

## **An Alternative Model for Motivation in the Academe: An Exploratory Factor Analysis**

**MA. FLORECILLA C. CINCHES**  
ORCID NO. 0000-0001-7205-7733  
[fcinches@liceo.edu.ph](mailto:fcinches@liceo.edu.ph)  
Liceo de Cagayan University  
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

**RUTH LOVE V. RUSSELL**  
ORCID NO. 0000-0002-6585-7916  
[russell@xu.edu.ph](mailto:russell@xu.edu.ph)  
Xavier University-Ateneo de Cagayan  
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

**JUDITH C. CHAVEZ**  
ORCID NO. 0000-0003-2082-3015  
[jchavez302003@yahoo.com](mailto:jchavez302003@yahoo.com)  
Lourdes College  
Cagayan de Oro City, Philippines

### **ABSTRACT**

What works best to motivate the employee and engage them toward commitment have been unending inquiries in the workplace. The interest in the quest for appropriate motivation models is strengthened by widespread assumptions that a motivated workforce is a critical antecedent to the organization's productivity. This study verified Haefner's Fourth Theory of Motivation further after having used it as a program theory in redesigning the faculty evaluation scheme project of the University five years back where it saw that when team members are engaged, they contributed to the substantial outcome of the project. The first stage of this study has been completed after having classified the qualitative responses of 100 professionals in the academe. Using the guidelines of Heppner and Heppner (2004), the responses were

analyzed into core ideas and were categorized as general, typical, and variant. Core ideas were fitted into the constructs within each of the three-motivation queues: leadership, work environment, and individual psychology. Results of the qualitative responses confirmed most of the constructs in the motivational queues. The second stage of this study developed scales for each motivational queue. The scales were floated to 300 academics of three HEIs to test the validity and reliability of the constructs in the subsystems using exploratory factor analysis. Factors were clustered and confirmed most of the constructs in Haefner's motivational queues. To further validate the theoretical assumptions of the scales, confirmatory factor analysis is recommended.

**Keywords:** Motivation, leadership, work environment, individual psychology

## INTRODUCTION

The search for “what works” in employee motivation has been an unending inquiry in the workplace. Perhaps the interest in the quest for “appropriate” motivation models is strengthened by widespread assumptions that a motivated and engaged workforce is a critical antecedent to the organization's productivity. Oftentimes when not properly redirected, the complexities of organization elements combined with the unpredictable nature of human psychology can seriously inhibit a motivated workforce from sustaining engagement in the workplace.

Haefner's Fourth Theory of Motivation (2008) was generated from a case of the production team in an industry trying to recover production shortfall (Haefner, 2011). This study started when a planned change intervention on redesigning faculty evaluation scheme project relied heavily on the Haefner's Theory for its program theory support. Haefner's Theory was tested in an industrial scenario, but it was used in an academic workplace seeing the benefit of using the various motivation factors interact to form systemic motivation. Substantial outcomes were reported not only of producing the new faculty evaluation scheme as planned but also created a favorable organizational culture characterized by trust, wholesome social interaction, autonomy and self-efficacy (Cinches and Borbon, 2012). The fruitful progress and completion of the project may not have been possible had it not for highly motivated and engaged members of the study and consultative teams. The study supported Haefner's statement that motivation systems involve human psychological

states that are diverse, complex social mechanisms, and are less mechanistic than a functional organization process (Haefner, 2008). The positive result of the planned change intervention encouraged these authors to delve deeper into the theory with the aim of using this model as an alternative for motivating academics where team result is highly desired. There are practices of grouping academics into committees and/or groups for assigned tasks and oftentimes saw a member or two dominating the discussion and ending up with decisions that are not wholly owned by the whole group. This study is convinced that motivation has not been efficiently studied as a subsystem from the perspective of open systems theory. Using this theory as an alternative model for motivation in the academe may bring about leaders who encourage a non-threatening, more motivated, engaged, productive, and committed teachers to produce group outputs they can own and continuously support implementations. Exploring further into the theory in this study means identifying more distinct indicators of the variables that operate within the motivational queues, which can validate and confirm the fourth theory of motivation.

