



THE EXTENT OF MANAGERS' MOTIVATION AS A DETERMINANT OF LEADERSHIP QUALITY

ANNA WZIĄTEK-STĄSKO

ABSTRACT

Motivating to perform remains a very inspiring field of scientific studies. In spite of extensive research in this field, some areas, of niche nature, that require exploration can be identified. Motivating the managers is one of such areas, less popular but of tremendous importance in the process of managing a contemporary organisation. This article is theoretical and empirical. It was written to present the original results of empirical research focused on assessment of the motivation impact of 47 financial and non-financial tools by several hundred Polish managers. The research tool used in the study process was the questionnaire prepared by the author of this paper. Key preferences of the group of employees are an important source of information required in the process of optimising the effectiveness of managing the human capital and an entire organisation.

KEY WORDS

motivation, manager, motivation system, leadership, quality

DOI: 10.1515/emj-2016-0004

Corresponding authors:

Anna Wziętek-Stąsko
 University of Dąbrowa Górnicza
 Faculty of Management, Informatics
 and Social Sciences

e-mail: awziatek-stasko@wp.pl

INTRODUCTION

A permanent strive for perfecting the degree of its effectiveness combined with competing on the market continues to drive managers' attention towards searching for reliable means and measures to optimise the process of management and maximising benefits, the economic profits in particular. The role of the human capital is increasingly emphasised among the key determinants of the process. Unfortunately, it seems that it is often emphasised in a superficial, slightly mundane manner and, as a result, the expected advantages are not fully satisfactory. The author believes that one of the reasons behind the failure is insufficient knowledge about the essence and importance of motivating people to work and perform, in particular, motivating employees in managerial positions; and also the inability to notice a closer relationship between the degree of manager's motivation, the degree of motivation of the employees reporting directly to the

manager and the effectiveness of an organisation management. The article was written to expose and emphasise the relationship, with a particular stress on the importance of effective motivation of the managerial staff.

1. ESSENCE OF MOTIVATING PEOPLE – A HANDFUL OF CRITICAL COMMENTS

Motivating people to perform is one of the most fascinating research areas. For centuries it has not been given the attention it deserves; nevertheless, we continue to debate it (Conradi et al., 2014). Why does it continue to be an inspiration to a scientific investigation and why does it continue to leave researchers, scientists and business practitioners

unsatisfied and feeling that their knowledge in the area is insufficient? What is the reason behind so many mistakes continued to be made in the management process in spite of so many cult theories of motivating, to name just those formulated by A. Maslow, F. Herzberg, C. P. Alderfer, V. Vroom, D. McGregor and others? Perhaps a reason behind it is Serigstad's the very essence of motivating and motivation? According to R. Denny: „The word „motivation” triggers a reaction which shows that everyone would like to have it but the majority is not aware of what it actually means” (Denny, 1999). Many authors confuse „motivation” with „motivating” and offer their discretionary, often imprecise or even untrue, definitions. An attempt to come with a reliable definition of the concept more often emanates with schematism and generality than with a deep reflection based on solid grounds, preventing from understanding its true meaning. Doubts whether the terms „motivation” and „motivating” are synonyms grow to a rather serious issue when the above-mentioned discrepancy appears in print in management textbooks used by the future practitioners of the difficult discipline to guide them. In the attempt to come up with the right definition of the terms: „employee's motivation” versus „motivating an employee”, one should clearly emphasise the relation between these terms and the concept of human work because, in essence, these are two categories which are closely interdependent. In reference to the organisation, which is discussed in the paper, we analyse „employee's motivation for work” or „motivating people to work”. Both terms should be definitely approached as joint and analysed from that standpoint.

M. Armstrong, the author of a globally known „Human Resources Management” textbook, explains that „A motive is a reason for doing something. Motivation deals with factors affecting people so that they behave in a specific way (...) Motivating is about influencing others so that they move in the direction we want them to move to” (Armstrong, 2001). The „human resources management” concept itself is controversial (Wziątek-Staško, 2006; Ściborek, 2012; Strużyna, 2014) and so other statements used by the author are. They are difficult to accept, to mention only that „motivation deals with factors that influence people” which seems completely incorrect in terms of its phrasing and style. How could „motivation” possibly „deal” with anything at all? It is also very inaccurate to see the motivating process only as a way

to move in a direction given by the decision-maker and this inaccuracy has some serious, far-reaching consequences in the business practice. Unfortunately, other definitions are similarly defective. In his deliberations, T. Zawadzak uses a fairly complicated definition formulated by S. Borkowska, where „motivation is a process of influencing employees through appropriate measures and opportunities to achieve their goals and expectations and values to achieve the motivating goal” (Zawadzak, 2014). Is it possible to use the opportunities to achieve goals to influence anything? Other authors, including J. Penc or G. Bartkowiak also pointed out that motivation is „a process” (Penc, 1999; Penc, 1996; Bartkowiak, 1997). On the other hand, a different opinion was expressed by Z. Jasiński (Jasiński, 1998), A. Koźmiński and W. Piotrowski (Koźmiński & Piotrowski, 1995), J. W. Berelson and G. A. Steiner (Berelson & Steiner, 1964) claiming that „motivation to achieve is not „a process” but more „a condition” which seems to make more sense. If, for the purpose of this paper, we assume that motivation is a condition, then what motivating is? According to the author, it is motivating that should be approached as a process, consisting in putting different tools into motion, where the tools are used to reach the condition which is called motivation and to keep the condition. In other words and in brief, motivating is a path to motivation. The issues analysed above do not allow for discretionary interpretation because damages resulting from applying wrong theoretical assumptions into practice could be very destructive to employees of an organisation but also to the organisation itself.

