.00	.64	.33
Q10.	.19	.60	.05	.45

Factor #	Eigenvalue	% of Var.
1	2.04	20.4
2	1.47	14.7
3	1.31	13.2
4	1.13	11.4

Table IV
Factor Analysis Varimax - Rotated Factor Matrix
Questions 11 - 20
Assigned Goal Setting

Question #	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Q11.	-.17	.74	.02
Q12.	.78	.12	.16
Q13.	.74	-.36	-.11
Q14.	-.04	.77	-.15
Q15.	-.02	.24	-.74
Q16.	.68	-.12	.16
Q17.	.48	-.00	.54
Q18.	.01	.69	-.31
Q19.	.10	-.09	.74
Q20.	.06	-.04	.52

Factor #	Eigenvalue	% of Var.
1	2.92	29.3
2	1.46	14.7
3	1.28	12.9

Table V
Factor Analysis Varimax - Rotated Factor Matrix
Questions 21 - 30
Motivation

Question #	Factor 1	Factor 2	Factor 3
Q21.	-.37	.68	.21
Q22.	.19	.84	.07
Q23.	-.29	.30	.52
Q24.	.88	-.02	-.12
Q25.	.80	-.28	-.23
Q26.	.57	-.62	-.02
Q27.	.63	-.58	-.03
Q28.	-.10	.02	.86
Q29.	-.36	.50	.00
Q30.	.55	-.04	.54

Factor #	Eigenvalue	% of Var.
1	4.14	41.4
2	1.42	14.2
3	1.11	11.1

Bibliography

Benge, E. and Hickey, J., Morale and Motivation, New York: Franklin Watts, 1984.

Brown, T., "Beyond the Bottom Line," Industry Week, May 15, 1989, 26.

Collamore, T. J., "Making MBO Work in the Public Sector," The Bureaucrat, Fall 1989, 37-40.

Conrad, C., Strategic Organizational Communication. Fort Worth: Harcourt Brace Javanovich, Inc., 1990.

Crino, M.D. and White, M.C., "Satisfaction in Communication: An Examination of the Downs-Hazen measure." Psychological Reports, 1986,49, 831-838.

Daley, D., "Performance Appraisal and Organizational Success, Public Employee Perceptions in an MBO-Based Appraisal System," Review of Public Personnel Administration, Vol. 9, No. 1, Fall 1988, 17-25.

Downs, C.W. Communication Audits. Glenview, Illinois, Scott Foresman and Company, 1984.

Downs, C.W., and Hazen, M.D., "A Factor Analytic Study of Communication Satisfaction." Journal of Business Communication, 1977, 14, 63-75.

Farmer, M., "Pumping Profit," Management Today, June 1989, 121-127.

Fowler, F.G., and H.W., The Oxford Dictionary, Seventh Edition, Clarendon Press, 1984

Fry, E., CBF, "Seeing the Big Picture and Getting There," Business Credit, Nov 1991, Vol 18,36-37.

Glatthorn, A. A., "A New Concept Of Supervision," Educational Horizons, Winter 1987, 78-82.

Goldhaber, G. M., "Evaluating Internal Communication: The ICA Audit." New Directions for Institutional Advancement, 2, 37-53.

Goldhaber, Gerald, Yates, M., Porter, D. T., Lesniak, R., "Organizational Communication." Human Communication Research, 1978, 5, (1), 76-96.

Grant, Phillip C., The Effort-Net Return Model of Motivation, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1981

Humphrey, V., "Training the Total Organization," Training & Development Journal, Oct. 1990, 57-64.

Maehr, M. L., and Braskamp, L., The Motivation Factor. Massachusetts: Lexington Books, 1986.

Murphy, M., "Setting Goals for Organizational and Individual Achievement: An Overview," Journal of Library Administration, Vol 8(2), Summer 1987, 65-79.

Nevotti, J.R., Olsen, K.H., and Stevenson, J.S. An Employee Attitude Questionnaire Based on Herzberg's Motivator-Hygiene Theory. Unpublished Manuscript, University of Nebraska at Omaha, 1969

Pincus, J.D., Communication Satisfaction, Job Satisfaction and Job Performance," Human Communication Research, 1986, 12, 395-419.

Rodgers, R., and Hunter, J. E., "Impact of Management by Objectives on Organizational Productivity," Journal of Applied Psychology Monograph, 1991, Vol. 76, N0. 2, 322-336.

Roebuck, D. B., "An MBO Approach to Teaching Organizational Communication," The Bulletin, March 1989, 26-28.

Rosenbaum, B. L., How to Motivate Today's Workers. New York: Mcgraw-Hill Book Company, 1982.

Sonnenberg, F. K., "A Strategic Approach to Employee Motivation." The Journal of Business Strategy, 1991, 41-43.

Vroom, V., Work and Motivation, New York: John Wiley and Sons, 1964.

White, M., "Our Tried-and-True Tactic: Management by Objectives," Psychological Reports, Vol 67, April 1991, 13& 27.