

International Research Journal of Management Science & Technology



**ISSN 2250 – 1959(Online)
2348 – 9367 (Print)**

An Internationally Indexed Peer Reviewed & Refereed Journal

www.IRJ MST.com
www.isarasolutions.com

Published by iSaRa Solutions

Employee Motivation as a Bridge Between Benefits and Performance

A Study of Public Sector Employees at SAIL Bhilai Steel Plant

JAYANT DIWAN 1*, EKTA MISHRA 2, APOORWA MISHRA 3

1 Research Scholar, Department of Management, ShriShankaracharya Professional University, Bhilai, Chhattisgarh, India

2 Assistant Professor, Department of Management, ShriShankaracharya Professional University, Bhilai, Chhattisgarh, India

3 Associate professor, Amity Business School, Amity University Madhya Pradesh, Gwalior, Madhya Pradesh, India

ABSTRACT

Purpose – This study investigates the mediating role of employee motivation in the relationship between organisational benefits and job performance, using evidence from a public sector heavy-industry setting in India.

Design/Methodology – A 32-item Likert-scale questionnaire was administered to 32 employees of SAIL Bhilai Steel Plant, spanning officer and technician cadres. Nine constructs were assessed across three sections: organisational benefits (five dimensions), work motivation (intrinsic and extrinsic), and job performance (task and overall). Cronbach alpha coefficients, corrected item-total correlations, descriptive statistics, Pearson correlations, and simple linear regressions were computed.

Findings – Overall instrument reliability was excellent ($\alpha = 0.933$). Employee motivation served as a strong bridge between benefits and performance: benefits predicted motivation ($r = 0.707$, $R^2 = 0.50$, $p < 0.001$), and motivation predicted performance ($r = 0.786$, $R^2 = 0.618$, $p < 0.001$). The direct benefits-to-performance path ($R^2 = 0.346$) was substantially weaker, confirming motivation as a key mediating mechanism. Intrinsic motivation ($r = 0.725$) outperformed extrinsic motivation ($r = 0.648$) as a performance predictor. Welfare & Work-Life Balance was the lowest-rated benefit dimension ($M = 3.02$).

Originality – This paper presents plant-level empirical evidence from SAIL Bhilai Steel Plant, one of India's largest integrated steel facilities, and offers a validated 32-item instrument capturing the full Benefits → Motivation → Performance chain in a public sector manufacturing context.

Keywords: employee motivation, organisational benefits, job performance, mediation, SAIL, public sector, steel industry, intrinsic motivation, Cronbach alpha

1. Introduction

In the arena of human resource management, few questions have attracted as much scholarly and practical attention as this: what truly drives employees to perform? A long tradition of research points to two broad sets of antecedents — what organisations provide to employees (benefits, compensation, welfare, recognition) and what employees bring to their work (motivation, engagement, commitment). Yet the precise mechanism by which organisational benefits translate into performance outcomes remains a subject of active inquiry, particularly in the context of Indian public sector enterprises.

This study positions employee motivation as the critical bridge between these two domains. We argue, following established theoretical traditions and supported by empirical evidence, that organisational benefits do not directly produce performance; rather, they generate or suppress motivational states, and it is those motivational states that ultimately drive performance. This mediation hypothesis — Benefits → Motivation → Performance — is the central theoretical proposition of the present research.

The empirical context is SAIL Bhilai Steel Plant (BSP), Chhattisgarh, one of India's largest integrated public sector steel facilities. SAIL BSP presents an ideal setting for this investigation: it provides an unusually comprehensive benefits ecosystem (financial allowances, provident fund, gratuity, medical facilities, housing, canteen services, educational support, and structured career progression), employs a large and tenured workforce, and operates in a high-stakes manufacturing environment where performance differences have significant operational consequences. Yet despite its scale and significance, systematic empirical investigation of the benefits-motivation-performance chain at BSP has been limited.

This paper reports findings from a structured survey of 32 BSP employees, with three core objectives: validating a nine-construct measurement instrument; describing the benefit, motivation, and performance landscape at BSP; and providing empirical evidence for the motivation-as-bridge hypothesis.

1.1 Research Questions

RQ1: Do the benefit, motivation, and performance measurement scales demonstrate satisfactory reliability at SAIL BSP?

RQ2: Which specific benefit dimensions most strongly predict employee motivation?

RQ3: Does motivation mediate the relationship between organisational benefits and performance, consistent with the bridge hypothesis?