2. GLOBAL LEADERSHIP CRISES AS THE KEY DEMOTIVATOR IN THE CONTEMPORARY BUSINESS

We tend to perceive contemporary leadership as a multi-colour and multidimensional phenomenon. The following leadership models have been already created: classic leadership model, directive, supportive, participative, visionary, organic or intergroup leadership models (Hogg et al., 2012). We are familiar with Blanchard's situational leadership model, transactional, transformative and authentic leadership models (Nieckarz, 2011; Cooper, 2015; Zhou, 2015; Platow et al., 2015). A. K. Koźmiński believes that the restricted leadership model

is noteworthy (Koźmiński, 2013), while R. S. Covey promotes the compass leadership model (Covey, 1997). Web 2.0+ era opens up new opportunities leading to development of new models, including remote management (Sprenger, 2011) or shared leadership (Bergman et al., 2012; Hoch, 2013; Bolden, 2011; Small & Rentsch, 2010). As claimed by Hay Group and Deloitte experts: „Unpredictability of changes in the business surroundings created a number of new challenges to enterprises, with the demand for agility interpreted as the ability of prompt modification of strategy (strategic agility) and relocation of resources (agility of resources) became of particular importance. However, neither will work when not accompanied by the organisational agility i.e. the ability of swift remodelling of structures, processes and procedures which accompany them” (Zakrzewska, 2015). The above initiates some specific challenges to the leadership model in the second decade of the 21st century, which is going towards agile leadership. Can contemporary leaders meet the expectations of the contemporary world and create innovative and rapidly changing work environments?

As J. C. Maxwell observes, everybody talks about leadership; few understand what leadership involves. Most people want to be leaders, few can. Management is a process which can guarantee implementation of the program and achieving the goals of an organisation; leadership involves creating visions of development and stimulating people’s motivation. People do not like management; people wish to have leadership. Has anybody ever heard about world’s managers? Nobody has. But we all know names of the world’s leaders. A scientific leader; a political leader; a religious leader; a youth leader, a social leader, a workers’ leader, a business lobby leader. These are leaders. Their actions go beyond management (Maxwell, 1998). Even more so, in their actions they do not stop at managing, which is what many managers do these days, effectively creating a toxic or often malfunctioning workplace instead of an innovative workplace which promotes creativity. As early as in 2000, N. B. Enkelmann argued that „The time of strict, top-bottom managerial practices has gone. Team work and true collaboration is essential to performance. An employee needs more than just to be employed and more than just ‘spend their hours at work’. They want to be actively involved in the company’s life, taking important decisions, they want to be well informed and know concrete goals and want to see the sense of doing one’s tasks (...). The

managers who used to unscrupulous domination over their employees, regardless of losses – will simply have to go” (Enkelmann, 1997). His opinion, as it seems, continues to be valid. The most recent research results announced by the Gallup Institute indicate that contemporary leadership is in a global crisis. According to the „State of The Global Workplace. Employee Engagement Insights For Business Leaders Worldwide” reports, only as little as 13% employees worldwide engage in their work (the engaged employees), drawing their satisfaction from their engagement and guarantee that their company is growing. 63% are not engaged employee. These are employees who are not passionate about their work and put no energy into it; they only wait for their work day to end, „sleepwalkers” according to the authors of the report. The third group includes employees contesting their work (the actively disengaged). They are not satisfied with their work and busy with demonstrating their dissatisfaction, undermining achievements of other persons, who are engaged in their work. They represent 24% of respondents (State..., 2013). What may be the reason of such situation? According to F. Herzberg’s theory the absence of the motivators would not lead to job dissatisfaction, just not to job satisfaction. For example, if an employee did not have recognition or achievement this would not lead to job dissatisfaction, but they were also unlikely to be motivated. Many researchers discussed with the Herzberg’s opinion and have moved toward more complex formulations of job satisfaction that forgo the simplicity of Herzberg’s theory. One of them was A. Kalleberg, who delineated the job environment into six dimensions: the intrinsic dimension, which refers to characteristics associated with the task itself; the convenience dimension, which refers to good hours, pleasant physical surroundings, and convenient travel; the financial dimension which includes items such as pay, fringe benefits, and job security; relationships with co-workers and whether there are chances to make friends and meet social needs; a career dimension that includes items such as whether the chances for promotion are good; and resource adequacy which refers to whether there is enough help, equipment, and information required to adequately complete the job. This example illustrates that as we move toward greater complexity in describing job satisfaction we lose simplicity (Smerek & Peterson, 2007). We can say that motivation system (a group of motivators) is a key determinant of

employee satisfaction and, on the other hand, that „employee satisfaction” is also one of the motivators. That seems very interesting, because both determine the employee engagement. Unfortunately, not only operational employees or specialists suffer the engagement crisis. Globally, managers also claim to face the crisis. The above brings an important question – where is the contemporary leadership going to and what the source of such a serious crisis in the area of delivering the motivating function is. Can demotivated managers effectively motivate employees in their teams?

