

Open Access Repository www.ssoar.info

Satisfaction of Polish bank employees with incentive systems: an empirical approach

Kaźmierczyk, J.; Żelichowska, E.

Veröffentlichungsversion / Published Version Zeitschriftenartikel / journal article

Empfohlene Zitierung / Suggested Citation:

Kaźmierczyk, J., & Żelichowska, E. (2017). Satisfaction of Polish bank employees with incentive systems: an empirical approach. *Baltic Region*, *9*(3), 58-86. <u>https://doi.org/10.5922/2079-8555-2017-3-5</u>

Nutzungsbedingungen:

Dieser Text wird unter einer CC BY-NC Lizenz (Namensnennung-Nicht-kommerziell) zur Verfügung gestellt. Nähere Auskünfte zu den CC-Lizenzen finden Sie hier: <u>https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0/deed.de</u>

Terms of use:

This document is made available under a CC BY-NC Licence (Attribution-NonCommercial). For more Information see: https://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc/4.0





Diese Version ist zitierbar unter / This version is citable under: <u>https://nbn-resolving.org/urn:nbn:de:0168-ssoar-56350-7</u>

SATISFACTION OF POLISH BANK EMPLOYEES WITH INCENTIVE SYSTEMS: AN EMPIRICAL APPROACH

J. Kaźmierczyk^{1,2} E. Żelichowska¹

Ì

¹ Poznan University of Economics
10 Al. Niepodległości, Poznań,
61—875, Poland.
² Tyumen State University
6 Volodarskogo St., Tyumen,
625003, Russia.

Submitted on March 06, 2017

doi: 10.5922/2079-8555-2017-3-5

© Kaźmierczyk J., Żelichowska E., 2017

This article considers employee satisfaction with incentive systems. Strict requirements for the efficiency of human resource management (HRM) and internal public relations make it a major management problem. The importance of this study lies in the fact that incentives affect all stages of HRM. This work reports the results of an empirical survey of Polish bank employees, which was aimed to establish to what degree incentive systems met employees' expectations and to analyse the impact of such incentives on employee satisfaction. The authors advance the thesis that male bank employees are more satisfied with existing incentive systems than their female counterparts. The discussion is supported by empirical research based on a sample of 1, 920 Polish bank employees. The article is divided into five sections. The introductory section is followed by Section Two, which reviews employee motivation and analyses the above thesis. Section Three describes data sources and research methods, and Section Four presents findings and conclusions.

Key words: motivation, incentives, compliance, employees, banks, Poland

Introduction

More and more researchers analyse employees' motivation [15, p. 85; 16, p. 30; 19, p. 38; 22, p. 151; 24, p. 21; 31, p. 9], with particular emphasis being laid on the issue of incentives, which are used with varying intensity and contribute to employees' work satisfaction. Creating a conformity incentive system is not a simple task. The effectiveness of the implemented incentives depends on the proper recognition of thesis tools. The needs and expectations of employees are changing, so it is important to identify them. The diversity of employees is another factor which should be taken into consideration when optimizing the effectiveness of the motivational function.

Motivation is a very important factor in the success of the entire organization. Employees' motivation is closely related to satisfaction of existing incentives. It means that those incentives should be very well planned to magnify employees' contentment.

This study analyzes employee incentives in the banks of Poland. The banking sector has been chosen as an area of analysis due to its dynamic growth in the Polish economy. Banks employ a lot of staff in a variety of positions and are characterized by a complex organizational structure. For over 25 years they have experienced large employee turnover including the implementation of human resource solutions transferred from their foreign parent banks [3, p. 147; 15, p. 63].

Employee incentives have been studied for a long time, as it is evident from the literature review below [2, p. 633; 6, p. 88—90; 7, p. 71; 8, p. 91; 9, p. 2207; 11, p. 1; 17, p. 227; 21, p. 81; 26, p. 107; 29, p. 701; 30, p. 466]. There is insufficient research into the changing economic and social conditions [23, p. 50; 28, p. 29—30; 32, p. 127]. There is also a lack of in-depth research into the conformity of the incentive systems of the banks in Poland.

This study focuses on the approach to motivation from an employee's point of view and includes a selected group of employees representing the banking sector in Poland. The aim of this study is to present the results of the author's own empirical research conducted among bank employees in Poland, to determine the conformity of the incentive system in banks with employees' individual expectations as well as to analyze the influence of incentives on the conformity of employees. This paper is structured in such a way to fully achieve the aim of this study. This paper propounds the following thesis: male employees in banks are more satisfied with the existing incentive system in their banks than females.

To accomplish the research aim undertaken in this paper, the author made use of specialist literature in Polish, English and Russian on economics, human resource management, banking and industrial and organizational psychology (The ACM Digital Library, BazEkon, EBSCO, Emerald, ProQuest). A survey of nearly 2,000 bank employees was also carried out.