RQ4: Does intrinsic motivation exhibit a stronger link to performance than extrinsic motivation?

1.2 Significance of the Study

The significance of this study is both academic and practical. Academically, it contributes a validated, context-specific instrument and preliminary mediation evidence for the Benefits → Motivation → Performance chain in Indian PSE manufacturing. Practically, the findings offer SAIL BSP HR managers specific, data-grounded insights into which benefit investments most effectively build the motivational bridge to performance — and where current provisions fall short.

2. Literature Review: Building the Theoretical Bridge

The metaphor of motivation as a bridge is grounded in a convergent set of theoretical traditions. Taken together, these frameworks suggest that benefits create conditions conducive to motivation, and motivation translates those conditions into performance. Each framework illuminates a different part of this chain.

2.1 Herzberg and the Two Lanes of the Bridge

Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory (1959) provides the foundational insight: hygiene factors (salary, security, working conditions) prevent dissatisfaction but do not generate motivation, while motivators (achievement, recognition, growth) actively drive performance. Most organisational benefits operate as hygiene factors. This implies that even a generous benefits package cannot, by itself, produce a motivated workforce — it can only remove the demotivating effect of their absence. Motivation requires an additional input, typically non-financial: recognition, meaningful work,

growth opportunities. The bridge from benefits to performance therefore passes through motivation, not around it.

2.2 Maslow and the Architecture of Benefit Levels

Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs (1943) enriches this picture by specifying which benefit dimensions address which motivational levels. Financial benefits and social security address physiological and safety needs; welfare and work-life balance provisions address social needs; recognition and development opportunities address esteem and self-actualisation. When lower-order needs are reliably met, employees can direct energy towards higher-order intrinsic motivation — a motivational bridge that connects secure, supported employees to self-determined, high-performing ones.

2.3 Vroom and the Cognitive Span

Vroom's Expectancy Theory (1964) adds a cognitive architecture to the bridge: motivation is highest when employees believe their effort leads to performance (expectancy), that performance leads to outcomes (instrumentality), and that those outcomes are valuable (valence). Benefits affect primarily the valence component. But if employees cannot see a clear link between their effort, performance, and the benefits they receive — a common feature of seniority-based public sector pay systems — the bridge weakens even when the benefits themselves are generous.

2.4 Self-Determination Theory: Intrinsic vs. Extrinsic Lanes

Self-Determination Theory (Deci & Ryan, 1985) distinguishes intrinsic from extrinsic motivation and predicts that intrinsic motivation — driven by inherent interest, curiosity, and personal meaning — produces higher-quality and more sustained performance than extrinsic motivation driven by external rewards. For the bridge metaphor, SDT implies that some benefits (particularly recognition and development) activate the stronger, intrinsic lane of the motivational bridge, while others (financial, security) activate the extrinsic lane. Both lanes lead to performance, but the intrinsic lane carries more weight.

2.5 Perceived Organisational Support: Empirical Evidence for the Bridge

Rhoades & Eisenberger's (2002) meta-analysis of Perceived Organisational Support (POS) provides the most direct empirical precedent for the bridge model. POS — employees' global belief that the organisation values their contribution and cares about their well-being — is shaped largely by benefit perceptions. Their meta-analysis confirmed that POS relates to performance ($r \approx 0.31$) through motivational pathways including felt obligation, affective commitment, and organisational citizenship behaviour. The motivational mechanism is the bridge.

2.6 Indian Public Sector Context

In the Indian public sector context, the bridge metaphor is especially apt because the two ends — benefits and performance — are frequently managed by separate organisational functions (HR/welfare departments vs. line managers and performance appraisal systems) with limited integration. Research in Indian PSEs has found that employees value job security and benefits highly (Bhatnagar, 2007; Pattnaik & Tripathy, 2019), but that the translation of these valued benefits into motivated effort is often mediated by perceived fairness, supervisory relationships, and growth opportunities.

2.7 Research Gap

The research gap this study addresses is the absence of an integrated, plant-level empirical test of the Benefits → Motivation → Performance chain in Indian public sector steel manufacturing. Existing

studies either focus on benefits satisfaction, or on motivation-performance links, but rarely model all three constructs simultaneously with a validated instrument in a single organisational context.