## FRAMEWORK

The Fourth Theory of Motivation (2008) was a result of Joseph Haefner's study. Methodically analyzing motivation models, he saw that many of the motivation models stressed more on inputs, others on the process (human behavior), and on the human performance outcome. While these are recognized by many practitioners, Haefner viewed these as disintegrated believing that motivation should be treated in the context of open systems. Haefner (2008) built his view on general systems theories of Bertalanffy, Laszlo, Skyttner, and Gladwell and posited that motivation is a systemic phenomenon that has four interacting subsystems of leadership, work environment, personal psychology, and deterrence orientation. He considers motivation as a critical subsystem and stresses that unless motivation is considered part of the bigger system, attempts to increase productivity may be pointless. He tested his model in an industry that had a production crisis. The experience offered deeper insights into strengthening his position on motivation; hence, thus giving birth to the Fourth Theory of Motivation. The inputs influence the process of task autonomy that affects human motivation, which, in turn, produces a performance output effect, which is a motivation effect. The environment subsystem fits into the

motivation subsystem, and the motivation subsystem fits within the organization system (Haefner, 2008).

This current study hinged on the Haefner's Fourth Theory of Motivation and recognized the presence of subsystems in systemic motivation. The subsystems are leadership, environment, and personalities-linked by core values in maintaining quality systems. The most recent researches have shown that the contemporary leader is characterized by the supportive leadership style that shows the leader's concern for subordinates well-being and their personal needs. Leadership behavior is open, friendly, and approachable, and the leader creates a team climate and treats subordinates as equals (Blanchard, 2009). Such leadership ensures the highest possible employees engagement in striving to achieve the company's goals, vis-à-vis productivity, employment, and a better standard of life (Buble, Juras, and Matić, 2014). Leadership has been studied to be one of the most influential factors that determine organizational learning and creativity (Hm Tse and Mitchell, 2010).

In the leadership subsystem, Haefner claimed that when launching into a project, leadership could introduce motivation queues such as intellectual stimulation, enabling formulation, goal setting, and clarifying task significance participative decision-making atmosphere to enable the employees as decision-makers. Intellectual stimulation means the capability of a leader to exercise the appropriate skills and knowledge for the situation. In their study, Sadeghi and Pihie, (2012) discussed intellectual stimulation as one of the dimensions of transformational leadership together with idealized influence, inspirational motivation, and individualized consideration. Other researchers considered intellectual stimulation to explain the degree to which the leaders stimulate their followers' endeavors to be innovative and creative (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008) and regarded old organizational problems with new perspectives (Moss & Ritossa, 2007).

In Haefner's case study, intellectual stimulation was the first motivational queue introduced by leadership. It is important that management ensures that projects are headed by leaders who can "exercise extensively the appropriate skills and knowledge for the situation." A Global Workforce Study in 2008 defined leadership as the driving force that engages employees to commit and be productive (Towers-Perrin, 2008). With the intellectual stimulation, enabling formulation follows, which means that the team is participants in solving the problem and enable them as decision-makers. This further means that the leader is one with the team and considered a co-equal participant (Haefner, 2011).

The above direction set by the leadership lays the ground in shaping the second source of motivation called work environment. Motivating environments encourage an organization to propel members to give their best effort to their jobs. According to Copozzoli (1997), a motivating environment exists with these conditions, namely, high standards, clear objectives, adequate training, adequate management contact, adequate feedback, rewards that employee's value, adequate working conditions, and effective leadership. Leadership is always viewed as a persistent element to initiate a motivating environment. This is established when the leadership can impress team members that they are trusted and empowered to make decisions for the achievement of project goals.

Haefner, however, said that "merely trusting and empowering workers" may not be sufficient. Cinches and Borbon, (2012) also cited that in a previous study participative decision-making, trust and interest alignment was generated in social interaction done through sustained brainstorming and consensus building that established the groundwork for strong intrinsic motivation. It is further assumed that developing trust is instrumental in arousing healthy social interaction and shared norms among group members when there are shared norms and high task interdependence and work as a team to solve the problem (Haefner, 2011). This process provides an ambiance of equals in the team where each opinion could be allowed to express and listened to. Brainstorming if managed well could reinforce trust as group members have the autonomy to decide on the project outcomes (Poitras and Bowen, 2002). Healthy work atmosphere can be more enriched with the collective efficacy of a work team. Bandura (1986 as cited by Kurt et al., 2012) defined collective efficacy as a group's shared a belief in its conjoint capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required for producing given levels of attainment. The root of this collective efficacy is self-efficacy. Bandura further identifies four sources of efficacy expectations: mastery of experiences, physiological and emotional states, vicarious experiences, and social persuasion.

