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Abstract

The overall purpose of this research paper is to determine whether Irish graduates’ value intrinsic factors over extrinsic factors when deciding on a place of employment. The sample demographic that this research will be based upon are Irish graduates who have graduated, or will graduate, from the years 2013 to 2019.

This study utilised the Herzberg Two Factor theory, and the research was gathered through quantitative measures. The process also used a questionnaire which was constructed to collate the data, and merged two published surveys into one questionnaire.

It was found that graduates do indeed favour intrinsic factors over extrinsic factors when it comes to choosing a place of employment. With regards to Irish graduates, they prefer career advancement over monetary gain. Additionally, the work itself is favoured over career advancement.
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Chapter 1 – Introduction

With the ever-increasing levels of competition in today’s business environment, companies are continuously evaluating the internal structures of the organisation to improve overall performance. (Govindan, Azevedo, Carvalho and Cruz-Machado, 2014). Major factors that companies are faced with, among others, include the retention of personnel (Subhash, Kundu & Lata, 2017) and the loss of knowledge from outgoing senior and experienced staff (Leary-Joyce, 2009). To eradicate any potential issues that could possibly evolve from the aforementioned issues, companies need to be aware of the importance of recruiting (Ahmad & Schroeder, 2002) and the necessity for an organisation culture to instil a sense of loyalty among employees (Deery & Jago, 2015). Management must self-evaluate the needs of the firm and determine the suitable characteristics that are required from potential candidates (Wickramasinghe, 2012). Companies who wish to increase loyalty among their staff must incorporate these values early to impressionable employees, most notably graduates (Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008).

As firms in Ireland today face the fact that early Generation Y employees are facing retirement, the need for hiring suitable staff is high on the company’s agenda (Thompson and Aspinwall, 2009). The increase in students graduating from third level education has increased in the last 10 years and with that so has the competition among graduates for jobs, while it has also increased the need for firms to attract the appropriate applicants for their employment availabilities (Jurkiewicz, 2000). If a company wishes to be selective with candidates and recruit talented employees, the company must attract a large number of applicants for consideration in the possible selection pool (Terjesen, Vinnicombe & Freeman, 2007). The challenge of attracting a large enough pool of potential candidates is an issue for many firms, and although there has been significant research on recruitment methods and job structuring to entice the appropriate staff, there is very little research on the employment characteristics and job specifications that appeal to third level graduates.

The proposed area of focus for this paper is to determine the specific characteristics of an organisation and of the proposed work position that appeal to Irish third level graduates when selecting potential places of employment, thus assisting Irish companies in attracting the appropriate candidates by structuring potential job openings to attract the ideal graduate applicants. The planned method to obtain this desired information is by conducting a questionnaire survey aimed at third level graduates or future graduates who have or will graduate between the years 2013 to 2019 and will be targeting employment in
the Irish private sector. The data retrieved from the survey will be statistically analysed using inferential statistics to allow for a conclusion to be drawn from this research.
Chapter 2 - Literature Review

2.1 Introduction

The primary aim of this research is to distinguish the factors that attract Irish graduates to jobs. This literature review identifies the differing job expectations from both employers and employees while determining the importance of graduate recruitment. By reviewing these topics, it will then be important to analyse the reasons why people leave organisations and the impact it has on employers. Following the examination of reasons for leaving organisations, the importance of employee retention will be investigated, together with applicable theories of motivation that can be considered for this research.

2.2 Job Expectations

When an employer and an employee agree to their contract of employment, there are certain expectations from both parties with regards to work and the conditions of employment (Malik & Subramanian, 2015). For an employer, there are certain duties that are anticipated the employee will undertake when operating within the organisation, regardless of their role or job title (Low, Botes, Rue & Allen, 2016). A core trait that any organisation seeks in a potential employee is a strong work ethic (Klibi & Oussii, 2013). A company can benefit greatly from an employee who is driven to succeed in their role, as they will operate efficiently and pursue measures to either increase productivity or save time with their operational duties (Sankey & Machin, 2014). By incorporating individuals with a strong work ethic into the work place, they can indirectly enhance enthusiasm within the company (Damij, Levnajić, Rejec Skrt & Suklan, 2015).

An employee who demonstrates characteristics of responsibility and dependability is a highly desired professional by organisations (Suzukida, 2015). These traits include the employee showing up to work on time, dressing in appropriate attire and acting in a professional manner (Kavanagh & Drennan, 2008). An employee exhibiting these behaviours helps to create and maintain high standards throughout the workforce (Limsila & Ogunlana, 2008). Furthermore, companies value employees who can demonstrate adaptability (Matsouka & Mihail, 2016). This has become a key expectation from employers in recent years given the shifting trend of disruptive technology, and the requirement for companies to adapt rapidly to changes in the economic environment (Bamett, Chiu, Franklin & Sebastiá-Barri, 2014). Adaptability does not only relate to changes in the company role,
it also requires the individual adjusting to the different personalities and habits of their co-workers (Hetzner, Gartmeier, Heid & Gruber, 2009). This has become a trait that can sometimes be undervalued and overlooked in the recruitment process (Zacher, 2014), especially as capable workers can make the workplace more attractive, as they perform diligently and with a positive attitude (Wei, Samiee & Lee, 2014).

The attributes expected in the work process vary from an employee’s perspective between extrinsic and intrinsic factors (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). It is generally perceived that employees will seek a position of employment where they expect that their abilities will be put to best use (Pearce & Randel, 2004), while simultaneously obtaining a feeling of accomplishment after carrying out their duties of work (Johennesse & Te-Kuang, 2017). A new employee can presume that their new employer will provide adequate training and supportive guidance after undertaking a new position (Tymon & Mackay, 2016). While the type of work is a rising factor of importance for employees (Great Expectations, 2016), the provision of secure and steady employment is viewed as an assumed element for many job-seekers (Kambayashi & Kato, 2017). There is a belief among employees that they are entitled to be paid fairly in comparison to the rest of the market (Moriarty, 2014), while concurrently receiving other benefits offered by the employer, such as bonuses or benefits in kind (Moriarty, 2014). Employees can provide alternative ideology as to how processes or sections of a business can be improved and there is an expectation from the employee that their voice will be heard (Keaveny & Inderrieden, 2000). A recent anticipation among employees is that employers are flexible when it comes to work hours (Lee, Yu, Sirgy, Singhapakdi & Lucianetti, 2018) and that the aspect of work-life balance is considered when discussing work hours (Ridić, Avdibegović & Bušatlić, 2016).