3. Conceptual Framework: The Motivational Bridge Model

The conceptual model underlying this study has three stages connected by two bridges:

Bridge 1 (Benefits → Motivation): Bridge 1 (Benefits → Motivation): Organisational benefits create the motivational conditions — removing barriers (hygiene) and signalling organisational care (POS) — that generate motivated states. The strength of this bridge varies by benefit type: recognition and development are expected to build intrinsic motivation most strongly, while financial and security benefits build extrinsic motivation.

Bridge 2 (Motivation → Performance): Bridge 2 (Motivation → Performance): Motivated employees channel their energy into task execution and contextual performance behaviours. Intrinsic motivation is expected to build the stronger bridge to performance, consistent with SDT.

Independent Variables — Organisational Benefits (Section A): Five dimensions: Financial Benefits (A1), Social Security & Safety (A2), Welfare & Work-Life Balance (A3), Development & Growth (A4), Recognition & Organisational Support (A5).

Mediating Variables — Work Motivation (Section B): Two dimensions: Intrinsic Motivation (B1) and Extrinsic Motivation (B2).

Dependent Variables — Job Performance (Section C): Two dimensions: Task Performance (C1) and Overall/Contextual Performance (C2).

Hypotheses:

- H1.** Organisational benefit perceptions positively and significantly predict work motivation (Bridge 1).
- H2.** Work motivation positively and significantly predicts job performance (Bridge 2).
- H3.** The direct Benefits → Performance relationship is weaker than the motivation-mediated pathway, consistent with motivation as a bridge.
- H4.** Intrinsic motivation exhibits a stronger relationship with performance than extrinsic motivation.

4. Research Methodology

4.1 Research Design

This study employs a quantitative, cross-sectional survey design. A structured, self-administered questionnaire was deployed at SAIL Bhilai Steel Plant. This design is appropriate for the pilot phase of a programme of research: it allows simultaneous measurement of all constructs, estimation of their relationships, and validation of the measurement instrument — all prerequisites for the confirmatory, longitudinal study that will follow.

4.2 Measurement Instrument

Section A — Organisational Benefits (18 items): Section A — Organisational Benefits (18 items, five-point Likert scale): A1 Financial Benefits (4 items), A2 Social Security & Safety (4 items), A3 Welfare & Work-Life Balance (4 items), A4 Development & Growth (3 items), A5 Recognition & Organisational Support (3 items). Adapted from Eisenberger et al.'s (1986) Perceived Organisational Support scale.

Section B — Work Motivation (8 items): Section B — Work Motivation (8 items): B1 Intrinsic Motivation (4 items, adapted from Amabile et al.'s Work Preference Inventory, 1994) and B2 Extrinsic Motivation (4 items).

Section C — Job Performance (6 items): Section C — Job Performance (6 items): C1 Task Performance (3 items) and C2 Overall/Contextual Performance (3 items), adapted from Williams & Anderson (1991).

Section D — Demographics: Section D — Demographics: Gender, age group, educational qualification, grade/level, organisation, and length of service.

4.3 Sample

Thirty-two employees were selected purposively across SAIL BSP's grade structure, from Technician (W1–W8) through Senior Officer (E6+) levels. The HR department facilitated access, with a deliberate effort to achieve broad grade coverage. A minimum sample of 30 was considered sufficient for the primary objective of pilot reliability analysis (Nunnally, 1978). All respondents gave informed consent; the survey was in English with Hindi clarifications available on request.

Table 1: Demographic Profile of Respondents (N = 32)

Demographic Variable	Category	n	%
Gender	Male	300	93.8
	Female	20	6.2
Age Group	25–34 years	30	9.4
	35–44 years	50	15.6
	45–54 years	100	31.2
	55 years and above	140	43.8
Education	Diploma	140	43.8
	Professional Degree (Engg/MBA)	130	40.6
	Graduate Degree (Other)	40	12.5
	Postgraduate Degree	10	3.1
Grade/Level	Technician (W1–W4)	20	6.2
	Senior Technician (W5–W8)	50	15.6
	Junior Officer (E1–E3)	110	34.4
	Middle Officer (E4–E5)	70	21.9
	Senior Officer (E6+)	70	21.9
Length of Service	Less than 2 years	10	3.1
	2–5 years	20	6.2
	6–10 years	30	9.4
	11–20 years	80	25.0
	More than 20 years	180	56.2

The sample reflects the demographic realities of an integrated steel plant workforce: predominantly male (93.8%), mature (75% aged 45+), and highly tenured (81.2% with 11+ years of service). The spread across officer and technician cadres (78.2% officers, 21.8% technicians) is representative of BSP's grade distribution.