It is not difficult to assume then that from this second environment queue according to Haefner emerges the third motivation queue called the individual psychology also dubbed as the "wild card in any social and organizational group." Given this leadership and environment, motivation queues in the system could lead to a ground work of positive mood, pro-social personality and agreeableness. Being self-determined and self-efficacious, motivation of group members emanates within themselves, thus, goal

regulation becomes a natural function (Haefner, 2011). Bandura maintains that self-efficacy is the belief in “one’s capabilities to organize and execute the courses of action required to produce given attainments.” Collective efficacy was positively associated with self-efficacy (Lev and Kolowsky, 2009). A group can have collective efficacy by sharing the belief that together they can organize and execute courses of action required to attain a common goal (Milner, 2012). This is also in support of Heffner’s systemic motivation that linked the three motivation queues with shared core values.

A fundamental rule in the fourth theory of motivation is that leadership has the responsibility to institute behaviors that become positive core values from which positive motivation may emerge. Leadership is the first and most important subsystem in systemic motivation. The other motivation subsystems are environment and individual psychology.

## OBJECTIVES OF THE STUDY

This study aimed to establish the validity and reliability of a formulated scale of motivation to verify Haefner’s Fourth Theory of Motivation in the academic setting using factor analysis.

## METHODS

The first phase of the study was qualitative in nature and a prelude to the second phase. It gathered qualitative information through open-ended questions on the various aspects of the motivational subsystems such as *situations that one looks forward to from leadership as sources of encouragement and motivation, to commit and be part of the successful productivity program; specific work environment that best stimulate an individual to work with the team and go extra mile without counting the cost; and qualities an individual person bring to best contribute to the completion of a team project.* These were floated to 100 graduate students of an HEI. All the responses participants were encoded verbatim; the diverse answers were content analyzed and coded individually. Experts and practitioners in psychology and management validated the content analysis prior to determining the final thematic categories for the responses to each of the research questions. These were categorized into themes and core ideas after data coding. Frequency counts of the responses under each thematic category were done. The categories and core ideas was also verified by a professional colleague and the

researchers. Using the guidelines of Heppner and Heppner (2004), the responses were analyzed into core ideas and were categorized as general, typical, and variant. General responses means almost all the participants indicated the response. Typical responses if stated at least by a fourth to half of the participants while responses labeled as variant were those mentioned by only one or two participants. There were no general responses, only typical and variant. Since the themes were already pre-identified using the constructs of each motivational queue, core ideas were fitted into the constructs within each subsystem/queue: leadership, work environment and individual psychology.

The second stage of this study developed scales for each subsystem termed as motivational queues. The item indicators were based from the typical responses of the first phase. The scales were floated to 300 academics of three HEIs to test the validity and reliability of the constructs in the subsystems using exploratory factor analysis. For factor analysis, the study used the Principal Axis Factor (PAF) with a Varimax (orthogonal) rotation of the Likert scale questions from the survey questionnaire, which was conducted to 300 participants. The analysis was suppressed at 0.45. The Kaiser-Meyer Olkin (KMO) measure of sampling adequacy was tested as well as the reliability using Cronbach's Alpha.

## RESULTS AND DISCUSSION

*First Phase:* The first open-ended question revolved around leadership traits, which were their sources of *encouragement and motivation*. The responses were to the major themes under *leadership*, which are as follows: intellectual stimulation, enabling formulation goal setting, participative decision making, extrinsic motivation, regulatory foci, job design, and task characteristics. From the themes, core ideas were generated. Included under leadership are core ideas that refer to each of the major themes. Under this theme were consultative and participative leadership, collaborative, committed, leadership by example, team building, and open-minded. High standard of integrity were the respondents' most recurrent responses. Next to this were goal-oriented, stability and confidence, goal-oriented, technically knowledgeable, creative, assertive, and productive as an integral part of the leadership. The thematic category of extrinsic motivation encompassed core ideas on members given recognition through reward system, proper delegation of task, proper monitoring and ideal working condition, reward system for business

partners and employees and compliments, compensation on the work done.