2.3 Causes of Employee Turnover

Employee turnover can be defined as the proportion of staff that leave a company in a defined period of time (Rahman & Nas, 2013). The turnover of staff can be associated with two main influences; push factors and pull factors (Shah, Zainab, Shakil Ahmad & Khalid, 2010). Push factors are associated with issues of discontent or unhappiness for the employee with their current role or organisation (Ramball, 2003). Whereas pull factors are the better prospects on offer from an organisation elsewhere (Pailla, 2013). Although the purposes of this research are to determine the specifications associated with jobs that attract graduates, it is fundamental to understand the aspects that cause employees to resign from roles.
With an organisation there is a natural expectation of some turnover in staff, however this turnover can exceed a normal level due to poor management (Winterton, 2004) and as Morgan (2008) stated that the primary reason for employees leaving a company is the failure of their managers to lead the staff. Bryson, Forth & Stokes (2017) state that the common factors that employees feel aggrieved with an organisation or their positions are:

1. A lack of growth and progression within their organisation
2. The feeling of being overworked
3. A lack of feedback and recognition for their work
4. A lack of employee empowerment
5. The employee not being the correct fit for the position

Therefore, it is crucial for management to identify any issues within the company and quickly address the employee’s concerns. The organisation’s management can easily resolve these issues by investing in their employees, whether that be through further education or allowing employees to assist with internal improvements. Furthermore, management can show their employees that they value their contribution by adequately rewarding and compensating them for their efforts in work (Adler & Ghiselli, 2015). By regularly meeting with employees to review their performances and providing beneficial feedback, employers can improve communications with their staff. By meeting frequently employers can identify any issues early on with employees and seek to agree solutions to prevent possible escalation of any concerns or disputes (Sahoo & Mishra, 2012). As previously stated, employees resigning from their role or employer can be attributed to a mis-match of job expectations. Therefore, it is imperative for employers to improve their recruitment process to hire employees who share the same expectations as the company.

A 2018 study conducted by Lincoln Recruitment Specialists found that 54% of Irish professionals envisage themselves changing employers in the year ahead. According to the survey results, the main reasons employees are interested in seeking another role are:

- 56% - better career prospects
- 43% - improved monetary benefits
- 31% - better work culture
- 31% - lack of future opportunities
- 24% - better recognition and rewards
2.4 Cost of Employee Turnover

Employee turnover can be differentiated into two distinctive categories, voluntary and involuntary. Involuntary turnover is a situation where the employee has no choice in the termination of their employment, whereas voluntary redundancy is dissolution of employment initiated by the employee. The costs associated due to employee turnover can be difficult to calculate precisely, and require serious consideration to distinguish between direct and indirect costs (Davidson, Timo & Wang, 2010).

The direct costs incurred by employee turnover comprise of recruitment costs related to hiring a replacement, advertising costs for new position, the costs associated with training and initiation of new staff, and potentially over-time to cover the loss of the employee (Davidson, Timo & Wang, 2010). Indirect costs pertain to a loss of knowledge, the cost connected to the loss of productivity while replacement staff are trained, and the potential cost linked to the loss of motivation of a staff member prior to leaving. There are further underlying indirect costs relating to replacing staff. These may include the cost of time required in connection with organising and conducting interviews, the screening process of new staff, the drafting of new contracts and the preparation required for new joiners.

It is difficult for companies to quantify the overall costs of replacing staff as the cost is not fixated to one specific department but spread across the organisation. There are claims that the cost of employee turnover can rise to the equivalent of 150% of the departing employee’s salary (Duda & Žůrková, 2013). The costs incurred in retaining an employee are considerably less than the expenses related with recruiting a new employee (Jacobs, 2007). Due to the high costs involved in the replenishment of the workforce for employers, it is imperative that the organisation’s management firstly attract the appropriate applicants, potential new employees understand the expectations of the job and employers understand the factors that employees value to help in preventing unnecessary employee turnover and incurring avoidable costs. By companies implementing an employee retention policy it can assist with preventing future losses of staff and improve motivation among their employees (Němečková, 2017).
2.5 Graduate Recruitment

As companies continue to grow and develop in this dynamic economic environment, they must analyse their recruitment process with a strong emphasis on attracting and retaining staff. A primary outcome of this employment analysis is the importance that should be placed on the recruitment of graduates. By employing graduates, companies can benefit greatly with their returns in investment. A major attraction for many companies in actively recruiting graduates is their affordability (Jones, 2017). Companies can offer lower salaries to graduates in return for training and experience. Although they may not have working experience equivalent to other members of the work force, graduates do bring a yearning to learn and an eagerness to succeed which can be infectious and extremely beneficial for a company’s culture. Moreover, compared to experienced workers, graduates can be easier to manage as they do not have the same level of that feeling of entitlement (Fulgence, 2015). In the same comparison, graduates tend to be more focused on their own day-to-day operations rather than the overall operations of the company, which in turn allows management to focus on their own duties.

Graduates are an attractive prospect for companies who may require an injection of innovative ideas as they employ the most current academia and allocate them to their potential roles (Jones, 2017). Furthermore, highly educated graduates possess strong core skills which can be transferrable. This is due to the enhancement of third-level courses with the introduction of placements and the higher proportion of graduates undertaking post-graduate courses. Organisations which employ unique practices in running a business can benefit in employing new graduates with little to no previous work experience. Employees with a significant amount of working knowledge can develop habits and be slow to adjust to new working conditions (Woods & Dennis 2009). Whereas graduates are more adaptable, often learn faster, and more likely to take guidance and instructions to train into their positions. For a business, it is important that they get the quickest return on their investment, with many companies now shifting to a larger graduate work-force (Fulgence, 2015). The position of succession planning has increased on the agenda for several companies. With this shift in strategy, organisations have acknowledged that management should be developed from within the company.

From this ideology, there has been an increasing number of graduate programmes implemented within companies as they develop the management of the future for the company within these programmes (Bonnici, Maatta, Klose et al., 2016). The advantage of graduate programmes is that they allow, as previously mentioned, companies to develop
graduates to the specific ways of the company by rotating through different functions. By implementing training and offering the chance of further education, graduates can develop themselves personally and in turn improve their knowledge and performance for the company.

2.6 Motivational Theories

With each new generation entering the workforce, the factors that these new employees seek from their potential new roles and employers change. For instance, Baby Boomers (born between 1946 and 1964) sought positions of power and were motivated by tangible factors such as monetary rewards and promotional opportunities (Karisto, 2007). Generation X (born between 1965 and 1980) valued positions with a favourable work-life balance and the prospect of positions which allow them to grow personally and the opportunity of making decisions that can impact the company (Karisto, 2007). Generation Y (born between 1981-1994) value places of employment which offer training, mentoring, feedback, a positive culture and flexible schedules (Hajdu & Sik, 2018). However, a unique scenario of a cross-over in generations is occurring with late Generation Y’s and Millennials now entering the workforce and companies are now faced with the task of attracting and retaining both generations to new positions. To identify the factors for motivating and retaining these new entrants to the workforce, this literature review will explore motivational theories. A motivational theory assists in identifying the driving factors that construct people’s attitudes to their work. There are eight motivational theories that can be considered when trying to determine the factors that motivate employees:

1. Maslow’s Need Hierarchy Theory is a five-tier measure of a person’s motivation ranging from basic needs (physiological and safety), psychological (social and ego) to their self-fulfilment needs (self-actualization). The needs located at the bottom of the pyramid must be satisfied first before an individual can address the needs higher up on the scale.