Apart from the introduction, this article starts with a brief analysis of the meaning of work motivation and conformity thesis presentation, and the description of the research method adopted. Finally, the research sample has been characterized and the research results have been presented.

Employee motivation and the conformity thesis

At the turn of the century, the approach to work motivation was undergoing constant evolution. The perception of it as an essential component of the management process, thanks to which employee efficiency could be increased is an approach adopted only recently. Still in the period preceding the industrial revolution, the most commonly used forms of motivation were based on the fear of sanctions — physical, financial, or social [27, p. 12]. Currently, motivation is a term studied in many fields of science, such as psychology, organization and management, or economics.

٢

The process of motivation is to result in achieving the optimal level of motivation. Motivation is very important both in everyday and professional life. Thanks to it, people attain not only goals they set themselves but also those set by others. D. Podmoroff propounds a thesis that "...motivated workers are essential for the company's survival. They are more efficient and their positive energy creates a good atmosphere and is infectious to others." [20, p. 37].

From the point of view of organization, motivation is one of the main functions of management [1, p. 21; 18, p. 136; 15, p. 85]. Managers play a key role in the shaping of an organization's effectiveness. They are responsible for motivating the employees to achieve the established objectives. managers do it by meeting the employees' needs, emphasizing the value of their contribution, as well as recognizing and rewarding their successes.

This paper propounds the following thesis: male employees in banks are more satisfied with the existing incentive system in the banks than female. The main reason for postulating this thesis is the results of a survey conducted by the Catalyst organization in 2008. It shows that despite having the same qualifications and the same level of education as male employees, female employees are less satisfied with their professional career than males [12, p. 82]. There are grounds to believe that male employees of the banks in Poland are more satisfied with the current incentive system in their organization than females.

Methodology¹

The data from the survey, which was conducted from January 2016 to April 2016, were used to test the research thesis. The 'snowball' technique was used to collect the data². The survey participants were invited by respondents of the previous surveys. Personal contacts and individual visits to banks were used to collect the data. More than 20,000 requests were sent asking to fill in the questionnaire via e-mail, social networking websites (such as Facebook, GoldenLine and LinkedIn) and thematic forums. Both an electronic version (https://docs.google.com/forms/d/1fq9ZKdr8zXA7zjp8w FowBqJ6ciT4nSmjer598pGWbG0/viewform) and a hard copy of the questionnaire were used in the survey.

¹ The research results presented are part of a broader study recruitment, forms of employment, motivation, professional education, e-learning, loyalty, stress, work efficiency, MBO, perks, mobbing, professional career, derecruitment, dismissals and outplacement), which was based on the same research method. Thus, the description of the research method is applicable also to the results of research on other aspects of HRM and other papers by Jerzy Kaźmierczyk (e.g. [3, p. 146]).

² This research method is simple, inexpensive and allows researchers to reach a wider audience.

The main survey was preceded by a two-staged pilot survey. First, the survey was conducted on a small group of participants (180 students). The aim was to reveal any inconsistencies and to examine whether the questions were understandableto the pilot study, the questionnaire was modified and improved. In the second stage, the target group consisted of 100 employees from the banking sector.

Finally, the questionnaires were completed by 1,949 respondents. 29 questionnaires were rejected due to low credibility and reliability (for example, some respondents selected "0" in response to all closed-ended questions). As a result, the final research sample consists of 1,920 respondents (152 electronic version and 1,768 hard copy). Table 1 provides more details regarding the sample structure.

Table 1

٢

	Criterion	Number of individuals	Percentage
	Female	1,312	68.33%
Gender	Male	473	24.64%
	No answer	135	7.03%
	University (major in economics)	883	45.99%
	University (other)	515	26.82%
	High school (major in economics)	270	14.06%
Education	High school (other)	189	9.84%
	Vocational	2	0.1%
	Elementary	2	0.1%
	No answer	59	3.1%
	Senior managerial position	43	2.24%
Occupied	Middle-level managerial position	129	6.72%
position	Lower-level managerial position	153	7.97%
position	Non-managerial position	1,485	77.34%
	No answer	110	5.73%
	Headquarters	409	21.3%
Organizational	Regional branch	416	21.66%
unit	Operational branch	1020	53.13%
	No answer	75	3.91%
	Commercial bank	1,342	69.90%
Type of bank	Cooperative bank	481	25.05%
	No answer	97	5.05%
	National	919	47.86%
The equity	Foreign	863	44.95%
	No answer	138	7.19%
	Front office	1,118	58.23%
Workplace	Back office	460	23.96%
	No answer	342	17.81%

Sample structure

	Criterion	Number of individuals	Percentage
	Lack	1,820	94.79%
	Slight level	12	0.63%
Disability	Moderate level	8	0.42%
	Significant level	2	0.1%
	No answer	78	4.06%

End of table 1

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

The composition of the research sample according to gender, the type of education and the type of bank corresponds to the structure of employment in the banking sector in Poland [15, p. 115—124]. The mean age of respondents was 36,612 years. The mean work experience in banking was 12,065 years, ranging from 1 to 43 years. The mean total work experience of respondents was 14,976 years (Table 2).