Responses were also categorized for work environment which generated eight thematic categories namely: interest alignment, shared norms, natural work units, organization values and dynamics, high task interdependence, intrinsic normative, autonomy and group rewards, low formalization, and trust. Open-ended question about *stimulating work environment was asked*. Describing the work environment that affects the worker is interest alignment characterized with members believing in the cause of their work and greater good, being passionate of their work and concern of their members, and manifesting teamwork/output orientation. Nonetheless, there is consistency in the notion of an ideal work environment. The respondents highlighted respect, friendliness, encouragement, and approachable leaders/managers. These concepts are interrelated with the other elements in the theory of motivation. Among the factors in the environment subsystem is *trust* which entailed safe and secured environment, trust and delegation among members, peaceful environment/open environment, non-competitive, full support for administration, and presence of trust. For High Task Interdependence, teams that are supportive and participative and are willing to work and handle pressure coupled with their expertise and interest in the completion of the project were stressed.

Under the subsystem of individual psychology, the frequency of the responses of the respondents was almost typical except for self-monitoring and goal regulation, which were classified as variant. This section collates the responses of the respondents on the question, *what qualities should individual person bring with him/her to best contribute to the completion of the project?* The finding in this dimension is closely interrelated to the responses on leadership and environment. Responses in this area mostly focused on the abilities, skills, and achievement of an individual as member and team player. In the theme, prosocial disposition the following are some of the salient responses: qualities manifesting self-respect and respect for others, discipline, patience and hard work, compassion, enthusiasm, resourceful and research oriented, cooperation, teamwork, commitment and interpersonal relations. On self-efficacy, the respondents highlighted the values of resourcefulness, cooperation, competence responsibility as well as sensitivity to other's needs. Attributable qualities such as being assertive, open-minded, confident, motivated, optimistic, hardworking, self-directed, positive thinking, and optimistic also came to the fore. For Agreeable Disposition, the sterling qualities believed to be



of prime importance in effecting best contributions to the completion of the project are: being cooperative, considerate, determined to help others, innovative, goal-oriented, flexible, organized, hardworking, confident, and open-minded. Furthermore, the responses given by the respondents on the theme of Intrinsic Motivation included team members qualities such as striving for excellent completion of the project, being team players, thinkers, and participative. Being knowledgeable and passionate to do the work and having helping attitude were also evident in their responses.

*Second Phase.* For the *Leadership queue*, Table 1 shows the PAF with a Varimax (orthogonal) rotation of the 19 Likert scale questions from the *Leadership* scale items, further examination of the Kaiser-Meyer Olkin measure of sampling adequacy suggested that the sample was factorable (KMO=.894). Seven factors with eigenvalues higher than 1 were found that explained the following percentages of the total variance: 39.13% (first factor), 8.5% (second factor), and more than 6% in the remaining factors; that is, a total of more than 59% of the variance was explained by this set of factors, which suggests the specificity of each item, and the multidimensional character of the construct, even when there is a common part shared by all of the items. These percentages of variance also revealed the greater importance of the first factor, as the first necessary characteristic of leadership called *Intellectual Stimulation*.

Nine items loaded into factor one called *Intellectual Stimulation*. *Leadership* traits such as being *consultative and participative, open minded, delegate well defined tasks, share resources and opportunity for learning, compliment members for work done, committed to accomplishing the vision-mission-goals, show respect and professionalism, and technically knowledgeable* were noted. Other researchers considered intellectual stimulation to explain the degree in which the leaders stimulate their followers endeavors to be innovative and creative (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008), and consider old organizational problems with new perspectives (Moss & Ritossa, 2007). The items under this factor validated the characteristics of a contemporary leader exhibiting support, open, friendly, and approachable behaviors (Blanchard, 2014) that ensures highest possible employee engagement in achieving company's goals (Buble, Juras, and Matic, 2014). Further, intellectual stimulation is the first motivational queue introduced by leadership.