2. Herzberg’s Motivation Hygiene Theory distinguishes factors for satisfaction and dissatisfaction. The ‘motivation’ factors tests satisfaction with a role whereas ‘hygiene’ factors determine dissatisfaction.

3. McClelland’s Need Theory states that a person’s motivation is determined by the need for achievement, new for affiliation and the need for power.

4. McGregor’s Participation Theory is broken down into two concepts into Theory X and Theory Y. Theory X states that managers believe that their employees are lazy,
unmotivated and dislike work. Whereas Theory Y holds the opposite opinion where employees are motivated and encouraged to develop their skills within the organisation.

5. Urwick’s Theory Z is a concept that a company’s management style is responsible for the commitment of their employees through collective decision making and showing concern for their employees which leads to employee satisfaction, low turnover and higher productivity.

6. Argyris’s Theory dictates that a person’s behaviour to a scenario is determined by their maturity.

7. Vroom’s Expectancy Theory determines why an individual is motivated to pick one option over another measured through the expectancy, instrumentality and valence of the task.

8. Porter and Lawler’s Expectancy Theory details that an individual’s motivation in completing a task is stimulated by the reward that they expect to receive upon completion of the task.

With the objective of this research paper to understand the factors that recent graduates’ value in jobs and employers, the theory that is applicable to this study is Herzberg’s theory. The reason for selecting this theory as a framework for this research is due to the theory determining factors to be either be satisfying or not satisfying and dissatisfying or not dissatisfying (Habib, Awan & Sahibzada, 2017).

2.7 Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory

Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory measures certain features of employment that either satisfy the employee’s needs or is a form of dissatisfaction (Daw & Khoury, 2014). The features that Herzberg measured are principles that management could use to learn the elements of employment that motivate workers. Herzberg performed his initial investigation in the 1950’s and 1960’s to determine the segments of employment that caused satisfaction and pleasure, while also testing the features that could diminish an employee’s motivation and satisfaction with a role (Habib, Awan & Sahibzada, 2017).

Herzberg assessed an employee’s satisfaction under two sections; hygiene and motivators. The hygiene or extrinsic factors are the more tangible of the two and generally gauge an employee’s value of importance over salary, job security and status (Teck-Hong & Waheed, 2011). By management not providing the expected extrinsic motivators to employees, it can
create an undertone of dissatisfaction among staff and result in unmotivated behaviour. Other components assessed under Herzberg’s hygiene factors include (Habib, Awan & Sahibzada, 2017):

- Company policy
- Relationship with Supervisor
- Working conditions
- Monetary reward
- Relationship with peers

The motivators or intrinsic factors are not as easily measured as the hygiene (or extrinsic) factors as the motivating factors relate to the emotional needs of an employee (Daw & Khoury, 2014). Even though they are not as easily quantifiable or measured as hygiene factors, it is vital that management do not ignore these needs and frequently endorse these constructs as they can potentially create added satisfaction for employees (Shipley & Kiely, 1986). Management can corroborate staff by constantly evaluating whether the work is challenging for staff. By incorporating this ethos, it will also provide opportunities of growth for staff. Other components assessed under Herzberg’s motivating factors include (Habib, Awan & Sahibzada, 2017):

- Achievement
- Advancement
- Recognition
- The work itself
- Growth

2.7.1 Creating Job Satisfaction

As previously stated there are two segments to Herzberg’s motivation theory; hygiene (extrinsic) and motivation (intrinsic). For an employer to create satisfaction for an employee, they simply cannot just eliminate the part of the work that employees are dissatisfied with or try to remove the issue by throwing money at it. If they only remove the dissatisfying parts, then the employee will move to a state of not-dissatisfied. This ideology applies to the traits of jobs that give employees a state of satisfaction. An employee cannot be fully satisfied if the characteristics of dissatisfaction still exist (Daw & Khoury, 2014). Therefore, it is important that management communicate with their staff to determine the
areas of dissatisfaction within the company and the areas that can aid in motivation and satisfaction. Herzberg’s Two Factor theory can detect the factors of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, and if applied correctly, can aid a company in improving staff morale and lowering staff turnover (Davis, 2013).

2.7.2 Achievement

It is widely agreed that employees are motivated by the need for achievement when they see value in the work they are tasked with and the work environment supports it (Habib, Awan & Sahibzada, 2017). The more employers feel they are trusted by their superiors, they will strive to deliver and exceed their performance goals. Employees with a strong need for achievement will want personal responsibility to improve their own performance. Also, if faced with any problems, they will seek to rectify the issue and propose a solution. To develop the need of achievement within a company, an employer must provide encouraging feedback to the employee. Once they have recognised the work of an employee performing consistently, the next level of achievement would be to include the worker in decision-making and either promote or acknowledge their work through incentives such as a bonus (Shipley & Kiely, 1986). By implementing this practice will show fellow employees the value of the work they are tasked with and the potential benefits of high performance.

2.7.3 Career Advancement

In the current job market, employees are changing jobs due to a number of factors ranging from a larger salary to a new job title. Therefore, it is vital that employers clearly illustrate the potential career path that employees can undertake within the current place of employment (Oertle & O'Leary, 2017). With a company highlighting and communicating this route for their employees, they can attract a stronger calibre of staff. Furthermore, by employers willing to provide staff with training and courses to self-improve can increase the levels of satisfaction within a position. By investing in your staff’s career and development will assist in decreasing employee turnover and simultaneously aid the company by hiring from within the company rather than employing a new member of staff (Jacobs, 2007). Employees will react positively to employers showing an interest in their career and will assist with productivity. It is shown that employees will also become more engaged if they are invested in and react positively to changes and assist in problem-solving.
2.7.4 The Work Itself

By an employer placing an emphasis on the work that employees carry out can positively influence the performance of the staff and with that improve the company’s output (Paradnikė & Bandzevičienė, 2016). A company must consistently evaluate the morale of its workforce. If there is low morale within a workforce, a company can combat this by introducing a break away from the normal work day and allow staff to enjoy themselves. This can be done by introducing an incentive for staff such as extra annual leave or hosting a company party. By implementing this approach, it will instil a sense of loyalty among staff and build a supportive and enjoyable work environment. By establishing clear objectives for employees and supporting to staff to put forward ideas will establish a sense of value among employees (Davis, 2013). Once the employee has completed their task, it is important to recognise them for their hard work.