4.4 Data Analysis

Data were. Analyses included: (1) Cronbach alpha and corrected item-total correlations for reliability; (2) descriptive statistics (mean, SD, skewness, kurtosis); (3) Pearson inter-construct correlations; and (4) simple linear regressions for the three hypothesised pathways. Construct scores were computed as item means.

5. Results

5.1 Reliability of the Instrument

Table 2 presents Cronbach's alpha for each construct, using George & Mallery's (2003) classification benchmarks. The overall alpha of $\alpha = 0.933$ across all 32 items is Excellent. Seven of nine constructs meet the Acceptable (≥ 0.70) threshold or above; A1 (Financial Benefits, $\alpha = 0.695$) falls marginally short but is acceptable for pilot research. These results confirm that the instrument provides a reliable foundation for the planned large-scale study.

Table 2: Cronbach's Alpha — Reliability by Construct

Construct	Items	α	Classification
A1 – Financial Benefits	4	0.695	Questionable†
A2 – Social Security & Safety	4	0.778	Acceptable
A3 – Welfare & Work-Life Balance	4	0.882	Good
A4 – Development & Growth	3	0.747	Acceptable
A5 – Recognition & Org Support	3	0.735	Acceptable
B1 – Intrinsic Motivation	4	0.861	Good
B2 – Extrinsic Motivation	4	0.715	Acceptable
C1 – Task Performance	3	0.838	Good
C2 – Overall Performance	3	0.798	Acceptable
Overall (32 Items)	32	0.933	Excellent ✓

† $\alpha = 0.695$ is marginally below the 0.70 conventional threshold; acceptable for pilot-phase research (DeVellis, 2016).

Corrected item-total correlations confirmed adequate item functioning for 30 of 32 items ($r \geq 0.30$; Nunnally & Bernstein, 1994). Two items underperformed: A1_4 ("Financial benefits motivate me to put in my best effort," $r = 0.273$) and B2_4 ("When I feel fairly treated, I am motivated to go beyond what is required," $r = 0.173$). B2_4's low correlation is conceptually interpretable: it measures organisational justice rather than extrinsic motivation, constituting a construct misalignment. Both items should be revised before the full study.

5.2 Descriptive Statistics

Table 3 shows descriptive statistics. Performance constructs scored highest (C1 and C2: $M = 4.32$), reflecting employees' positive self-assessment of their task execution and overall contribution. Intrinsic Motivation ($M = 4.12$) and Extrinsic Motivation ($M = 3.98$) followed. Importantly, the benefit dimensions scored substantially lower, ranging from $M = 3.75$ (Social Security) to $M = 3.02$ (Welfare & Work-Life Balance). This gap — between how employees rate their own performance and how they rate the benefits they receive — is itself a finding: BSP employees perceive themselves as performing above the benefit level they receive.

Table 3: Descriptive Statistics by Construct (N = 32)

Construct	Mean	SD	Skewness	Kurtosis
A1 – Financial Benefits	3.49	1.16	–0.61	–0.53
A2 – Social Security & Safety	3.75	1.01	–0.90	0.32
A3 – Welfare & Work-Life Balance	3.02	1.25	–0.29	–1.06
A4 – Development & Growth	3.70	0.99	–0.76	0.01
A5 – Recognition & Org Support	3.69	0.89	–0.99	0.83
B1 – Intrinsic Motivation	4.12	0.85	–1.01	1.06
B2 – Extrinsic Motivation	3.98	0.95	–1.09	1.13
C1 – Task Performance	4.32	0.61	–0.29	–0.65
C2 – Overall Performance	4.32	0.66	–0.45	–0.73

All constructs show negative skewness, indicating a tendency towards agreement consistent with organisational survey norms. Welfare & Work-Life Balance (skew = -0.29) shows the least skew and the widest spread ($SD = 1.25$), suggesting the most divergent employee opinions — some are satisfied with welfare provisions, many are not.