Five items loaded into the second factor related into empowering members of the

team as decision-makers, the leader is part of the group and not a boss exemplifying that a modern leader also creates a team climate and treats subordinates as equals (Haefner, 2008; Blanchard, 2009). *Factor Two* included “*leading by example*”, “*is a good listener and listens with the heart*”, “*is creative*”, “*exhibits high standard of integrity*”, and “*monitors accomplishment of tasks.*” *Factor two* is regarded as “*Enabling Formulation.*” Enabling formulation means team members participate in problem solving and enable them as decision-makers.

Three items that load into *Factor Three* was categorized as “*Extrinsic Motivation.*” It included “*recognizes members’ contribution for work done*”, “*compensates/incentivize members for work done*”, and “*initiates team building.*” Copozzoli (1997) emphasizes that a motivating environment exists when rewards that employees value are present in the workplace.

*Factor four* includes items that are labeled as “*Goal Setting*”, specifically “*shows stability and excellence*” and “*aims for excellence.*” Under the leadership subsystem, 19 factors under five major themes were initially examined. The five major themes are reduced into four to include: *intellectual stimulation*, *enabling formulation*, *extrinsic motivation*, and *goal setting*. The theme participative decision making is presumed to be subsumed under intellectual stimulation. Likewise, regulatory foci, was subsumed participative decision making. The results of an orthogonal rotation of the solution are shown in Table 2.

Table 1

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.894
Approx. Chi-Square		2504.166
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	df	171
	Sig.	.000

Table 2

*Factor Loadings for Rotated Component of 19 Survey Items (Leadership)*

COMPONENTS	1	2	3	4
LT12 shares a common purpose/goal among team mates	.655	.113	.188	.168
LT3 is open minded	.629	.403	.111	.109

Table 2 Continued

COMPONENTS	1	2	3	4
LT6 shares resources and opportunity for learning	.599	.323	.181	.163
LT16 monitors accomplishment of tasks	.588		.490	.158
LT1 uses consultative and participative leadership	.580	.186		
LT13 delegates well defined tasks to each member of the team	.571	.192	.163	.109
LT2 is committed to accomplishing the vision-mission-goals	.464	.257		.224
LT14 shows respect and professionalism	.428	.267	.104	.170
LT8 is technically knowledgeable	.420	.211	.223	.157
LT4 is a good listener and listens with the heart	.326	.698	.220	
LT7 leads by example	.239	.697		
LT5 is creative	.251	.667	.268	.123
LT11 exhibits high standard of integrity	.138	.591	.247	.316
LT15 monitors accomplishment of tasks	.259	.499	.351	.143
LT18 compensates /incentivize members for work done	.169	.244	.748	
LT17 compliments members for work done	.136	.354	.693	
LT19 recognizes members' contribution through rewards	.390	.142	.438	.146
LT10 exudes stability and excellence	.269	.178	.112	.883
LT9 aims for excellence	.373		.177	.459
<b>Eigenvalues</b>	<b>7.434</b>	<b>1.616</b>	<b>1.259</b>	<b>1.041</b>
<b>Percent of Total Variance</b>	<b>39.128</b>	<b>8.505</b>	<b>6.625</b>	<b>5.481</b>
<b>Number of Test Measure</b>	<b>9</b>	<b>5</b>	<b>3</b>	<b>2</b>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring.  
 Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.  
 a. Rotation converged in 6 iterations.

Leadership is one of the most influential factors that determine organizational learning and creativity; it directly controls the motivation subsystems and has a profound responsibility in systematic motivation (HmTse and Mitchell, 2010; Haefner and Makrigeorgis, 2008). This theory in review also conceived that from *Leadership*, the subsystem of *Work Environment* emerges. Table 3 shows the PAF with a Varimax (orthogonal) rotation of the 20 Survey items from the *Work Environment* scale and of sampling adequacy suggested that the sample was factorable (KMO=.920).

*Work Environment*. Table 4 shows the four factors with eigenvalues higher than 1 were likewise found that explained the following percentages of the total variance: 42.70% (first factor), and almost 6% in the remaining factors.