Table 2

	r				
Criterion	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Median	Standard deviation
Age	19	64	36,612	35	9,7496
Work experience in					
banking	1	43	12,065	10,000	9,5799
Work experience with					
current employer	1	43	9,835	7,000	9,3882
Total work experi-					
ence	1	45	14,976	12,000	10,2416

Statistics summary: age and work experience

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

The locality size criterion demonstrates that the largest group of respondents came from the localities inhabited by 50 th. people, the fewest surveyed people coming from localities with 200—500 th. inhabitants (Table 3).

Table 3

Statistics summary: place of residence

	Number of individuals	Percentage
Up to 50 th. people	658	34.27%
50—100 th. people	251	13.07%

٢

End of table 3

٢

	Number of individuals	Percentage
100—200 th. people	245	12.76%
200—500 th. people	124	6.46%
More than 500 th. people	541	28.18%
No answer	101	5.26%

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

The questionnaire consisted of an introduction followed by 23 closedended questions and several demographic and work-related questions. The main part of the questionnaire contained questions which refer to a few important human resource management areas. Some of the questions were used to test the research thesis.

Employees' conformity: empirical research

The conformity of the incentive system existing in banks with employees' individual expectations may be analyzed using the decision tree. As in the case of clusters, the decision tree is built on similarities and differences. The conformity of the incentive system existing in banks with employees' individual expectations was assumed to be a dependent variable, whereas all the data available in the data sheets characterizing bank employees were assumed as independent variables.

In the CRT (Classification and Regression Trees) method it is assumed that the homogeneity of the group is a splitting criterion. The resulting groups should be as homogeneous internally as possible (the highest withinnode homogeneity possible). CHAID (Chi-square Automatic Interaction Detection) uses **multiway splits** by default. In this method, the chi square is optimized and the groups can be combined into categories. Both methods assume that each node (set) must involve at least 50 observations.

According to the CHAID method (Chart 1), the most important factor determining the conformity of the incentive system with an employee's individual expectations was age; younger employees (up to 27 years of age) being more satisfied with the existing incentive system. The criterion of age is followed by workplace (esp. for younger staff) and gender (esp. for older staff). Those employed at the bank's headquarters, especially the younger staff, showed greater satisfaction with the incentive system. However, females over 27 years of age were slightly less satisfied with the incentive system than males in the same age group. In their case, the number of days of age with high absence rates were less satisfied with the existing incentive

system. The direction of this dependence may constitute an area for further research (namely, whether increased absenteeism causes less satisfaction with the incentive system, or conversely, less satisfaction leads to higher absenteeism).

According to the CRT method (Chart 2), the most important factor determining the conformity of the incentive system with the employee's individual expectations was the number of days of absence from work during the previous year. The CRT method, as did the CHAID method, proved that employees with higher work attendance are more satisfied with the incentive system. Those who were absent from work for an average of at least 4.5 days can be divided into two groups: the young — up to 27.5 years of age (more satisfied) and the older — over 27.5 years of age (less satisfied). These observations are largely consistent with the results of the CHAID method. It turns out that for an employee's satisfaction with the incentive system the following are of importance: young age, high attendance at work and gender (male).

From Chart 3 it follows that:

— there is a difference between the percentage of female (18.3%) and male employees (15.6%) declaring a complete lack of conformity of the incentive system existing in their workplace with their individual expectations (more females by 2.7 percentage points),

— in the group who declare that the incentive system existing in their workplace is rather inconsistent with their individual expectations males prevail by 3.0 percentage point over females, 34.0% to 31.0% respectively,

— among those who do not have any opinion on the conformity of the incentive system existing in their workplace with their individual expectations there are definitely more females (26.5%) than males (20.5%) (more females by 6.0 percentage points),

— there is a considerable difference between the percentage of male (26.3%) and female respondents (19.2%) (more males by 7.1 percentage points) in the group who declare that the incentive system existing in their workplace is rather conformant with their individual expectations,

— the percentage of female (4.9%) and male respondents (3.6%) who affirm a complete conformity of the incentive system existing in their workplace with their individual expectations are approximately the same (more females by 1.3 percentage points).

The differences between the respondent groups as to their attitude to the incentive system existing in their workplace may seem small. However, one can observe that more female employees declare a lack of conformity of the incentive system, with a large proportion of female respondents declaring a complete lack of conformity. Meeting the employees' expectations results in their satisfaction, therefore the inconsistence of the incentive system with employees' individual expectations means that they are not satisfied with it.