2.7.5 Recognition

As previously stated it is vital that employers recognise their employees for the work they have completed. By acknowledging staff for their efforts, it displays that management value them and it gives the employees a sense of appreciation (Sahir, Phulpoto & uz Zaman, 2018). When an employee identifies with this gratitude, it improves their morale which can positively influence the rest of the workforce. Once staff see others being endorsed, it will build a stronger supporting environment amongst subordinates. Positive recognition, along with an established career path in the current place of work, will enhance the sense of loyalty among staff (Brun & Dugas, 2008). As previously noted, by improving employee retention will aid a company in reducing unnecessary costs of staff turnover. Recognition does not have to be formally acknowledged, however there is a benefit to have a fixed structure established either on a monthly, quarterly or annual basis to evaluate and validate the company’s value for the employee (Sahir, Phulpoto & uz Zaman, 2018).

2.7.6 Growth

The importance of promoting employee growth should not be under-appreciated. By embracing a culture that advocates an employee to undertake extra training or education can improve a worker’s satisfaction within a role (Hajdu & Sik, 2018). Companies who noticeably support their staff by offering education packages for further studies can
undoubtedly improve the culture of a company and in turn improve the company’s brand when attracting new staff members. By demonstrating an interest in an employee’s personal development and monitoring their growth can improve their morale and simultaneously foster a sense of loyalty (Tymon & Mackay, 2016). While the value of promoting further studies can benefit the company with highly educated staff, this new-found knowledge must be incorporated into the employee’s work. By an employee actively using these new skills will they develop a sense of pride and achievement in themselves and appreciation for the management and company. Simultaneously, by promoting further studies among staff will it spur the employees to strive and exceed their targets which will help establish a culture of learning and self-evaluation (Johennesse & Te-Kuang, 2017). This culture can be advantageous for a company as staff will put forward new ideas to improve the company’s performance, address any issues quickly and initiate corrective procedures.

2.7.7 Company Policy

The management must be conscious of the policies they have for their staff and the impact of being too stringent with certain policies can impact an employee’s motivation or satisfaction levels. This is the first of five constructs under Herzberg’s Two Factor theory which signifies dissatisfaction with a role. For instance, by a company being favourable to one employee over working times and not offering the same to other staff can negatively impact the morale within a company (Brun & Dugas, 2008). Whereas a policy which is unnecessarily demanding and does not pertain to the core values illustrated by the company can have the same affect. Furthermore, company policies must not be visibly articulated to signify a lack of trust from management in their employees as this too will stimulate a sense of cynicism and diminish employee’s motivation and satisfaction. When an organisation’s management decides to administer a policy company wide, they must clearly articulate and communicate to staff the expectations and interests of the proposed policy (Sahir, Phulpoto & uz Zaman, 2018).

2.7.8 Relationship with Peers

Satisfaction in the work place can be greatly influenced by the relationships between co-workers. New employees can have a sense of uncertainty when beginning a new role, however this can be either positively or negatively impacted by the existing atmosphere among their new colleagues (Wei Tian, Cordery & Gamble, 2016). An initial factor is the communication and actions between their co-workers. By communicating efficiently and
following through on promises will establish trust and resulting in building a positive relationship (Menguc, Auh, Yeniaras & Katsikeas, 2017). The dynamic of employees not taking responsibility for the actions can fracture relations and result in a loss of productivity. Employees can develop their skills further from the constructive observations from their fellow workers more so than feedback from supervisors or management (Liu, Tangirala, Lam, Chen, Jia & Huang, 2015). Employees at the same level within the company see their colleagues’ working habits frequently and can draw from their own experience to advice others. Employee’s observations of their fellow workers can result in recognition and acknowledgement of a job well done, which builds a favourable work environment where knowledge is freely shared. This results in a culture where employees work together to achieve the same goal which can aid a company in other factors such as employment retention, attraction of new employees and increased productivity.

2.7.9 Relationship with Supervisor

One of the key factors that determines a worker’s satisfaction in a job is the relationship between employee and supervisor. The benefits of maintaining strong and positive relations between staff and management include increased productivity, employee loyalty and a friendly environment where conflict is reduced (Schwab & Heneman III, 1970). To build this rapport, management must consistently communicate with their staff and implement an “open door” policy where staff can feel free to converse with management (Johennesse & Te-Kuang, 2017). To strengthen the relationship, staff must feel trusted. This can be achieved by making staff feel valued and regularly delegating tasks that will signify that management trust their staff. Furthermore, it will promote ambition among staff. A key element that can weaken this relationship is that management do not follow through with their promises (Damij, Levnajić, Rejec Skrt & Suklan, 2015). Therefore, by regularly communicating with staff, management can advise of any impending issues and alert staff.

2.7.10 Money

Money plays a crucial role in how satisfied or dissatisfied employees are with their positions in a company (Němečková, 2017). It is vital that a company is aware of the industry standard in terms of the salary and benefits packages. If there is a large variance then it will undoubtedly result in a higher than average employee turnover and a reduction in morale among staff. To combat this, management must incorporate a distinguished compensation plan which signifies the salary band that can be expected for a particular skill level within
the company and clearly communicate this to their staff (Teck-Hong & Waheed, 2011). Staff already discuss their salary amongst themselves, but by integrating a pay scale based on skill level, it will validate the sense of fairness among staff regarding their respective salaries. The value of holding a regular formal financial review should not be underestimated. By holding a review, it will allow management to communicate their satisfaction with the employee’s work and allow them to constructively discuss their application to work (Olafsen, Halvari, Forest & Deci, 2015). Under this discussion the merit of the compensation earned should be expressed and justified to the staff. However, it is imperative that management refrain from arguing or focusing on recent work as this will dissatisfy the employee. By applying this foundation in a company, it will omit staff having to come forward requesting a raise when they have grown highly dissatisfied with their current level of pay.

2.7.11 Work Environment

The negative consequences of an inadequate work environment far outweigh the benefits of a positive work environment (Thompson & Aspinwall, 2009), therefore it is in the company's best interest to promote a positive atmosphere. The repercussions of a mediocre working environment include little to no interactions among employees, which in turn impacts the level of staff turnover within the company. Furthermore, the lack of communication among staff coinciding with a high level of staff turnover will impact the decision-making process (Terjesen, Vinnicombe & Freedman, 2007), as knowledge is lost by losing workers and staff do not have the confidence of other members of personnel. To combat this, it is crucial the company endorses a positive work environment by promoting a healthy level of work-life balance (Shaw & Fairhurst, 2008). Staff must be adequately trained to fulfil their duties. This will result in confidence within the workforce which will increase the desire among personnel to improve the company and its processes.