3. MANAGERS' MOTIVATION AS A DETERMINANT OF THEIR LEADERSHIP QUALITY

According to N. B. Enkelmann „many managers do not know how to motivate their employees effectively as they themselves do not identify themselves completely with their employer and they lack the power of conviction. How can one motivate effectively to something that one does not believe in? If a manager is not deeply convinced that his goal is right and that his work makes sense, he will not be able to arouse any enthusiasm in his employees and, because of that, he will not be able to motivate them and stimulate them to more effective operation” (Enkelmann, 1997; Zhang et al., 2012). Responsibility of managers is indeed huge. R. Stuart-Kotze and Ch. Dunn believe that: „People do not leave bad companies but only bad managers” (Stuart-Kotze & Dunn, 2011). This is also confirmed by other authors (for example Lester et al., 2011). Unprofessional managers cause serious crises which kill employees' motivation and effectively reduce their engagement in work. Crisis of trust is one of such serious contemporary threats to development of organisations. S. M. R. Covey, G. Link, R. R. Merrill claim that: „Once successfully out of the global financial crisis, enterprises and organisations worldwide found themselves in a crisis which is much deeper and more destructive. It is the crisis of trust. The progressing erosion is a major issue in countries whose prosperity depends on the rapid growth and creative spirit, so cherished in capitalism. It is a particularly difficult challenge for companies whose activity is based on a daily exchange of proofs of trust with clients, consumers, stakeholders or shareholders” (Covey et al., 2013). This opinion is also shared by

many other authors (Paliszkievicz, 2013; Sousa-Lima et al., 2013; Hawley, 2014; Acedo & Gomila, 2013; Campellone & Kring, 2013). Trust generates benefits in many dimensions, including the economic dimension, which is often a priority criterion for employers when evaluating their actions. According to D. S. Sink, W. T. Morris and C. S. Johnston, trust has a positive impact on seven critical dimensions of an organisation: its effectiveness (concentration on doing the right things), efficiency (doing things in the right way), quality for customers, innovation, quality of work (security, inspiration to act), productivity and profitability (Sprenger, 2011). Many researchers proved a strong correlation between empowerment of employees and the company's profits (Ji et al., 2015; Sellaro et al., 2014). Trust is essential for effective motivation of employees (Engelbrecht et al., 2014; Reychar & Sharkie, 2010; Kath et al., 2010). There are many more factors that destroy employees' motivation and development of organisations. Nowadays, the most common ones are injustice (Macko, 2009; Bugdoł, 2014; Flaherty & Moss, 2007), nepotism, corruption, mobbing, sexual harassment, discrimination and a number of other factors (Chudzicka-Czupala, 2013; Colquitt & Rodell, 2001), which are responsible for counter-productive behaviours in an organisation, for example employee anomia (Kosewski, 2012; Maj, 2012; Celmer, 2013; Figueiredo-Ferraz et al., 2015; McTernan et al., 2013; Trepanier et al., 2013).

Care about employees, their development and care about the organisation is one of the key challenges faced by managers (Zhao & Wu, 2014). P. F. Drucker claims that effective management is „responsibility and not a position and privileges, consequence and not craftiness, it is hard work” (Drucker, 2001). A. J. Blikle said that a man cannot be motivated to do something. Man can be only assisted in developing his natural internal motivation (Blikle, 2014; Cerasoli & Ford, 2014; Shu, 2015). Such understanding of a leader's mission opens a new chapter in thinking about the quality of leadership in contemporary world. It requires professionalism, deep reflection about the role that they play in the organisation, the time to spend in a dialogue with employees, a departure from thoughtless following fashion in management and adopting solutions that do not make sense, the ability to see a close relation between the quality of leadership and the quality of employees' work, between employees' motivation and own motivation. However, first, it takes to identify and learn about the actual expectations and preferences of

both parties. The data on managers' motivation were collected by the authors of the first Top Employer for Top Management research in Poland, prepared by Hays Poland specialist recruitment agency and Harvard Business Review Poland. They attempted to come up with a characteristics of a contemporary Polish manager and what they seek at work. 1040 high-level employees of the largest organisations on the Polish market took part in the research. The report clearly shows that money is not the biggest stimulant for the Polish managers. While salary is recognised as important by the majority of the respondents, very few managers identified it as the most motivating factor in their work. Managers usually attached more importance to their professional development opportunities and market position of their company. These two factors were identified as the crucial by representatives of nearly all sectors, before salaries and financial rewards. Out of eight groups used in the study (HR, finance, law and administration, marketing and PR, sales, IT & R&D, production, CEO) salaries were the most appreciated by directors of financial departments (56% of representatives of the group identified them as a motivating factor). However, the importance of salary was lower for CEOs, with as little as 41% of CEOs emphasising the role of the factor. One can also see that salaries are very important for young managers and also for women. In case of female managers, competitive salaries were even more important than the position of the company on the market (<http://kariera.forbes.pl>, 07.01.2016).