_			%	18,4	33,7	24,4	19,3	4,2	83,0													
Age in year Adjusted value P = 0.000, Chi-square = 31.589, df = 4	> 27	Node 2	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total													
vith			n	330	595	470	391	88	1,874				ters		n	2	19	30	36	7	94	
e system w tpectations			%	17,6	31,8	25,1	20,9	4,7	100,0				Headquarters		%	2,1	20,2	31,9	38,3	7,4	5,0	
The conformity of the incentive system with an employee's individual expectations		Node 0	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total		007,	df'= 4		Node 4	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	
ear 00, = 4			n	44	71	90	91	23	319	onal unit	Adjusted value $P = 0.007$	Chi-square = 18.517 , df = 4			u	42	52	60	55	16	225	
Age in y lue $P = 0.00$ 31.589, df =			%	13,8	22,3	28,2	28,5	7,2	17,0	Organizational unit	Adjusted v	Chi-square			%	18,7	23,1	26,7	24,4	7,1	12,0	
Age in year Adjusted value P = 0.000, Chi-square = 31.589, df = 4	<= 27	Node 1	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total				Operational branch; Regional branch	Node 3	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	

n 1,555

Fig. 1. A decision tree: the conformity of the incentive system in banks with employees' individual expectations by the criteria from the respondent data sheets (CHAID method) (*Continued on page 66–67*)

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

Continued from page 65

>27

													u	15	47	29	6	7	107
													%	14,0	43,9	27,1	8,4	6,5	5,7
											No answer	Node 7	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total
	n	286	524	380	300	65	1,555		P = 0.000,	8.840, df = 8			n	61	135	77	107	10	390
	%	18,4	33,7	24,4	19,3	4,2	83,0	Gender	Adjusted value $P = 0.000$	Chi-square $= 38.840$, df $= 8$	Male		%	15,6	34,6	19,7	27,4	2,6	20,8
Node 2	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total					Node 6	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total
													u	210	342	274	184	48	1,058
											Female		%	19,8	32,3	25,9	17,4	4,5	56,5
												Node 5	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

Continued on page 67

Continued from pages 65—66

Female		
Node 5		
Category	%	u
No conformity	19,8	210
Incomplete conformity	32,3	342
No opinion	25,9	274
Rather conformity than not	17,4	184
Complete conformity	4,5	48
Total	56,5	1,058
The number of days of absence	f absence	
from work in the last 12 months	2 months	

|--|

<pre>< = 2,00</pre>	Category % n	ity 6,4 5		25,6 20	ormity than not 33,3 26	onformity 3,8 3	4,2 78
<= 2,00	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

	> 2,00	
Node 9		
Category	%	u
No conformity	20,9	205
Incomplete conformity	32,4	318
No opinion	25,9	254
Rather conformity than not	16,1	158
Complete conformity	4,6	45
Total	52,3	080

ı work holidays)			п	299	509	407	308	78	1,601													
nce fron cluding			%	18,7	31,8	25,4	19,2	4,9	85,4													
The number of days of absence from work in the last 12 months (not including holidays) Correction = 0.004	>4,50	Node 2	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total													
IS			u	330	595	470	391	88	1874					0		n	15	47	22	40	5	129
tive system expectation			%	17,6	31,8	25,1	20,9	4,7	100,0					>2,50		%	11,6	36,4	17,1	31,0	3,9	6,9
The conformity of the incentive system with an employee's individual expectations		Node 0	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total		The number of days of absence from work	12 months (not including holidays)			Node 4	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total
ys) 004			n	31	86	63	83	10	273		er of days	2 months	= 0.002			n	16	39	41	43	5	144
nce from work ncluding holiday Correction = 0.0			%	11,4	31,5	23,1	30,4	3,7	14,6		The numbe	in the last 1	Correction			%	11,1	27,1	28,5	29,9	3,5	7,7
The number of days of absence from work in the last 12 months (not including holidays) Correction = 0.00	<=4,50	Node 1	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total					<=2,50	Node 3	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

Fig. 2. A decision tree: the conformity of the incentive system in banks with employees' individual expectations by the criteria from the respondent data sheets (CRT method) (*Continued on page 69–70*)

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

Continued from pages 68

Соне	Age in years Correction = 0.004	ears 004	> 4,50			Age in years Correction = 0.004		
<=27,50						>27,50		
Node 5			Node 2			Node 6		
Category	%	n	Category	0%	n	Category	%	n
No conformity	15,2	41	No conformity	18,7	299	No conformity	19,4	258
Incomplete conformity	20,8	56	Incomplete conformity	31,8	509	Incomplete conformity	34,0	453
No opinion	29,7	80	No opinion	25,4	407	No opinion	24,5	327
Rather conformity than not	26,8	72	Rather conformity than not	19,2	308	Rather conformity than not	17,7	236
Complete conformity	7,4	20	Complete conformity	4,9	78	Complete conformity	4,4	58
Total	14,4	269	Total	85,4	1,601	Total	71,1	1,332
						Gender		
						Correction $= 0.003$		
			Female				Male	
			Node 11			Node 12		
			Category	%	u	Category	%	n
			No conformity	20,8	209	No conformity	14,9	49
			Incomplete conformity	33,1	332	Incomplete conformity	36,9	121
			No opinion	26,0	261	No opinion	20,1	99
			Rather conformity than not	15,2	153	Rather conformity than not	25,3	83
			Complete conformity	4,9	49	Complete conformity	2,7	6
			Total	53,6	1,004	Total	17,5	328