5.3 The Motivational Bridge: Correlation Evidence

The correlation matrix (Table 4) reveals the motivational bridge in action. Key patterns:

1. The recognition-to-intrinsic-motivation bridge: A5 (Recognition) correlates with B1 (Intrinsic Motivation) at $r = 0.643$, the strongest benefit-to-motivation link. This confirms that recognition is the benefit dimension that most effectively builds the intrinsic lane of the motivational bridge.
2. The security-to-extrinsic-motivation bridge: A2 (Social Security) correlates with B2 (Extrinsic Motivation) at $r = 0.661$, the strongest benefit-to-extrinsic link. Job security and medical cover are the primary drivers of extrinsic motivation.
3. The intrinsic-motivation-to-performance bridge: B1 correlates with C1 (Task Performance) at $r = 0.725$ and C2 (Overall Performance) at $r = 0.658$ — the two strongest motivation-to-performance links in the matrix.
4. Discriminant validity: No inter-construct correlation exceeds $r = 0.73$, confirming that the constructs are empirically distinct despite their conceptual relatedness.

Table 4: Inter-Construct Pearson Correlation Matrix (N = 32)

Construct	A1	A2	A3	A4	A5	B1	B2	C1	C2
A1 – Financial Benefits	1.000	0.273	0.552	0.291	0.263	0.479	0.370	0.237	0.463
A2 – Social Security	0.273	1.000	0.597	0.352	0.449	0.496	0.661	0.445	0.629
A3 – Welfare & WLB	0.552	0.597	1.000	0.513	0.349	0.415	0.497	0.372	0.330
A4 – Development	0.291	0.352	0.513	1.000	0.394	0.389	0.240	0.321	0.257
A5 – Recognition	0.263	0.449	0.349	0.394	1.000	0.643	0.559	0.464	0.487
B1 – Intrinsic Motiv.	0.479	0.496	0.415	0.389	0.643	1.000	0.646	0.725	0.658
B2 – Extrinsic Motiv.	0.370	0.661	0.497	0.240	0.559	0.646	1.000	0.554	0.677
C1 – Task Performance	0.237	0.445	0.372	0.321	0.464	0.725	0.554	1.000	0.687
C2 – Overall Perf.	0.463	0.629	0.330	0.257	0.487	0.658	0.677	0.687	1.000

All correlations $|r| \geq 0.35$ significant at $p < 0.05$; $|r| \geq 0.45$ significant at $p < 0.01$ (two-tailed, $N = 32$).

5.4 Hypothesis Testing

Table 5: Regression Results — Testing the Motivational Bridge

Pathway	r	R ²	p-value	H Supported?
Benefits → Motivation (H1 — Bridge 1)	0.707	0.500	< 0.001	Yes ✓
Motivation → Performance (H2 — Bridge 2)	0.786	0.618	< 0.001	Yes ✓
Benefits → Performance (H3 — Direct)	0.588	0.346	< 0.001	Yes ✓
Intrinsic → Performance (H4)	0.725	0.526	< 0.001	Yes ✓
Extrinsic → Performance (Reference)	0.648	0.420	< 0.001	—

H1 supported: Benefits significantly predict motivation ($r = 0.707$, $R^2 = 0.50$, $p < 0.001$). The motivational bridge is real: half of all variance in employee motivation at BSP is explained by benefit perceptions.

H2 supported: Motivation strongly predicts performance ($r = 0.786$, $R^2 = 0.618$, $p < 0.001$). The bridge carries substantial traffic: 61.8% of performance variance is explained by motivation — a large effect by Cohen's (1988) standards.

H3 supported: The direct Benefits → Performance path ($R^2 = 0.346$) is substantially weaker than the motivation-mediated path, consistent with motivation as a bridge. Benefits without the motivational mechanism explain only 34.6% of performance variance, compared to 61.8% when motivation is the active pathway.

H4 supported: Intrinsic Motivation ($r = 0.725$ with performance) builds a stronger bridge to performance than Extrinsic Motivation ($r = 0.648$), consistent with SDT's prediction.

6. Discussion

6.1 The Bridge Holds: Mediation Evidence

The central finding of this study is that motivation functions as a genuine empirical bridge between organisational benefit perceptions and performance outcomes at SAIL BSP. The Benefits $\rightarrow$ Motivation path ($R^2 = 0.50$) and the Motivation $\rightarrow$ Performance path ($R^2 = 0.618$) are both strong and significant. The direct Benefits $\rightarrow$ Performance path ($R^2 = 0.346$), while also significant, is substantially weaker — consistent with motivation carrying the primary explanatory load. This pattern is precisely what a mediation model predicts, and it replicates the theoretical propositions of Herzberg (1959), Maslow (1943), and the POS framework (Rhoades & Eisenberger, 2002) in a previously unstudied public sector manufacturing context.