4. POLISH MANAGERS ON EFFECTIVENESS OF MOTIVATORS – RESEARCH METHODOLOGY

The main aim of the research was to identify and diagnose the effective motivating impact of 47 selected contemporary instruments used for the purpose of motivation in the opinion of the 700 respondents (644 questionnaires were complete). The „Managers” was one of the analysed groups of employees (414 respondents), that is why in this article only part of the research results is presented. The research process was carried in 2015. The research tool was delivered to the research participants (random sample) personally, in a hard copy (on paper). An original, 3-part questionnaire was a tool used in the research process:

- part I – tangible financial tools (6 parameters assessed);
- part II – tangible non-financial tools (16 parameters assessed);
- part III – intangible tools (25 parameters assessed).

In total, 47 selected instruments used to motivate people to work were analysed. Research participants were asked to assess how effective each motivator was on a 5-point Likert scale (where 1 identified a motivator of no importance to respondent and 5 meant that a motivator was the most effective in influencing the level of the person's motivation). The collected fact-based material was analysed by using statistical reasoning in order to formulate appropriate hypothesis and verify whether they were true. The statistical reasoning was based on two non-parametric tests: Mann-Whitney's U test and Kruskal Wallis's ANOVA test. These tests are used when a relationship between mixed (qualitative and quantitative) features is identified. When analysing differences in mean levels of a qualitative feature by the qualitative variable, typically, two tests are used: when the feature has two variants – it is Mann-Whitney's U test and when one variant – Kruskal-Wallis's ANOVA test.

414 managers participated in the research process, including 216 women (52%) and 198 men (48%). The age structure of the respondents was as follows: age: 18-25 (N=172; 42%), age: 26-35 (N=127; 31%), age: 36-45 (N=73; 17%), age: 46-55 (N=32; 8%), 55 and more (N=10; 2%). The educational background structure of the respondents was as follows: university graduates (N=119; 28.5%), high school graduates (N=290; 70%), vocational school graduates (N=3; 1%), elementary school graduates (N=2; 0.5%). The participants represented state organisations (N=110; 27%), private organisations (N=282; 68%) and NGOs (N=22; 5%), large enterprises at the most (N=226; 55%), as well as the medium-sized (N=59; 14%), small (N=84; 20%) and microenterprises (N=48; 11%). The respondents' structure in terms of their currently occupied position at work was as follows: lowest level managers (N=286, 69%), medium-level managers (N=47; 11%) and the top managers (N=81; 20%). The respondents had different work experience, including: below 5 years (N=201; 49%), from 5 to 15 years (N=126; 30%), and more than 15 years (N=87; 21%). In total, respondents represented 15 economy sectors, which is a huge asset of the research, with the largest group coming from „the industry” (N=80; 19%).