2.8 Conclusion

The conclusion of this literature review is that there is an evolving dynamic in the Irish labour market whereby over half of Irish workers employed in the private sector are seeking to leave their current places of employment (Lincoln Recruitment Specialists, 2018). With job expectations not being matched stated as one of the major contributing factors for this sentiment, the topic of employee retention has become a major topic of concern for many employers (Covella, McCarthy, Kaifi & Cocoran, 2017). With over a quarter of all positions
expected to be advertised and filled by graduates, the attributes of positions to attract and retain graduates has never been more relevant. The purpose of this literature review was to garner a broader and significant comprehension of the value of retaining staff and the significance of recruiting graduates to organisations. Although there are multiple motivational theories that can assist in illustrating generic constructs that employees desire, there is a limited amount of analysis with regards to Irish graduates. Therefore, the researcher will conduct primary research of the factors that Irish graduates place the highest significance on when selecting places of employment in relation to Irish graduates.
Chapter 3 - Methodology

3.1 Introduction to Research Design

The previous chapter outlined the literature relating to the aspects affecting recruitment, with a strong emphasis on graduates. To better comprehend these features, an overview of the different theories of motivation in relation to job expectations were evaluated with Herzberg’s Hygiene-Motivation theory being selected to be used in this research. This chapter will explain the aims and objectives of the research, while focusing on the purposes as to why the Hygiene-motivation framework will be utilised in this study. Finally, the designs and measures implemented in this research will be scrutinized with a summary of the specific considerations used in this study.

3.2 Research Aims and Objectives

The main objective of this research is to determine the factors that Irish graduates place the greatest value on when deciding upon potential places of employment. Following research of the literature on this topic, there is an agreement that with every generation, there is a changing of values (Macky & Wong, 2008). As previously advised, Baby Boomers placed more value on work than personal life (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008) whereas early to mid-Generation Y valued job security with a degree of flexibility (Acar, 2014). However, the Irish job market faces an interesting stage as there is a combination of late Generation Y and Millennials now entering the work-force. As this combination of new entrants enter the job market, an emphasis on the factors these graduates value must be considered by potential employers if they are to entice favourable candidates to their company.

Hypothesis 1: Intrinsic factors are more important for graduates than extrinsic factors

3.3 Research Sub-objectives

To further evaluate the main objective of this research paper, additional hypotheses were to be investigated to help determine the exact factors that graduates value the most. The
first sub-objective sought to discover whether Irish graduates valued monetary gain (an extrinsic factor) over career advancement.

_Hypothesis 2:_ Graduates place a higher importance on monetary gain over career advancement when deciding on a place of employment.

The second sub-objective focused on the value placed on the intrinsic factors of career advancement compared to the work itself.

_Hypothesis 3:_ The opportunity of career advancement is more important than the work itself.

### 3.4 Research Framework

The research basis utilised for this study is the conceptual framework of Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene Theory (or otherwise known as the Two-Factor Theory) (Schwab & Heneman III, 1970). This framework was employed to assist in deducing the important constructs for graduates when they are selecting potential areas of employment. The purpose for this specific framework is that it assesses both intrinsic and extrinsic characteristics of jobs (Ewen, Smith & Hulin, 1966). Herzberg’s theory articulates that certain aspects of work will cause an employee to be satisfied with their job, known as motivators (Lundberg, Gudmundson & Andersson, 2009), whereas there are characteristics of jobs that cause dissatisfaction with a job and not the actual role itself (DeShields, Ali & Erdener, 2005). The specific constructs of employment under Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory can be shown in the below table (Maidani, 1991):

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Hygiene</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivators</strong></td>
<td><strong>Hygiene</strong></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>Company Policy</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>Relationship with Peers</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>Relationship with Supervisor</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Due to the design of this research to understand the current sentiments of Irish graduates while amalgamating specific hypothesis to test, it was deduced to use a quantifiable approach when considering the results.

3.5 Participants and Procedures

As this study focuses on Irish graduates, the sample for this research were graduates from Irish colleges and universities who either graduated no earlier than 2013 or were projected to graduate in either 2018 or 2019. The participants were gathered by way of Convenience sampling, with the data being collated by means of a survey questionnaire. The survey was distributed through the medium of social media (LinkedIn, Facebook and WhatsApp), e-mail to various companies and colleges with a link to ‘SurveyMonkey’. These mediums were chosen to maximize the number of participants to undertake the survey. Responses were received from 71 participants over a one-month period. The purpose of using ‘SurveyMonkey’ were due to its ease of use from the perspective of the participant and surveyor, the quality of information that can be reported from the survey and the need of confidentiality for the participant. Before taking the survey, the participant was advised of the process involved in a section detailing the purpose of the research, the length of time it would take to complete the questionnaire and a short statement confirming confidentiality, along with other ethical considerations. As part of the ethical consideration, a short statement prior to the commencement of the on-line survey stated the following:

- Any participant who agreed to partake in the research, their survey would be guaranteed to be private and the data received would be protected.
- By agreeing to partake in the survey, the participant was agreeing to all the questions set-out in the questionnaire. The survey was designed so that a participant could only proceed to the next stage of the survey if all the questions within each section had been answered. If a question was left unanswered, it was not possible to move on to the following section.
- It was outlined that under no circumstances would reports on an individual basis be given out. Any reports derived from the data collected would be reported on at a group level.
- The data gathered upon completion of this research will be securely stored with the School of Business, National College of Ireland.


3.5.1 Pilot Study

A pilot study was administered to four graduates to establish whether the proposed survey was adequately coherent/comprehensive and to determine if the anticipated results would be returned. From the results of the pilot survey, it was deduced that the survey questions were concise and understood by the participants. The participants in the pilot study were selected at random and each candidate came from a different academic and work background. This difference between the candidates was beneficial for the pilot study as it tested each question of the proposed surveys to analyse whether there would be any similarity in results, regardless of the participant’s background. After reviewing the pilot study’s results, there were certain questions which provided similar if not identical results. Alternatively, responses to other questions provided considerably mixed responses, which was to be expected due to the varied backgrounds of the participants. The pilot survey proved a success as it was determined to be a working method of gathering desired data. However, the results of the pilot survey could not dictate an early trend in the results as the sample size was too small. With further responses the results would show more consistencies. Following the completion of the pilot study, it was decided to take the results of respondents who graduated no earlier than 2013 and prospective graduates by no later than 2019. The purpose of this adjustment was to allow for responses from participants with a mixture of experiences and expectations of work-life.

3.6 Design and Measures

The questionnaire was structured to begin with an introductory section which asked participants their gender, age bracket (pre-defined), highest level of schooling completed, year of graduation, employment status, area of occupation or interest (pre-defined). The proceeding section of the survey comprised of questions measuring Herzberg’s Motivation and Hygiene factors, which was followed by questions regarding Intrinsic/Extrinsic job satisfaction.

3.6.1 Study one

The questionnaire assembled for this research contains a combination of two separate scales, with the first scale having been developed by Ewen et al. (1966), Graen (1966), Sergiovanni (1966), House and Wigdor (1967), Lindsay et al (1967), Maidani (1991), and Pizam and Ellis (1999) and was applied in Teck-Hong & Waheed’s (2011) study of the
Malaysian retail sector. In Teck-Hong & Waheed’s (2011) study, they assessed Herzberg’s Hygiene-Motivation theory using a five-point Likert scale. The scale ranged from ‘1’ representing a response that strongly disagreed with the supplied description, ‘3’ being the surveyed neither agreed or disagreed with the statement and ‘5’ depicting a respondent who strongly agreed with the provided statement. The validity and reliability of this published survey can be shown through the Cronbach alpha value of Teck-Hong & Waheed’s results. They recorded the Cronbach coefficient to be between 0.70 and 0.84 for each construct of the survey.