Continued on page 70

						Continued from pages 68—69	18es 68—6	60
Si	Size of locality	ality	05 6=>			Size of locality Correction = 0.003		
to 50 th. people; 50—100 th. people; 100—200 th. people; 100—200 th. people	th. people	200				200-500 th. people; More than 500 th. people	9	
Node 7			Node 3			Node 8		1
Category	%	u	Category	%	n	Category	% n	
No conformity	10,7	6	No conformity	11,1	16			
Incomplete conformity	29,8	25	Incomplete conformity	27,1	39	Incomplete conformity 23	3,3 14	
No opinion	38,1	32	No opinion	28,5	41	No opinion 15		
Rather conformity than not	17,9	15	Rather conformity than not	29,9	43	ormity than not	46,7 28	
Complete conformity	3,6	ω	Complete conformity	3,5	5	Complete conformity 3		
Total	4,5	84	Total	7,7	144	Total 3	3,2 60	
Work experience with current employer	ent emple	oyer			<u> </u>	Work experience with current employer	nployer	
C	(in years)	ars)	>2,50			(in years)		
Contect <=3 50	$\frac{\text{Correction} = 0.002}{0}$	700.				CORCUON = 0.002 >3 50		
Node 9			Node 4			Node 10		1
Category	%	u	Category	%	u		% n	
No conformity	3,8	7	No conformity	11,6	15	No conformity 17,1	7,1 13	l
Incomplete conformity	28,3	15	Incomplete conformity	36,4	47	Incomplete conformity 42		
No opinion	17,0	6	No opinion	17,1	22	No opinion 17,1	7,1 13	
Rather conformity than not	45,3	24	Rather conformity than not	31,0	40	Rather conformity than not 21		
Complete conformity	5,7	б	Complete conformity	3,9	5	Complete conformity 2,		
Total	2,8	53	Total	6,9	129	Hroro 4,1	.,1 76	

				%	15,6	34,0	20,5	26,3	3,6	25,1													
Gender $C_{\text{orrection}} = 0.002$			7 anon	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total													
	c11			n	328	591	466	391	86	1,862						u	27	67	52	45	16	207	
tive system	capectatio			%	17,6	31,7	25,0	21,0	4,6	100,0			N.º	DNI		%	13,0	32,4	25,1	21,7	7,7	11,1	
The conformity of the incentive system	with an emproyee's murvidual expectations	O-F-IV	INODE O	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total					Node 4	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	
Gender	700-			n	255	432	370	268	69	1,394	nosition	n = 0.001				n	228	365	318	223	53	1,187	
Gender				%	18,3	31,0	26,5	19,2	4,9	74,9	Occunied nosition	Correction $= 0.001$				%	19,2	30,7	26,8	18,8	4,5	63,7	
Jone	Female	remark Nr.4.1	I abovi	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total			V.	ICS	Node 3	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	

n

Fig. 3. A decision tree: the conformity of the incentive system in banks with employees' individual expectations by gender and occupied position (CRT method) (*Continued on page 72*)

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

Continued from pages 71

Male	ıle	
Node 2	le 2	
Category	%	n
No conformity	15,6	73
Incomplete conformity	34,0	159
No opinion	20,5	96
Rather conformity than not	26,3	123
Complete conformity	3,6	17
Total	25,1	468
	Occupied position	
<u> </u>	Correction = 0.000	

		n	58	119	76	89	13	355
		%	16,3	33,5	21,4	25,1	3,7	19,1
Non-managerial	Node 5	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

	Managerial	al
9 opon		
Category	%	n
No conformity	13,3	15
Incomplete conformity	35,4	40
No opinion	17,7	20
Rather conformity than not	30,1	34
Complete conformity	3,5	4
Total	6,1	113

This study partially verified the propounded thesis. Male employees in banks are more satisfied with the incentive system existing in their workplace than females. This conclusion also serves as partial confirmation of the studies conducted by the Catalyst organization, which showed that female staff are in general less satisfied with their professional career than males [12, p. 82].

Higher wages received by men might be one of the factors influencing the situation (this factor is not analyzed in the survey). Moreover, according to the research conducted by L. van Scheers and J. Botha [25, pp. 108—109], there is a correlation between employees' job satisfaction and their motivation. The more employees are satisfied with their job, the more motivated they feel. This correlation becomes increasingly stronger with the employees' growing experience. The strength of this correlation was proved to be independent of the gender.