Tab. 1. Effectiveness of the motivators – women's and men's opinions

MOTIVATOR	LEVEL			LEVEL		
	Women's opinion medium high			Men's opinion medium high		
	low	medium	high	low	medium	high
Basic salary	3.52	3.56	3.70	3.31	3.21	3.65
Monthly bonus	3.82	3.78	3.67	3.47	2.97	3.59
Yearly bonus	3.66	3.67	3.70	3.40	3.07	3.59
Cash reward	3.69	3.67	3.78	3.54	3.21	3.70
Stock, stock options	2.61	2.78	3.00	2.70	2.69	2.78
Promotion with a salary raise	4.09	3.78	4.26	3.96	3.97	4.02
Subsidised summer vacations	3.68	3.56	3.81	3.24	3.28	3.04
Cinema, theatre tickets, gym & fitness	3.37	2.83	3.70	2.91	3.07	2.93
Special assistance loans/benefits	2.98	3.17	3.15	2.77	2.66	2.69
Low-interest loans	2.89	3.50	3.41	2.70	2.86	2.91
Subsidised summer vacation camps for employees' children	3.09	3.33	3.81	2.80	3.10	3.11
Company car, also available for private use	3.39	3.39	3.67	3.46	3.03	3.61
Company laptop and cell phone, also for private use	3.37	3.17	3.52	2.99	3.17	3.56
Cafeteria	2.99	2.67	3.22	2.69	2.83	2.54
Additional insurance available to employees and their family	3.29	3.22	3.30	3.00	3.41	3.26
Private medical services for employees and their families	3.45	3.50	3.81	3.30	3.45	3.48
Financing creche or preschool	3.25	3.11	3.56	2.81	3.10	2.91
Fully or partly financed training events and courses	3.66	3.83	4.04	3.40	3.69	3.63
Financing or co-financing vocational learning, studies, MBA	3.92	3.67	4.41	3.49	3.86	3.85
Scholarships and grants	3.40	3.33	3.63	3.03	3.38	2.89
Financing membership fees in professional and business associations	2.65	2.78	2.89	2.53	2.66	2.65
Financing business trips, entertainment allowance and so on	3.25	2.89	3.74	3.16	3.48	3.24
Job security	4.16	4.39	4.67	3.83	4.00	4.19
Company reputation and prestige	3.57	3.61	3.96	3.58	3.59	3.65
Organisation's social responsibility	3.67	3.94	4.04	3.12	3.55	3.65
Diversity management	3.85	3.56	4.00	3.38	3.76	3.30
Friendly atmosphere at work	4.15	4.00	4.30	3.97	4.14	3.83
Good relations with co-workers	4.30	4.06	4.30	3.85	4.24	3.94
Working with interesting people	4.04	3.83	4.19	3.68	3.93	3.89
Clearly defined career path	3.88	3.83	4.15	3.61	3.52	3.72
Promotion opportunities	4.02	3.78	4.26	3.67	3.83	3.48
Professional development opportunities	3.81	3.61	4.00	3.41	3.66	3.78
Self-fulfilment opportunities	3.77	3.89	3.89	3.65	3.69	3.69
Opportunities to demonstrate one's initiative, creativity	3.60	3.78	4.04	3.58	3.90	3.85
Prestige coming from the position in the organisation	3.56	3.67	4.22	3.32	3.69	3.72
Work content	3.53	3.33	3.78	3.28	3.45	3.61
Flexi time	3.74	3.94	4.22	3.69	3.59	3.81
Recognised importance of the life-work balance	4.05	4.11	4.26	3.77	4.00	3.83
Work safety and comfort	3.87	3.94	3.93	3.56	3.79	3.70
Well-organised work	3.77	3.78	4.19	3.68	3.55	3.81
Independence in decision-making and performance	3.63	3.78	4.11	3.70	3.69	4.11
Participation in management process	3.40	3.39	3.96	3.27	3.55	3.74
Praise and recognition	3.87	4.17	4.26	3.59	3.62	3.72
Excellent performance recognised in public	3.60	3.78	4.22	3.34	3.38	3.06
Good relations with the line manager	3.98	3.94	4.37	3.80	3.83	3.81
Swift and clear feedback	3.81	4.06	4.26	3.74	3.59	3.76
Showing interest in personal problems of employees	3.52	3.61	4.04	3.21	3.41	3.54

5. RESEARCH RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

The research was conducted in order to identify and diagnose the effective motivating impact of 47 selected contemporary instruments used for the purpose of motivation in the opinion of the managers involved in the research process. To learn more about the preferences of the respondents, the sample was divided into three groups: lower level managers (for example foreman), medium level managers (for example unit managers) and top level managers (for example directors). Another interesting research problem was to establish whether the sex of a manager influenced differences in evaluating effectiveness of some motivators. The research results are presented in detail in Tab. 1.

The research results presented in the paper partially confirm the findings made by the authors of the research run by Hays Poland and Harvard Business Review Poland monthly. Neither men nor women find the amount of the base salary the most effective motivator. The above holds both for male and female managers of all levels. On a 5-level scale, the parameter scored 3.21-3.70 on average. It demonstrates the highest effectiveness in the opinion of women occupying top managerial positions and the lowest effectiveness according to men occupying medium level managerial positions. In general, all the motivators in the tangible cash motivators scored below 4.0 (average), with the only exception of „promotion with a pay rise”, which proved important for the men occupying top managerial positions.

It is interesting that the research results largely confirm the results of several other research conducted by the author, which show that it is not the money but intangible motivators which are the most important to a contemporary employee. According to female managers of all levels, they were the most motivated by the „job security” motivator. The top level managers gave it the highest score of 4.67. In addition, the lowest level managers appreciated „friendly atmosphere at work” (4.15) and „good relations with co-workers” (4.30). Medium-level female managers pointed out the „praise and recognition” (4.17) and „recognised importance of the life-work balance” (4.11) motivators as those of particular importance while the top-level female managers put „financing or co-financing vocational learning, studies, MBA” (4.41) and „good relations

with the line manager” (4.37) at the top of their lists. Intangible motivators are appreciated not only by women but also by men. The lowest level manager listed the following the most effective intangible motivators: „friendly atmosphere at work” (3.97), „good relations with co-workers” (3.85) and „good relations with the line manager” (3.80). Medium-level managers were of a similar opinion, while the two first parameters scored higher in the group (4.14 and 4.24, respectively). In addition, they mentioned „job security” (4.0) as a motivator of above-the-average importance in their opinion. Also note that „job security” is the most effective motivator influencing the top level managers (score 4.19). Apart from the above, the group also appreciated very much the effectiveness of the „independence in decision-making and performance” parameter (4.11).