The survey is firstly split into two sections measuring Motivator and Hygiene factors. These factors are then further sub-divided with each factor measuring five separate constructs.

The first factor quantified is Motivator constructs and is broken down into five constructs as follows:

- Achievement (three statements)
- Advancement (two statements)
- Work itself (three statements)
- Recognition (three statements)
- Growth (three statements)

As previously stated, the statements for these constructs had five options that the respondent could answer with. The five-point Likert scale would allow the researcher to easily assess the results of each construct. A high cumulative score for one factor would signify that the sample strongly agreed to the factor of job satisfaction. Alternatively, a low aggregate score suggests that there was a contradiction to the construct causing satisfaction for the subjects tested. The Cronbach’s Alpha was calculated to be 0.757 for Motivation factors, using SPSS.

The second factor quantified is Hygiene constructs and is broken down into five constructs as follows:

- Company Policy (three statements)
- Relationship with peers (three statements)
- Relationship with supervisor (three statements)
- Money (two statements)
- Working Conditions (two statements)

A high cumulative score for one factor would signify that the sample strongly agreed to the factor of job dissatisfaction. Alternatively, a low aggregate score suggests that there was a
contradiction to the construct causing dissatisfaction for the subjects tested. The Cronbach's Alpha was calculated to be 0.578 for Hygiene factors, using SPSS.

3.6.2 Study two

The second portion of the questionnaire focused on the Intrinsic and Extrinsic factors of job satisfaction. The questions and scales were derived from Weiss, Dawis, England and Lofquist's (1967) survey which is known as the 'Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire'. There were two versions of the survey developed – a long and a short version. The long version features 20 constructs with five questions for each concept which measure the respondent’s satisfaction levels with a job (Weiss et al, 1967). The short version consists of the 20 constructs with only one question per concept (Sousa, Cruz and Martins, 2011). Both versions of the questionnaire are measured using a five-point Likert scale ranging from '1' being ‘very dissatisfied’ through to '5' being ‘very satisfied’ (Wanous, Reichers & Hudy, 1997). This research used the short form of the Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire as it was precise and quick to be filled by potential respondents (Weiss et al, 1967), especially considering the inclusion of Teck-Hong and Waheed’s questionnaire in this research. The validity and reliability of utilising the Minnesota Short Questionnaire has been consistently validated and is shown to be a reliable in measuring a recipient’s satisfaction levels (Van Saane, Sluiter, Verbeek & Frings-Dresen, 2003). The breakdown of the questions into the specific factors of extrinsic and intrinsic has been previously validated by Martins and Proença (2012). The table below shows the previous literature which illustrates the factors the questions represent in the short version of the Minnesota Short Questionnaire:

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Original</th>
<th>Schriesheim et al., 1993</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Being able to keep busy all the time.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. The chance to work alone on the job.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. The chance to do different things from time to time.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4. The chance to be &quot;somebody&quot; in the community.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>General</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. The way my boss handles his/her workers.</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>6. The competence of my supervisor in making decisions.</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>8. The way my job provides for steady employment.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>9. The chance to do things for other people.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>10. The chance to tell people what to do.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>11. The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities.</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>12. The way company policies are put into practice.</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
13. My pay and the amount of work I do | Extrinsic | General
14. The chances for advancement on this job. | Extrinsic | General
15. The freedom to use my own judgment. | Intrinsic | Intrinsic
16. The chance to try my own methods of doing the job. | Intrinsic | Intrinsic
17. The working conditions. | General | Extrinsic
18. The way my co-workers get along with each other. | General | Extrinsic
19. The praise I get for doing a good job. | Extrinsic | General
20. The feeling of accomplishment I get from the job | Intrinsic | Intrinsic

Table (Martins and Proença 2012)

The original constructs were taken with anything declared as ‘General’ then using Schriesheim’s (1993) constructs.

The intrinsic constructs measured under this survey include ability utilization, activity, independence, responsibility, variety and authority. Whereas the extrinsic constructs measured are compensation, co-workers, supervision, working conditions and recognition. The five-point Likert scale would allow the researcher to easily assess the results of each construct. A high cumulative score for one factor would signify that the sample strongly agreed to the factor of job satisfaction. Alternatively, a low aggregate score suggests that there was a contradiction to the construct causing satisfaction for the subjects tested.

3.7 Design and Analysis

The statistical analysis to be used to compute the output of the collected data is the SPSS Statistical tool. Once the data was collected, it was coded and uploaded to be suitably analysed in SPSS. Firstly, the data was categorised into Ordinal and Nominal data. This was then used to describe the respondent’s characteristics such as age, sex and education. The specific questions were then categorised as per Teck-Hong & Waheed’s published survey. This was followed by descriptive statistics which computed the Mean, Minimum, Maximum and Standard Deviation. To test the hypotheses of the research questions, the specific constructs were scored to give a composite variable. These composite variables were then tested using a one sample t-test.
Chapter 4 – Research Findings

The main purpose of this research paper was to decipher whether graduates valued intrinsic factors over extrinsic factors when it comes to choosing a place of employment. The first of two sub-objectives of the research aimed to determine whether graduates treasured monetary gain over career advancement. The second sub-objective tested whether graduates preferred the intrinsic factor of work itself over career advancement.

4.1 Overview of Respondents

The survey was distributed to a total of 71 potential candidates. Of the 71 contenders, a 69% response rate was received which results in a total of 49 samples to test. Of the 49 respondents, 33 were male (67.3%) and 16 were female (32.7%) as displayed in Table 1.

Table 1: Gender Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Gender</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Male</td>
<td>33</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
<td>67.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Female</td>
<td>16</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>32.7</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Of the ages of respondents, the majority of the sample collected ranged mainly in the 24 to 26 age category at 42.9%. This can be viewed as being significant to the test as this is the age bracket which most graduates are in their first place of employment following college (Matsouka & Mihail, 2016).

Table 2: Age Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Age</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>18-20</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>21-23</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>18.4</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
The proportion of the respondents who attribute third level studies as their highest level of education contributed to over 80%.

Table 3: Education Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Highest Level of Education</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Leaving Certificate</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Diploma</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>14.3</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Undergraduate Degree</td>
<td>15</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>30.6</td>
<td>44.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Higher Diploma</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>51.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Postgraduate Degree</td>
<td>13</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>26.5</td>
<td>77.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Professional Exams</td>
<td>10</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>20.4</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Other</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

The breakdown of the years of graduation for each candidate can be shown in Table 4.

Table 4: Year Graduated Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Year of Graduation</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Valid</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2013</td>
<td>14</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
<td>28.6</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2014</td>
<td>12</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>24.5</td>
<td>53.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2015</td>
<td>3</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>6.1</td>
<td>59.2</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2016</td>
<td>8</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>16.3</td>
<td>75.5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2017</td>
<td>4</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>8.2</td>
<td>83.7</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2018</td>
<td>7</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>14.3</td>
<td>98.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2019</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Table 5 dictates the employment status of the respondents with a significant majority already in full-time employment.