Table 3

*KMO and Bartlett's Test*

Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.920
Approx. Chi-Square		3242.058
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Df	210
	Sig.	.000

Table 4

*Factor Loadings for Rotated Component of 21 Survey Items (Work Environment)*

COMPONENTS	1	2	3	4
WE17 are willing to work and handle pressure	.808	.261	.235	.151
WE18 show interest in the completion of the project	.751	.224	.217	.299
WE20 are happy to be in the team	.638	.374	.130	.261
WE19 have the courage to strive harder to complete the task	.629	.339	.243	.146
WE16 are friendly and approachable	.603	.329	.182	.261
WE11 has clear direction and goals	.505	.154	.468	
WE2 shows concern among members in the workplace	.413	.651		.132
WE6 creates an atmosphere of encouragement and cooperation	.246	.610	.362	
WE5 brings out the best of the individual	.128	.539	.287	.133
WE4 values teamwork	.104	.525	.246	.115
WE7 promotes safety and secured environment	.337	.500	.159	.248
WE14 have the same goal	.398	.485	.245	.330
WE1 believes in the cause for greater good	.293	.471		.387
WE3 focuses on outputs or results	.255	.395		.168
WE15 are friendly and approachable	.276	.293	.211	.244
WE12 provides professional development	.178	.243	.714	.132
WE13 provides continuing formation to team members	.352	.284	.503	.207
WE10 addresses cultural diversity in the workplace	.256		.417	.626
WE21 inspire each other	.339	.222	.217	.527
WE8 is non-competitive		.133		.520
WE9 is open an peaceful	.333	.307	.241	.354
<b>Eigenvalues</b>	<b>8.966</b>	<b>1.256</b>	<b>1.222</b>	<b>1.154</b>
<b>Percent of Total Variance</b>	<b>42.696</b>	<b>5.982</b>	<b>5.819</b>	<b>5.493</b>
<b>Number of Test Measure</b>	<b>6</b>	<b>8</b>	<b>2</b>	<b>4</b>

Extraction Method: Principal Axis

Factoring.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization; Rotation converged in 9 iterations.

This also means, a total of more than 59.9% of the variance was explained by this set of factors, which suggests the specificity of each item, and the multidimensional character of the construct, even when there is a common part shared by all of the items.

The six items that load to Factor 1 was “*High Task Interdependence*” which characterized the environment as having people “*showing interest in the completion of project*”; “*having the courage to strive harder to complete the task*”; “*are happy to be in the team*”; “*working in harmony for task attainment*”; “*willing to work and handle pressure*”; and “*have clear direction and goals*”. This finding is upheld by Copozzoli (1997) who postulated that a motivating environment exists when certain conditions such as high standards, clear objectives, adequate training and feedback, and other factors including effective leadership permeate in the workplace. Seven items loaded for Factor 2 related to *Interest Alignment* described as an environment where people “*show concern among members in the workplace*”; “*creates an atmosphere of encouragement and cooperation*”; “*values teamwork*”; “*brings out the best in the individual*”; “*promotes safety and secured environment*”; “*have the same goal*”; and “*believes in the cause for greater good*”. In this context, effective leadership is also viewed as a persistent element to initiate a motivating environment. Cinches and Borbon (2012) in a previous study also pointed out that participative decision-making which is encouraged by the leadership, generated trust, and interest alignment emanating during the social interactions, sustained brainstorming, and consensus building.

The two items loading for Factor 3 identified organizational values and dynamics labeled as an environment that “*provides professional development*” and “*continuing formation of team members*”. Indicators for Factor 4 highlighted *Trust* as depicted in an environment which “*addresses cultural diversity in the workplace*”, “*where members are non-competitive*”, and “*members inspire each other*”. Trust is related to climate of openness, collegiality, professionalism, and authenticity (Tschannen-Moran and Hoy, 1998). This is believed to have established the groundwork for strong intrinsic motivation. The researchers further assumed that developing trust is instrumental in arousing healthy social interaction and shared norms among group members when there are shared norms and high task interdependence and work as a team to solve the problem (Haefner, 2011). A motivating environment as a subsystem is generally expected to sustain the ambiance that would encourage each team player to engage in the task on hand in a natural work setting where everyone’s interest to work are

collectively aligned in shared norms and high task interdependence.