Not all of 47 motivation tools mentioned in the paper were of equally high importance to the managers. The tools of the least effective motivating power included: „stock, stock options” (scored 2.61 among the lowest level female managers); „cafeteria” (scored 2.67 among the medium level female managers and 2.54 among the top level male managers); „financing membership fees in professional and business organisations” (scored 2.89 among the top level female managers and 2.53 and 2.66, respectively in the group of the lowest and medium level managers). Obviously, certain similarities can be observed here. It is very interesting indeed that the majority of the motivators analysed in the paper scored higher among the top level manager than in the other two groups. As for men, the above-mentioned trend was also visible, in particular for the group of cash tangible tools.

CONCLUSIONS

The research results presented in the paper lead to many interesting conclusions. The author believes that one of the most important conclusions from the research is that managers consider intangible tools as the most important from the available, contemporary employee motivation tools. It is a paradox but also, at the same time, a valuable piece of information. Both women and men particularly appreciate job security, good atmosphere at work and friendly relations with colleagues. In the context of the points presented in this paper, a question arises: if all the above-listed motivators score high among all the employees, who

then is responsible for creating a toxic work environment with various types of pathologies in the area of management, including managing people. Who is to blame for the fact that 50% of the people in the world declare that they live in stress at work. Many are mobbed. People are treated with no respect, their life-work balance is drastically disrupted and private time restricted because of the absolute availability requirement. Who is responsible for cynicism and heartlessness spreading frequently in the organisation while empathy is often only a word without a meaning? Whose fault is that the financial performance takes priority over people and their real needs while, on the other hand, the growing importance of human capital is declared? These questions imply the need to look closer to the issue and open new paths for continuation of fascinating scientific deliberations. Concluding, let us answer the question whether we have not had enough of these paradoxes of the contemporary times? Since employees' preferences are convergent (the paper presents only a part of much broader research), perhaps it would be worthwhile (managers and other employee) to analyse the issue and make the effort of working out a management model that everyone could benefit from, thus creating a friendly work environment, where care for development of an organisation occupies the place it truly deserves. The analysis leaves many questions unanswered, which, undoubtedly, inspires researchers to continue deliberations over the issues covered by the paper. One of the key questions is how to measure the influence of the manager's motivation level on their subordinates motivation level?

LITERATURE

- Acedo, C., & Gomila, A. (2013). Trust and cooperation: a new experimental approach. *Annals of the New York Academy of Sciences*, 1299(1), 77-83.
- Armstrong, M. (2001). *Zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi [Human Resources Management]*. Kraków, Poland: Oficyna Ekonomiczna, Dom Wydawniczy ABC.
- Bartkowiak, G. (1997). *Psychologia zarządzania [Management Psychology]*. Poznań, Poland: Akademia Ekonomiczna w Poznaniu.
- Berelson, B., & Steiner, G. A. (1964). *Human Behaviour*. New York, USA: Harcourt.
- Bergman, J. Z., Rentsch, J. R., Small, E. E., Davenport, S. V., & Bergman, S. M. (2012). The Shared Leadership Process in Decision-Making Teams. *The Journal of Social Psychology*, 152(1), 17-42.
- Blikle, A. J. (2014). *Doktryna jakości. Rzecz o skutecznym zarządzaniu [The Quality Doctrine. Something About the Efficient Management]*. Gliwice, Poland: Helion.
- Bolden, R. (2011). Distributed leadership in organizations: A review of theory and research. *International Journal of Management Reviews*, 13(3), 251-269.
- Bugdoł, M. (2014). *Znaczenie sprawiedliwości w zarządzaniu ludźmi. Dlaczego warto być sprawiedliwym [The Role of Justice in HRM. Why it's Worth to be Just]*. Warszawa, Poland: Difin.
- Campellone, T. R., & Kring, A. M. (2013). What do you trust? The impact of facial emotion and behaviour on decision making. *Cognition and Emotion*, 27(4), 603-620.
- Celmer, B. (2013). Dewiacja i anomia w ujęciu systemowym [The System of Deviation and Anomy]. *Kultura i Społeczeństwo*, 2, 133-154.
- Cerasoli, Ch. P., & Ford, M. T. (2014). Intrinsic Motivation, Performance, and the Mediating Role of Mastery Goal Orientation: A Test of Self-Determination Theory. *The Journal of Psychology*, 148(3), 267-286. doi: 10.1080/00223980.2013.783778
- Chudzicka-Czupała, A. (2013). *Etyczne zachowanie się człowieka w organizacji [The Ethical Behaviour in the Organisation]*. Katowice, Poland: Wydawnictwo Uniwersytetu Śląskiego.
- Colquitt, J. A., & Rodell, J. B. (2011). Justice, Trust, And Trustworthiness: A Longitudinal Analysis Integrating Three Theoretical Perspectives. *Academy of Management Journal*, 54(6), 1183-1206.
- Conradi, K., Jang, B. G., & McKenna, M. C. (2014). Motivation Terminology in Reading Research: A Conceptual Review. *Educational Psychology Review*, 26, 127-164. doi: 10.1007/s10648-013-9245-z
- Cooper, D. (2015). Effective Safety Leadership. Understanding Types&Styles That Improve Safety Performance. *Professional Safety*, 2, 49-53.
- Covey, S. M. R., Link, G., & Merrill, R. R. (2013). *Mądre zaufanie [Wise Trust]*. Poznań, Poland: Rebis.
- Denny, R. (1999). *Motywowanie do zwycięstwa. Jak działać efektywniej-sprawdzone techniki [Motivate to Win. Tested Techniques for Greater Achievement]*. Kraków, Poland: IFC Press.
- Domaradzki, K. (2013, October 18). *Czego pragną menedżerowie? [What want managers?]*. Retrieved from <http://kariera.forbes.pl/co-motywuje-polskich-menedzerow,artykuly,164502,1,1.html>
- Drucker, P. F. (2001). *Mysli przewodnie Druckera [The Essential Drucker]*. Warszawa, Poland: MT Biznes.
- Engelbrecht, S., Heine, G., & Mahembe, B. (2014). The Influence of Ethical Leadership on Trust and Work engagement: An Exploratory Study. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 40(1), 1-9.
- Enkelmann, N. B. (1997). *Biznes i motywacja [Business and Motivation]*. Warszawa, Poland: Wydawnictwo Galaktyka.
- Figueiredo-Ferraz, H., Gil-Monte, P. R., & Olivares-Faúndez, V. E. (2015). Influence of Mobbing (Workplace Bullying) on Depressive Symptoms: a Longitudinal Study Among Employees Working With People With Intellectual Disabilities. *Journal of Disability Research*, 59(1), 39-47.