Table 5: Employment Status Breakdown

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Employment Status</th>
<th>Frequency</th>
<th>Percent</th>
<th>Valid Percent</th>
<th>Cumulative Percent</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Valid</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Student</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Unemployed</td>
<td>1</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>2.0</td>
<td>6.1</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed - Full Time</td>
<td>44</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>89.8</td>
<td>95.9</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Employed - Part Time</td>
<td>2</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>4.1</td>
<td>100.0</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>49</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td>100.0</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Table 6 highlights the descriptive statistics of the data collected for both questionnaires and is analysed under each construct per questionnaire.

Table 6: Descriptive Analysis of Data

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Descriptive Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Minimum</th>
<th>Maximum</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>10.4694</td>
<td>2.22769</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>10.00</td>
<td>6.8776</td>
<td>1.67870</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>9.9184</td>
<td>2.61276</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>4.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>9.8163</td>
<td>3.12699</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.00</td>
<td>14.00</td>
<td>10.5714</td>
<td>2.04124</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policy</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>5.00</td>
<td>13.00</td>
<td>9.6939</td>
<td>2.18140</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Peers</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>12.7755</td>
<td>1.53114</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Relationship with Supervisors</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>3.00</td>
<td>15.00</td>
<td>11.0000</td>
<td>2.78388</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>5.6735</td>
<td>1.91907</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Working Conditions</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>2.00</td>
<td>9.00</td>
<td>6.6122</td>
<td>1.74184</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>22.00</td>
<td>55.00</td>
<td>43.3469</td>
<td>6.65692</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic Job Satisfaction</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>17.00</td>
<td>38.00</td>
<td>28.0408</td>
<td>4.82165</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Valid N (listwise)</td>
<td>49</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.2 Are intrinsic factors more important than extrinsic factors

To compute the first hypothesis, the composite variable had to be constructed for both questions related to intrinsic and questions related to extrinsic. The composite variable is a variable created by merging two or more variables together into a single combined variable (Hao, Yuan, Liu, Wang, Liu, Yang & Zhan, 2017). All the questions labelled as Intrinsic for both the Teck-Hong and Waheed and on the Minnesota Questionnaire were merged and the same was done for the extrinsic questions. Once merged, the author performed a t-test on the two composite variables.

Initially from the descriptive statistics, it is shown that both intrinsic and extrinsic factors highly motivate graduates as denoted by the high mean averages as shown in Table 7. However, according to the mean graduates do in fact favour intrinsic factors over extrinsic factors. The mean value tested was computed as 75.7143 following initial descriptive statistics analysis and thus was used as the test value following the merging of the factors into composite variables.

Table 7: Descriptive Analysis of Composite Variables

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>77.6327</td>
<td>12.28260</td>
<td>1.75466</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>73.7959</td>
<td>10.00412</td>
<td>1.42916</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per Table 8 and from the t-score for each construct, we can determine that graduates' value Intrinsic factors more so than extrinsic factors.

Table 8: T-test Results Intrinsic vs Extrinsic

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Intrinsic</td>
<td>1.093</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.280</td>
<td>1.91835</td>
<td>-1.6096 - 5.4463</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Extrinsic</td>
<td>-1.342</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.186</td>
<td>-1.91838</td>
<td>-4.7919 - .9551</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
However, one note to take away from this objective is that although intrinsic factors weigh heavier with graduates than extrinsic factors, the largest weighted factor was Relationship with Peers.

4.3 Sub-Objective 1 - Graduates place a higher importance on monetary gain over career advancement when deciding on a place of employment

The first sub-objective of this research was to determine whether graduates placed monetary gain over career advancement when job seeking. To determine this hypothesis, a composite variable for the construct of monetary gain and one for career advancement were created using the Comparative means function in SPSS. Firstly, the descriptive statistics show from the mean that this hypothesis is untrue as career advancement has a higher mean than the monetary construct in Table 9. This was followed by a one sample t-test with a test value of 6.27555 taken from the averages provided by the initial descriptive statistics in Table 6.

Table 9: Descriptive Statistics Results Money vs Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Statistics</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>N</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per Table 10 and from the t-score for each construct, we can determine that graduates' do not value monetary gain over career advancement when selecting employment opportunities. However, this viewpoint is likely to change when graduates advance in their careers (Rahman & Nas, 2013).

Table 10: T-test Results Money vs Advancement

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Test</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Test Value = 6.27555</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>t</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>-----</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Money</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
4.4 Sub-Objective 2 - The opportunity of career advancement is more important than the work itself

The second sub-objective of this research was to determine whether career advancement ranks higher than the work itself when a graduate chooses a potential place of employment. As per the first sub-objective, a composite variable for each construct of career advancement and work itself were created using the Comparative means function in SPSS. Firstly, the descriptive statistics show from the mean that this hypothesis is untrue as work itself pertains to a larger mean than career advancement as shown in Table 11. This was followed by a one sample t-test with a test value of 8.398 taken from the averages provided by the initial descriptive statistics in Table 6.

Table 11: Descriptive Statistics Results Advancement vs Work Itself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Statistics</th>
<th>N</th>
<th>Mean</th>
<th>Std. Deviation</th>
<th>Std. Error Mean</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>6.8776</td>
<td>1.67870</td>
<td>.23981</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>49</td>
<td>9.9184</td>
<td>2.61276</td>
<td>.37325</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

As per Table 12 and from the t-score for each construct, we can determine that graduates’ do not value career advancement over work itself when selecting employment opportunities. Much like the first sub-objective, dependent on a worker’s place in their career this value may change in future (Kambayashi & Kato, 2017).

Table 12: T-test Results Advancement vs Work Itself

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>One-Sample Test</th>
<th>Test Value = 8.398</th>
<th>t</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Sig. (2-tailed)</th>
<th>Mean Difference</th>
<th>95% Confidence Interval of the Difference</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>Lower</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>-6.340</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>-1.52045</td>
<td>-2.0026</td>
<td>-1.0383</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>4.073</td>
<td>48</td>
<td>.000</td>
<td>1.52037</td>
<td>.7699</td>
<td>2.2708</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
Chapter 5 – Discussion

This chapter will outline the key findings of this research and the literature to identify key trends emerging. The main objective was to determine whether intrinsic factors are more valued by Irish graduates than extrinsic factors when it comes to selecting places of employment. The framework utilised was Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory or Hygiene-Motivation theory. The questionnaires selected for the collation of data for this research were based on this framework with two published surveys combined, being Teck-Hong and Waheed’s published surveys, in conjunction with the short version of the Minnesota Satisfaction Survey.