*Individual Psychology.* Table 5 shows the adequacy of the sample given KMO= .931. Table 6 likewise presents the five factors with eigenvalues higher than 1 were also found that explained the following percentages of the total variance: 44% (first factor), and 6.6% (second factor) and almost 6% in the remaining factors; that is, a total of more than 65% of the variance was explained by this set of factors, which further implies specificity of each item, and the multidimensional character of the construct, even when there is a common part shared by all the items.

Haefner believes that the “intertwine of various personality traits with other elements in the organization affect motivation and productivity of individuals”. *Factor one* involves “*understanding individual differences*”, “*being generous, considerate of others, helpful, participative*”, and “*willing to innovate ideas for the completion of the project*”. Six items loaded into factor one termed as “*Prosocial Disposition*”. The said disposition composed of significant personality factors that involve the capacity to want to help others beyond the normal working scope (Haefner, 2011).

Five items loaded into the *second factor* under. These items relate to members being “*resourceful, open-minded, positive thinker, versatile, humble, and sincere*”. This factor is labeled as “*Self-Efficacy*”. Items for factor three identified team members as having dedication to the completion of tasks as reflected in “*manifests self-respect and respect for others*”, “*exhibits good interpersonal relations*”, “*communicates openly with the team*”, “*shows discipline and challenging work*”, and “*knowledgeable of one’s responsibility*”. *Factor three* is “*Commitment*”.

The three items that loaded into *factor four* has to do with the members’ disposition or approach toward work described as having team members who are “*familiar with the project’s timeline*”, “*less complaining and finger pointing*”, and “*delivering without hesitation one’s best capacities for the accomplishment of the group’s objectives*”. *Factor four* is identified as “*Positive Mood and Attitude*”.

Table 5

*KMO and Bartlett's Test*

KMO and Bartlett's		
Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin Measure of Sampling Adequacy.		.931
Bartlett's Test of Sphericity	Approx. Chi-Square	4447.197
	Df	300
	Sig.	.000

Table 6

*Factor Loadings for Rotated Component of 25 Survey Items (Individual Psychology)*

COMPONENTS	1	2	3	4	5
IP17 understand individual differences in diversified workplace	.675	.222	.199	.170	.213
IP12 be generous	.675	.322	.233	.131	.257
IP18 be considerate with others	.614	.157	.290	.305	
IP13 be helpful	.608	.278	.250	.209	.298
IP20 be a participative team player	.570	.225	.173	.373	.134
IP19 be willing to share innovative ideas for the completion of the	.565	.290	.206	.337	
IP16 be organized	.423	.283	.274	.300	.165
IP22 exude passion for work	.385	.218	.278	.381	.300
IP9 be resourceful		.765	.248	.106	.339
IP10 be open-minded	.298	.723		.149	.115
IP14 be a positive thinker	.232	.636	.201		.151
IP21 be humble and sincere	.422	.572	.250	.207	
IP7 be versatile	.227	.566	.321	.152	
IP5 manifest self- respect and respect for others	.189	.228	.726	.127	.114
IP4 exhibit good interpersonal relations	.290	.168	.643	.225	
IP3 be able to communicate with the team	.346	.267	.582	.151	.212
IP6 shows discipline and hard work	.318	.238	.548	.202	.171
IP2 be knowledgeable of one's responsibility		.159	.527	.345	.321
IP11 be innovative	.147	.283	.418	.110	.350
IP24 be familiar with the project's timeline	.319	.179	.107	.687	
IP23 render the extra mile for task completion	.213	.103	.108	.593	.581
IP25 be less complaining and finger pointing	.167		.186	.547	

Table 6 Continued

COMPONENTS	1	2	3	4	5
IP1 deliver accomplishment, without hesitation	.200	.166	.349	.495	.253
IP8 be optimistic and motivated	.260	.310	.307		.589
IP15 be assertive	.328	.135	.284	.147	.389
Eigenvalues	11.072	1.640	1.440	1.078	1.047
Percent of Total Variance	44.288	6.560	5.761	4.313	4.188
Number of Test Measure	8	5	6	4	2

Extraction Method: Principal Axis Factoring. Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization. Rotation converged in 8 iterations

Moreover, *Factor Five* under team member has a load of two items illustrating team members as “optimistic and motivated” and “assertive”. This factor is referred to as “*Self Determination*”. Haefner (2011) describes individual psychology as a wild card in any social and organizational group. Given the adequate leadership and environment motivation queues in the system is believed to have led the appropriate ground work for pro-social personality, self-efficacy, commitment, positive mood and attitudes, and self-determination.