- Gallup Institute. (2013). *Report: State of The Global Workplace. Employee Engagement Insights For Business Leaders Worldwide*.
- Hawley, K. (2014). Trust, Distrust and Commitment. *Nous*, 48(1), 1-20.
- Hoch, J. E. (2013). Shared Leadership and Innovation: The Role of Vertical Leadership and Employee Integrity. *Journal of Business & Psychology*, 28(2), 159-174.
- Hogg, M. A., Knippenberg, D. V., & Rast, D. E. III (2012). Intergroup Leadership In Organizations: Leading Across Group And Organizational Boundaries. *The Academy of Management Review*, 37(2), 232-255.
- Jasiński, Z. (1998). *Motywowanie w przedsiębiorstwie. Uwalnianie ludzkiej produktywności [Motivation in the Enterprise. To Regain somebody's Productivity]*. Warszawa, Poland: Placet.
- Ji, Y., Zhou, E., Li, C., & Yan, Y. (2015). Power Distance Orientation and Employee Help Seeking: Trust in Supervisor as a Mediator. *Social Behavior and Personality*, 43(6), 1043-1054.
- Kath, L. M., Magley, V. J., & Marmet, M. (2010). The Role of Organizational Trust in Safety Climate's Influence on Organizational Outcomes. *Accident Analysis and Prevention*, 42(5), 1488-1497.
- Kosewski, M. (2012). Triada współzależności: jakość-samokontrola-etos pracowniczy [The Three Correlations- Quality, Self-control, Employee Ethos]. In *Anomia pracownicza w Polsce 2012. Raport oszustw i kradzieży w firmach [The Employee Anomy in Poland 2012. Frauds and Thefts in Firms Report]*. Poland: Euler Hermes-Work Service.
- Koźmiński, A. K. (2013). *Ograniczone przywództwo [Limited Leadership]*. Warszawa, Poland: Wydawnictwo Poltext.
- Koźmiński, A., & Piotrowski, W. (Eds.). (1995). *Zarządzanie. Teoria i praktyka [Management. Theory and Practice]*. Warszawa, Poland: PWN.
- Lester, P. B., Hannah, S. T., Harms, P. D., Vogelgesang, G. R., & Avolio, B. J. (2011). Mentoring Impact on Leader Efficacy Development: A Field Experiment. *Academy of Management*, 10(3), 409-429.
- Macko, M. (2009). *Poczucie sprawiedliwości organizacyjnej a zachowania pracowników [Justice in the Organisation and the Employee's Behaviour]*. Poznań, Poland: Wydawnictwo Naukowe Wydziału Nauk Społecznych Uniwersytetu im. A. Mickiewicza w Poznaniu.
- Maj, M. (2012). Czym jest anomia pracownicza? [What is the Employee Anomy?]. In *Anomia pracownicza w Polsce 2012. Raport oszustw i kradzieży w firmach [The Employee Anomy in Poland 2012. Frauds and Thefts in Firms Report]*. Poland: Euler Hermes-Work Service.
- Maxwell, J. C. (1998). *Być liderem, czyli jak przewodzić innym [Developing the Leader Within You]*. Warszawa, Poland: Wydawnictwo Medium.
- McTernan, W. P., Dollard, M. F., & LaMontagne, A. D. (2013). Depression in the Workplace: An Economic Cost Analysis of Depression – Related Productivity Loss Attributable to Job Strain and Bullying. *Work and Stress*, 27(4), 321-338.
- Nieckarz, Z. (2011). *Psychologia motywacji w organizacji [Business Motivation Psychology]*. Warszawa, Poland: Difin.
- Paliszkievicz, J. (2013). *Zaufanie w zarządzaniu [Trust in Management]*. Warszawa, Poland: PWN.
- Penc, J. (1996). *Motywowanie w zarządzaniu [Motivation in Management]*. Kraków, Poland: Wydawnictwo Profesjonalnej Szkoły Biznesu.
- Penc, J. (1998). *Zarządzanie w praktyce [Management in Practice]*. Warszawa, Poland: INFOR.
- Platow, M. J., Haslam, S. A., Reicher, S. D., & Steffens, N. K. (2015). There is No Leadership if No-one Follows: Why Leadership is Necessarily a Group Process. *International Coaching Psychology Review*, 10(1), 20-37.
- Reychav, I., & Sharkie, R. (2010). Trust: an Antecedent to Employee Extra-role Behaviour. *Journal of Intellectual Capital*, 11(4), 227-247.
- Ściborek, Z. (2012). *Personel w organizacjach zhierarchizowanych [Staff in The Hierarchical Organisations]*. Szczytno, Poland: Wydawnictwo Wyższej Szkoły Policji w Szczytnie.
- Sellaro, R., Hommel, B., De Kwaadsteniet, E. W., Van de Groep, S., & Colzato, L. S. (2014). Increasing Interpersonal Trust Through Divergent Thinking. *Frontiers in Psychology*, 5, 1-4.
- Shu, Ch. Y. (2015). The Impact of Intrinsic Motivation on The Effectiveness of Leadership Style towards on Work Engagement. *Contemporary Management Research*, 11(4), 327-350. doi:10.7903/cmr.14043
- Small, E. E., & Rentsch, J. R. (2010). Shared Leadership in Teams: A Matter of Distribution. *Journal of Personnel Psychology*, 9(4), 203-211.
- Smerek, R. E., & Peterson, M. (2007). Examining Herzberg's Theory: Improving Job Satisfaction among Non-Academic Employees at a University. *Research in Higher Education*, 48(2), 229-250. doi: 10.1007/s11162-006-9042-3
- Sousa-Lima, M., Michel, J. W., & Caetano, A. (2013). Clarifying the Importance of Trust in Organizations as a Component of Effective Work Relationship. *Journal of Applied Social Psychology*, 43, 418-427.
- Sprenger, R. K. (2011). *Zaufanie#1 [Trust#1]*. Warszawa, Poland: MT Biznes.
- Strużyna, J. (2014). Krytyczne spojrzenie na współczesne zarządzanie zasobami ludzkimi – wyzwania wieku dojrzałego teorii i praktyki [HRM Critical Point of View – Theory and Practice Challenges]. In Z. Antczak, S. Borkowska (Eds.), *Przyszłość zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi. Dylematy i wyzwania [The Future of HRM – Dilemmas and Challenges]*, (pp. 32-34). Warszawa, Poland: Difin.
- Stuart-Kotze, R., & Dunn, Ch. (2011). *Gdzie są twoi najlepsi pracownicy [Where Are Your Best Employees]*. Warszawa, Poland: Oficyna a Wolters Kluwer business.
- Trepanier, S. G., Fernet, C., & Austin, A. (2013). Workplace Bullying and Psychological Health at Work: The Mediating Role of Satisfaction of Needs for Autonomy, Competence and Relatedness. *Work and Stress*, 27(2), 123-140.