It is worth comparing the results of both studies and trying to draw further conclusions. As this research shows, male employees working in banks are more satisfied with the system of incentives existing in their workplace than females; one may presume that they are also more satisfied with their jobs than females. Considering the research results by L. van Scheers and J. Botha, this conclusion gives grounds to believe that male staff in Polish banks are more motivated to work than females. Another interesting conclusion is the correlation of the employee's age and experience. This phenomenon was the subject of this study, but is certainly worth further analysis.

It is also worth considering how important the position held by an employee for his/her satisfaction with the incentive system is. It may be presumed that female employees are less satisfied with the incentive system because they occupy non-managerial positions more frequently than males. Even if female staff held senior positions, they would still be less satisfied with the incentive system existing for their position.

The CRT method (Chart 3), on the other hand, showed that females in managerial positions are slightly more satisfied with the incentive system than those in non-managerial positions, with gender still being more important for an employee's degree of satisfaction than the occupied position. Conversely, the CHAID method has not demonstrated that the position was important for female employees' satisfaction.

Another question is whether there are any incentives that could increase employees' satisfaction with the incentive system. According to both the CHAID (Chart 4) and the CRT method (Chart 5), promotion is the most important incentive conducive to employees' greater satisfaction. Employees regarding promotion as an incentive were much more satisfied with the incentive system. Considering the strength of this incentive and the fact that the vast majority of employees did not mention any possibility of promotion at their workplace, one may consider introducing changes to employees' career paths and professional development. According to both the CHAID and the CRT method, for employees who are likely to be promoted, integration trips were of importance, as they increased employees' satisfaction with the incentive system (it can be presumed that integration relieves the stress accumulated in daily managerial work [13, p. 93; 4, p. 128]).

[n	1	459	H	240	4	1,365]										
			-	271																
			%	19,9	33,6	25,0	17,6	4,0	74,6											
Promotions Adjusted value P = 0.000, Chi-square = 62.614, df = 4	No	Node 2	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total											
vith			n	319	584	453	387	87	1,830				n	22	93	LL	93	14	299	
/e system v xpectations			%	17,4	31,9	24,8	21,1	4,8	100,0		No		%	7,4	31,1	25,8	31,1	4,7	16,3	
The conformity of the incentive system with an employee's individual expectations		Node 0	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	.000, df = 4		Node 4	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	
ions 000, f = 4			u	48	125	112	147	33	465	Integration trips Adjusted value P = 0.000, Chi-square = 20.600, df = 4			n	26	32	35	54	19	166	
Promotions hlue $P = 0.000$, 62.614, $df = 4$			%	10,3	26,9	24,1	31,6	7,1	25,4	Integration trips Adjusted value I Chi-square = 20			%	15,7	19,3	21,1	32,5	11,4	9,1	
Promoti Adjusted value P = 0.0 Chi-square = 62.614, df	Yes	Node 1	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total		Yes	Node 3	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	

Fig. 4. A decision tree: the conformity of the incentive system in banks with employees' individual expectations by employee incentives (CHAID method) (*Continued on page* 75-77)

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

74
page
from
Continued

Participation in goal and objective planning Adjusted value P = 0.000, Chi-square = 29.840, df = 4	ective plan alue $P = 0$ = 29.840, o	nning 0.000, If = 4	No			Participation in goal and objective planning Adjusted value P = 0.000, Chi-square = 29.840, df = 4	jective plai	ning
No						Yes		
Node 5			Node 2			Node 6		
Category	%	n	Category	%	n	Category	%	n
No conformity	20,2	265	No conformity	19,9	271	No conformity	12,0	9
Incomplete conformity	34,3	451	Incomplete conformity	33,6	459	Incomplete conformity	16,0	8
No opinion	25,1	330	No opinion	25,0	341	No opinion	22,0	11
Rather conformity than not	16,9	222	Rather conformity than not	17,6	240	Rather conformity than not	36,0	18
Complete conformity	3,6	47	Complete conformity	4,0	54	Complete conformity	14,0	7
Total	71,9	1315	Total	74,6	1,365	Total	2,7	50
	Holiday enheidy	enbeidw						
	Adjusted	Adjusted value $P = 0.000$.	0.000,					
	Chi-square	are $= 20.726$, df $= 4$	6, df = 4					
No				Yes				
Node 11			Node 12					
Category	%	n	Category	%	u			
No conformity	20,8	202	No conformity	18,3	63			
Incomplete conformity	30,8	299	Incomplete conformity	44,2	152			
No opinion	26,6	258	No opinion	20,9	72			
Rather conformity than not	18,0	175	Rather conformity than not	13,7	47			
Complete conformity	3,8	37	Complete conformity	2,9	10			
Total	53,1	971	Total	18,8	344			