The first hypothesis was proven true that graduates place a higher significance on the intrinsic constructs when it comes to choosing a job. As the composite variable mean showed that the aggregate score was 77 for intrinsic versus 73 for extrinsic factors. On this basis, and in line with the literature Schwab & Heneman III, 1970), that Irish graduates are more satisfied with employment when intrinsic factors are met. However, it is also worth noting that extrinsic factors did a score a high rating with graduates showing that this construct can not be ignored when designing a job description and employment opportunity. The specific factor that obtained the largest aggregate score was the relationship with peers. By this observation, the emphasis that graduates place upon company culture in their selection of employment opportunities must be considered. Therefore, a company must be aware of the company culture as this could be impacting potential new applicants deciding to apply by recommendations of existing or previous employees (Wei Tian, Cordery & Gamble, 2016).

The first sub-objective was proven untrue. It was deemed, according to the sample data gathered that graduates hold career advancement higher in regard over monetary gain. This is in line with the literature (Bonnici, Maatta, Klose, Julien & Bajjaly, 2016) that graduates would prefer their first roles after graduation to be helpful for advancing in their career. However, it must be noted that this relationship is likely to change once a graduate progresses through their career when other external factors and needs must be met (Cennamo & Gardner, 2008). External factors such as a mortgage and costly expenditures such as cars and
children will motivate individuals alternatively which will shift this relationship in the opposite direction.

Like the first sub-objective, the second alternative was proven untrue. Unlike the literature (Great Expectations, 2016), the research shows that graduates place more emphasis on the actual work itself over career advancement. By companies being aware that millennials are satisfied more so by the work itself than career advancement, they could develop and advertise their open positions by emphasising on the work itself. By the graduates focusing on the work itself when selecting jobs, it would allow them to develop their skills for a specific role. This in turn would allow them to advance more so in their career externally than potential opportunities available in their existing company (Johennesse & Te-Kuang, 2017).
Chapter 6 – Conclusion

This research sought to compare whether graduates valued intrinsic job factors over extrinsic factors. It included a thorough review of the current international literature which relates to the factors that recent graduates place significant importance on, while considering this in the context of Irish graduates. The framework that was chosen to investigate these constructs was Herzberg’s Two Factor Theory or Hygiene-Motivation Theory. The questionnaire utilised in this study was based on the published survey by Teck-Hong and Waheed (2011). This survey was further accentuated by including the short version of the Minnesota Job Satisfaction survey. By combining the results of these surveys, the information gathered from Irish graduates was analysed using SPSS. Each hypothesis of this research paper was evaluated using the one sample t-test to establish whether it held a higher preference among the sample collected.

Given the findings of the research it is evident that Irish graduates favour intrinsic job factors over extrinsic factors. Furthermore, the sub-objective hypotheses were evaluated with graduates favouring the work itself over career advancement. Notably, career advancement is more important initially for graduates over monetary gain. This was highlighted in the literature review with previous research showing that graduates perceive career advancement as being critically important to their higher earning capacity later in their careers. By analysing these hypotheses, Irish employers can self-evaluate the current factors of their employment opportunities. If they envisage employing graduates, they can utilise these findings in re-constructing their roles to attract and retain staff.

The major limitation of this study, and not limited to, is the sample size testing this research. As there is a gap in the literature in relation to an Irish context, it is recommended that by gathering a larger sample size, it would further signify these results as a true reflection of the wider current Irish graduate’s core values for employment. Furthermore, a future study of the same sample to determine the shift in their job motivations would allow companies to evaluate the career paths in their companies. With this data they could then develop distinctive career opportunities that would not only motivate and satisfy their staff but assist in
retaining staff for longer periods which would benefit the company. The company would be able to avail of significant returns on investment, reduce the loss of productivity and limit the haemorrhaging of vital knowledge based skills from the company.
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### Herzberg Two Factor Questionnaire

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Motivators</strong></td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>1. I am proud to work in this company because it recognizes my achievements</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>2. I feel satisfied with my job because it gives me a feeling of accomplishment.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>3. I feel I have contributed towards my company in a positive manner.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>1. I will choose career advancement rather than monetary incentives.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Advancement</td>
<td>2. My job allows me to learn new skills for career advancement.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>1. My work is thrilling and I have a lot of variety in tasks that I do.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>2. I am empowered enough to do my job.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Work Itself</td>
<td>3. My job is challenging and exciting.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>1. I feel appreciated when I achieve or complete a task.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>2. My manager always thanks me for a job well done</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>3. I receive adequate recognition for doing my job well.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>1. I am proud to work in my company because I feel I have grown as a person.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>2. My job allows me to grow and develop as a person</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Growth</td>
<td>3. My job allows me to improve my experience, skills and performance.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Hygiene</td>
<td><strong>Company Policy</strong></td>
<td>1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Company Policy</td>
<td>1. The attitude of the administration is very accommodating in my company.</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>
## Company Policy

2. I am proud to work for this company because the company policy is favourable for its workers.

3. I completely understand the mission of my company.

## Relationship with Peers

1. It is easy to get along with my colleagues.

2. My colleagues are helpful and friendly.

3. My workplace is located in an area where I feel comfortable.

## Relationship with Supervisor

1. I feel my performance has improved because of the support from my supervisor.

2. I feel satisfied at work because of my relationship with my supervisor.

3. My supervisors are strong and trustworthy leaders.

## Money

1. I am encouraged to work harder because of my salary.

2. I believe my salary is fair.

## Working Conditions

1. I feel satisfied because of the comfort I am provided at work.

2. I am proud to work for my company because of the pleasant working conditions.

### Minnesota Satisfaction Questionnaire – Short Version

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Factors</th>
<th>Questions</th>
<th>Ratings</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Intrinsic</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Ability Utilization</td>
<td>The chance to do something that makes use of my abilities</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>The feeling of accomplishment that I get from the job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Activity</td>
<td>Being able to keep busy all the time</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Creativity</td>
<td>The chance to try my own methods of doing the job</td>
<td>1 2 3 4 5</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

1 = Strongly Disagree, 2 = Disagree, 3 = Neither Agree or Disagree, 4 = Agree and 5 = Strongly Agree
| **Independence** | The chance to work alone on the job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Moral Values** | Being able to do things that don’t go against my conscience | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Responsibility** | The freedom to use my own judgment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Security** | The way my job provides for steady employment | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Variety** | The chance to do different things from time to time | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Social Service** | The chance to do things for other people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Social Status** | The chance to be "somebody" in the community | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Authority** | The chance to tell other people what to do | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Extrinsic** | | | | | | |
| **Compensation** | My pay and the amount of work I do | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Policies and Procedures** | The way organization policies are put into practice | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Co-workers** | The way my co-workers get along with each other | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Supervision (Technical)** | The competence of my supervisor in making decisions | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Supervision (Human Relations)** | The way my boss handles his people | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Working Conditions** | The physical environment where I work | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Advancement** | The chances to advance on this job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |
| **Recognition** | The praise I get for doing a good job | 1 | 2 | 3 | 4 | 5 |