## CONCLUSIONS

This study outlined a wide range of indicators that described the numerous factors in the motivational queues in the subsystem. The exploratory factor analysis conducted for each scale of the queue culled some items and had defined various item statement that maybe used to develop the scale. Most of the assumptions of Haefner’s Fourth Theory of Motivation were verified given the results of the study. The scale for this theory can already be formulated based on the results of the study. However, there is still a need to further pilot the scale in studies and conduct confirmatory factor analysis to strengthen the position of the theory on motivation further. Consequently, this scale development study is of significance for filing the gap in the literature.



## LITERATURE CITED

- Blanchard, K. (2009). *Leading at a higher level*. New Jersey: Upper Saddle River.
- Buble, M., Juras, A. and Matic, I. (2014). The relationship between managers' leadership styles and motivation. *Management*, 19(1), 161-193 Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/1545865465/fulltextPDF/268A4296F6FC4110PQ/16?accountid=139409>
- Cinches, F. & Borbon, L.F. (2012). Redesigning the faculty evaluation scheme: Building a culture of trust, self- efficacy, autonomy in participative decision-making. *Asian Scientific Journals*, 8(1). <http://asianscientificjournals.com/new/publication/index.php/ljher/article/view/313>
- Capozzoli, T. (1997). *Creating a motivating environment for employees*. SuperVision 58.4(Apr 1997): 16-17. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/195594425/fulltext/81D4DAC358CA4726PQ/4?accountid>
- Haefner, J.J. (2011). The fourth theory of motivation. *Industrial Management*, 53(2), 17-21. (2008). Principles of Social System. Walden University.
- Heppner, P. & Heppner, M. (2004). *Writing and publishing your thesis, Dissertation And research: A guide for students in the helping professions*. Belmont, CA: Thomson Brooks Cole.
- Hm Tse, H. and Mitchell, R. (2010). A theoretical model of transformational leadership and knowledge creation: The role of open-mindedness norms and leader-member exchange. *Journal of Management & Organization*, 16, 83-99. Retrieved from <http://search.proquest.com/docview/346969886/fulltextPDF/1F06434322EE4DD5PQ/3?accountid=139409>

- Kurt, T., Duyar, I., & Calik, T. (2012). Are we legitimate yet? A closer look at the casual relationship mechanisms among principal leadership, teacher self-Efficacy and collective efficacy. *Journal of Management Development*, 31(1), 71 – 86.
- Lev, S., and Kolowsky, M. (2009). Moderating the collective and self-efficacy relationship. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 47(4).
- Limsila, K., & Ogunlana, S.O. (2008). Performance and leadership outcome correlates of leadership styles and subordinate commitment. *Engineering, Construction and Architectural Management*, 15(2), 164-184.
- Poitras, J., Bowen, R. (2002). A framework for understanding consensus-building initiation. *Negotiation Journal*, 18(3). ProQuest ph. 211.
- Milner, H. R. (2012). A case study of an experienced english teacher's self-efficacy and persistence through 'Crisis' situations: Theoretical and Practical Considerations. *The High School Journal*, 86(1), October-November 2002, 28-35.
- Moss, S.A., & Ritossa, D.A. (2007). The impact of goal orientation on the association between leadership style and follower performance, creativity and work attitudes. *Leadership & Organization Development Journal*, 3(4), 433-456.
- Sadeghi, A. and Pihie, A. (2012). Transformational leadership and its predictive effects on leadership effectiveness. *International Journal of Business and Social Science*, 3(7), 186.

### ACKNOWLEDGMENTS

The authors gratefully acknowledge Dr. Joseph Haefner for allowing us to use his Fourth Theory of Motivation.