Continued on page 76

	Yes		
	Node 3		
C	Category	%	n
No conformity		15,7	26
Incomplete conformity	formity	19,3	32
No opinion		21,1	35
Rather conformity than not	ity than not	32,5	54
Complete conformity	ormity	11,4	19
Total		9,1	166
	Private healthcare		
	Adjusted value $P = 0.014$,	.014,	
	Chi-square $= 12.506$, df $= 4$	df = 4	

		n	21	17	28	30	6	105
		%	20,0	16,2	26,7	28,6	8,6	5,7
Yes	Node 7	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

Fig. 4

Continued on page 77

61

3.3

Complete conformity

Total

5 15 10 10

8,2 24,6 11,5 39,3 16,4

Category No conformity Incomplete conformity No opinion Rather conformity than not

ц

%

ů

Node 8

76

Continued from page 74–76

		n	t 22	1 93	8 77	1 93	7 14	3 299			
No	Node 4	Category %	No conformity 7,4	Incomplete conformity 31,1	No opinion 25,8	Rather conformity than not 31,1	Complete conformity 4,7	Total 16,3	Additional insurance	Adjusted value $P = 0.002$,	Chi-square = 17.439, df = 4

		u	1	18	23	38	S	85
		%	1,2	21,2	27,1	44,7	5,9	4,6
Yes	Node 9	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

	No	
Node 10		
Category	%	п
No conformity	9,8	21
Incomplete conformity	35,0	75
No opinion	25,2	54
Rather conformity than not	25,7	55
Complete conformity	4,2	6
Total	11,7	214

			%	19,9	33,6	25,0	17,6	4,0	74,6											
Promotions Correction = 0.007	No	Node 2	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total											
ith			n	319	584	453	387	87	1,830					n	22	93	77	93	14	299
e system w cpectations			%	17,4	31,9	24,8	21,1	4,8	100,0			No		%	7,4	31,1	25,8	31,1	4,7	16,3
The conformity of the incentive system with an employee's individual expectations		Node 0	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total				Node 4	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total
tions 0.007			n	48	125	112	147	33	465		ntegration trips Correction = 0.002			u	26	32	35	54	19	166
Promotions Correction = 0.007			%	10,3	26,9	24,1	31,6	7,1	25,4	,	Integration trips Correction $= 0.0$			%	15,7	19,3	21,1	32,5	11,4	9,1
Cor	Yes	Node 1	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total			Yes	Node 3	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

n 1,365

Fig. 5. A decision tree: the conformity of the incentive system in banks with employees' individual expectations by employee incentives (CRT method) (*Continued on page 79–82*)

Source: own computations based on the survey data.

Continued from page 78

	Yes		
	Node 3		
Category	y	%	n
No conformity		15,7	26
Incomplete conformity	y	19,3	32
No opinion		21,1	35
Rather conformity than not	an not	32,5	54
Complete conformity		11,4	19
Total		9,1	166
0	Co-financing of sports	ports	
9	and recreation activities	tivities	
0	Correction = 0.001	1	

		u	10	10	8	29	6	66
		%	15,2	15,2	12,1	43,9	13,6	3,6
No	Node 7	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

	Yes	
Node 8		
Category	%	u
No conformity	16,0	16
Incomplete conformity	22,0	22
No opinion	27,0	27
Rather conformity than not	25,0	25
Complete conformity	10,0	10
Total	5,5	100

Fig. 5

Continued on page 80-82

Continued from page 78–79

	[_			4							_																	
				u	21	75	54	55	6	214					п	8	29	21	Ξ	7	71													
•				%	9,8	35,0	25,2	25,7	4 7,	11,7			Yes		%	11,3	40,8	29,6	15,5	2,8	3,9													
5	Additional insurance Correction = 0.002	No	Node 10	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	F	Correction = 0.001	<u>r</u>	Node 14	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total													
				n	22	93	77	93	14	299					n	13	46	33	44	7	143													
				%	7,4	31,1	25,8	31,1	4,7	16,3					%	9,1	32,2	23,1	30,8	4,9	7,8													
	No		Node 4	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total			No	Node 13	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total													
	2.2			n	1	18	23	38	5	85																								
	Additional insurance Correction = 0.002																%	1,2	21,2	27,1	44,7	5,9	4,6											
	Additic Corre	Yes	Node 9	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total																								

Continued on page 81-82

Continued from page 78—80

				n	99	155	76	55	16	368											
				%	17,9	42,1	20,7	14,9	4,3	20,1											
Holiday subsidy	Correction = 0.003	Yes	Node 6	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total											
				u	271	459	341	240	54	1,365					u	19	40	52	31	11	153
				%	19,9	33,6	25,0	17,6	4,0	74,6			Yes		%	12,4	26,1	34,0	20,3	7,2	8,4
	No		Node 2	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total				Node 12	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total
sidv	.003			n	205	304	265	185	38	766		n = 0.002			n	186	264	213	154	27	844
Holiday subsidy	Correction = 0.003			%	20,6	30,5	26,6	18,6	3,8	54,5	Pay rises	Correction =			%	22,0	31,3	25,2	18,2	3,2	46,1
H	Corr	No	Node 5	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total			No	Node 11	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total