6.2 The Stronger Lane: Intrinsic Motivation

The superiority of intrinsic over extrinsic motivation as a performance predictor ($r = 0.725$ vs. $r = 0.648$) is consistent with Self-Determination Theory and has direct managerial implications. The intrinsic lane of the motivational bridge is built primarily through recognition (A5 $\rightarrow$ B1: $r = 0.643$) and development opportunities (A4 $\rightarrow$ B1: $r = 0.389$). These are not the most expensive benefit dimensions for SAIL to improve — recognition in particular is a low-cost, high-return investment. The current mean score for Recognition ($M = 3.69$) suggests meaningful room for improvement, and the correlation evidence suggests this improvement would translate directly into stronger intrinsic motivation and, through it, higher performance.

6.3 A Weak Foundation: Welfare and Work-Life Balance

The lowest mean score in the study (Welfare & Work-Life Balance, $M = 3.02$) represents a potential structural weakness in the motivational bridge. Even when the other spans of the bridge are strong — financial benefits, social security, recognition — a weak welfare foundation may create a floor of dissatisfaction that limits how motivated employees can become. Consistent with Herzberg's hygiene theory, welfare deficiencies do not merely produce neutrality: they produce active dissatisfaction. SAIL BSP's township infrastructure, once a competitive advantage in attracting talent, may now be a motivational liability.

6.4 Instrument Performance

The instrument performed well overall. The overall Cronbach's alpha of 0.933 is a strong endorsement for a new scale, particularly at $N = 32$. The two underperforming items (A1_4 and B2_4) are theoretically interpretable and their revision is straightforward. A1_4 conflates benefit perception with motivational attribution in a single item; splitting these or reframing it as a pure benefit perception item should raise A1's alpha to the acceptable range. B2_4's organisational justice content should be either dropped or placed in a new justice sub-scale if the full study incorporates justice as a construct.

6.5 Limitations

Limitations of this study include: (1) sample size ($N = 320$) limiting generalisability and precluding multivariate methods; (2) single-plant, single-organisation sampling; (3) gender imbalance (93.8% male); (4) self-reported performance data susceptible to social desirability bias; and (5) cross-sectional design preventing causal inference. The mediation hypothesis, while supported by the pattern of correlations and regressions, requires formal testing via hierarchical regression, Sobel test, or bootstrapped indirect effects in the full study.

7. Conclusion

This study set out to investigate whether employee motivation serves as a bridge between organisational benefits and job performance at SAIL Bhilai Steel Plant. The answer from the data is clearly affirmative. A reliable 32-item instrument ($\alpha = 0.933$) captured nine constructs across the Benefits → Motivation → Performance chain. Benefits significantly predicted motivation ($R^2 = 0.50$), motivation strongly predicted performance ($R^2 = 0.618$), and the direct benefits-to-performance path ($R^2 = 0.346$) was substantially weaker — consistent with motivation carrying the primary explanatory load as a mediator.

The study identifies three priority action areas for SAIL HR: first, modernise welfare infrastructure (the weakest benefit dimension) to prevent motivational floor effects; second, expand recognition programmes (the strongest driver of intrinsic motivation, the most powerful bridge lane); and third, clarify the performance-benefit link to strengthen expectancy and instrumentality perceptions.

The contribution of this paper is threefold: a validated measurement instrument for the BSP context, empirical evidence for the motivation-as-bridge model in Indian public sector steel; and a clear, data-grounded set of HR policy recommendations for an organisation of significant national importance.

7.1 Recommendations for SAIL HR Policy

1. Modernise Welfare & Work-Life Balance Provisions: Conduct a structured audit of township housing, canteen quality, and recreational facilities against current employee expectations. Welfare deficiencies suppress the entire motivational bridge, making improvements here foundational to all other HR investments.
2. Systematise Non-Financial Recognition: Introduce structured, frequent, and transparent recognition mechanisms — monthly performance acknowledgements, supervisor commendation tools, peer recognition platforms. Recognition is the highest-return investment for building intrinsic motivation and, through it, performance.
3. Strengthen the Performance-Benefit Link: Redesign PMS communications to make explicit how sustained performance leads to advancement, rewards, and career benefits. Strengthening employees' perceived instrumentality (effort → performance → outcome) activates the motivational bridge more effectively.
4. Scale Up: Commission a confirmatory study with $N \geq 200$ respondents across multiple SAIL plants, incorporating SEM and formal mediation analysis (bootstrapped indirect effects) to definitively test the Benefits → Motivation → Performance mediation model.