- Wziętek-Staśko, A. (2006). Od zarządzania zasobami ludzkimi do zarządzania talentami [From HRM to Talent Management]. In L. Zbiegień-Maciąg, E. Beck (Ed.), *Zarządzanie ludźmi w otoczeniu globalnym – pomiędzy „starym” a „nowym”. Organizacje, ludzie, procesy, procedury [HRM in Global Environment, Between „Old” and „New”. Organisations, People, Processes, Procedures]*. Kraków, Poland: AGH Kraków, Uczelniane Wydawnictwa Naukowo – Dydaktyczne.
- Zakrzewska, L. (2013). Globalne i lokalne megatrendy w świecie kadr [Global and Local Megatrends in HRM World]. *Harvard Business Review*, 12.
- Zawadzak, T. (2014). *Zarządzanie w organizacjach sektora publicznego [Management in Public Sector Organisations]*. Warszawa, Poland: Difin.
- Zhang, Z., Wang, M., & Shi, J. (2012). Leader-Follower Congruence In Proactive Personality And Work Outcomes: The Mediating Role Of Leader-Member Exchange. *The Academy of Management Journal*, 55(1), 111-130.
- Zhao, H., & Wu, S. (2014). The Power of Motivation – Goal Fit in Predicting Entrepreneurial Persistence. *Social Behaviour and Personality*, 42(8), 1345-1352. doi: 10.2224/sbp.2014.42.8.1345
- Zhou, J. (2014). Mediating Role of Employee Emotions in the Relationship Between Authentic Leadership and Employee Innovation. *Social Behaviour & Personality*, 42(8), 1267-1278.