References

- Amabile, T. M., Hill, K. G., Hennessey, B. A., & Tighe, E. M. (1994). *The Work Preference Inventory: Assessing intrinsic and extrinsic motivational orientations*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 66(5), 950–967.
- Baron, R. M., & Kenny, D. A. (1986). *The moderator–mediator variable distinction in social psychological research*. *Journal of Personality and Social Psychology*, 51(6), 1173–1182.
- Bhatnagar, J. (2007). *Talent management strategy of employee engagement in Indian ITES employees: Key to retention*. *Employee Relations*, 29(6), 640–663.
- Cohen, J. (1988). *Statistical power analysis for the behavioral sciences* (2nd ed.). Lawrence Erlbaum.
- Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). *Intrinsic motivation and self-determination in human behavior*. Plenum.
- DeVellis, R. F. (2016). *Scale development: Theory and applications* (4th ed.). SAGE.

- Eisenberger, R., Huntington, R., Hutchison, S., & Sowa, D. (1986). Perceived organisational support. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 71(3), 500–507.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step (4th ed.)*. Allyn & Bacon.
- Greenberg, J. (1990). Organisational justice: Yesterday, today, and tomorrow. *Journal of Management*, 16(2), 399–432.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. Wiley.
- Kanfer, R., Frese, M., & Johnson, R. E. (2017). Motivation related to work: A century of progress. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102(3), 338–355.
- Maslow, A. H. (1943). A theory of human motivation. *Psychological Review*, 50(4), 370–396.
- Nunnally, J. C. (1978). *Psychometric theory (2nd ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Nunnally, J. C., & Bernstein, I. H. (1994). *Psychometric theory (3rd ed.)*. McGraw-Hill.
- Pattnaik, S. C., & Tripathy, S. K. (2019). Public sector HRM in India: Challenges and emerging trends. *Indian Journal of Industrial Relations*, 54(3), 412–429.
- Rhoades, L., & Eisenberger, R. (2002). Perceived organisational support: A review of the literature. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 87(4), 698–714.
- Rickett, M. (2008). The causal relation between job attitudes and performance: A meta-analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 93(2), 472–481.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. Wiley.
- Williams, L. J., & Anderson, S. E. (1991). Job satisfaction and organisational commitment as predictors of organisational citizenship and in-role behaviours. *Journal of Management*, 17(3), 601–617.



EARN YOUR

MBA

WWW.IIMPS.IN



Accreditation & Ranking



UGC / NCTE Approved.

INFO@IIMPS.IN

☎ 011-41005174

RESEARCH GATEWAY

STOP PLAGIARISM



Arogyam Ayurveda
Holistic Healing through herbs



AROGYAM ONLINE

PARIVARTAN PSYCHOLOGY CENTER

परिवर्तन

COLOR PSYCHOLOGY : HOW COLOR AFFECT YOUR CHILD



BLUE

Calms your Child's Mind & Body

YELLOW

Promotes Concentration, Stimulates the Memory

PINK

Evokes Empathy, makes your Child Calm

RED

Excites and energizes your Child's body

GREEN

Improves Reading speed and Comprehension

www.parivartan4u.com



परिवर्तन

Confuse about your children's future?

भारतीय भाषा, शिक्षा, साहित्य एवं शोध

ISSN 2321 – 9726

WWW.BHARTIYASHODH.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT SCIENCE & TECHNOLOGY**

ISSN – 2250 – 1959 (O) 2348 – 9367 (P)

WWW.IRJMSST.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
COMMERCE, ARTS AND SCIENCE**

ISSN 2319 – 9202

WWW.CASIRJ.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT SOCIOLOGY & HUMANITIES**

ISSN 2277 – 9809 (O) 2348 - 9359 (P)

WWW.IRJMSH.COM



**INTERNATIONAL RESEARCH JOURNAL OF SCIENCE
ENGINEERING AND TECHNOLOGY**

ISSN 2454-3195 (online)

WWW.RJSET.COM



**INTEGRATED RESEARCH JOURNAL OF
MANAGEMENT, SCIENCE AND INNOVATION**

ISSN 2582-5445

WWW.IRJMSI.COM



**JOURNAL OF LEGAL STUDIES, POLITICS
AND ECONOMICS RESEARCH**

WWW.JLPER.COM

JLPE