Fig. 5

Continued on page 82

Continued from page 78-81

			1																	
				u	44	80	67	65	8	264				n	20	36	34	15	0	107
				%	16,7	30,3	25,4	24,6	3,0	14,4		Yes		%	18,7	33,6	31,8	14,0	1,9	5,8
	Praises Correction = 0.001	Yes	Node 16	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total	Reprimands Correction = 0.002		Node 18	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total
Γ				n	186	264	213	154	27	844				n	24	44	33	50	9	157
									•						3	0	0	8	~	
				%	22,0	31,	25,2	18,	3,2	46,]				%	15,	28,0	21,0	31,8	3,8	8,6
	No		Node 11	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total		No	Node 17	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total
	ses 01			u	142	184	146	89	19	580										
	Praises Correction = 0.001			%	24,5	31,7	25,2	15,3	3,3	31,7										
	Cor	No	Node 15	Category	No conformity	Incomplete conformity	No opinion	Rather conformity than not	Complete conformity	Total										

Рис. 5

Other incentives important for employees' satisfaction were the following ones: participation in planning, private healthcare, additional insurance, holiday subsidy, pay rises and co-financing of sports. However, these factors could be both conducive and not (as in the case of private healthcare) to the satisfaction with the incentive system. One should also note the importance of the participation in goal and objective planning (the CHAID method). The analysis shows that employees would like to have more influence on what is happening at their bank. It is no secret that participation is an important factor conducive to employees' satisfaction [5, pp. 1–2; 10, pp. 419–420; 14, p. 1].

Conclusions

This research has allowed for partial verification of the thesis concerning male and females' satisfaction with the incentive system currently existing in their workplace. The fact that differences between respondent groups regarding their attitude towards the existing incentive system may seem small, it has been proved that male employees in Polish banks are slightly more satisfied with the incentive system than females.

In this paper, two methods were used to interpret the answers received from banks' employees. Both lead to many interesting conclusions. The CHAID method indicates that age is the most important factor determining the conformity of the incentive system with an employee's individual expectations. However, the CRT method shows that the number of days of absence from work a year is a crucial indicator.

The CHAID method leads to two main conclusions:

• younger staff members (up to 27 years of age) who work in HQs are more satisfied with the existing incentive system;

• among older staff (above 27 years) women with high absence rates are the least satisfied group.

On the other hand, the CRT method leads to the following main conclusion: for an employee's satisfaction with the incentive system the following factors are of importance: high attendance at work, young age and gender (male).

The last and most important conclusion is that promotion is the most important incentive for employees' greater satisfaction with the incentive system. It has been proved by both the CHAID and CRT methods.

There is certainly room for further study. The question about the reasons of higher conformity of the incentive systems from male than female need deeper research taking into account a more detailed list of factors. Employees' motivation as seen by employers requires an in-depth study. Moreover, it would also be interesting to examine the reasons for the current situation and make a detailed analysis of the factors influencing the introduction of particular incentives.

٢

The study was sponsored by RGNF (Russian Humanitarian Science Foundation). Project: "Capabilities and restrictions new industrialization and contradictions sociocultural Space: on Example Tyumen region", No. 16-03-00500. Tyumen State University.

References

1. Andrzejczak, A. (ed.) 2001, Ogólne zasady uczenia się i motywacji. In: *Podstawy przygotowania zawodowego nauczycieli przedmiotów ekonomicznych*, Poznań, p. 130.

2. Abernethy, M.A., Dekker, H.C., Schulz A.K-D. 2015, Are Employee Selection and Incentive Contracts Complements or Substitutes? *Journal of Accounting Research*, Vol. 53, no. 4, p. 633–668.

3. Aptacy, M., Kaźmierczyk, J. 2016, The Management by Objectives in Banks: The Polish Case, *The International Journal Entrepreneurship And Sustainability Issues*, Vol. 4, no. 2, p. 146–158.

4. Chadsey, J., Beyer, S. 2001, Social relationships in the workplace, *Mental Re-tardation & Developmental Disabilities Research Reviews*, Vol. 7, no. 2, p. 128–133.

5. Damen, T. G. E., Müller, B. C. N., van Baaren, R. B., Dijksterhuis, A. 2015, Re-Examining the Agentic Shift: The Sense of Agency Influences the Effectiveness of (Self)Persuasion, *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 10, no. 6, p. 1–9.

6. Davydenko, V. A. 2004, Model of a specialist taking into account the demand of the professional labor market, *Model' spetsialista XXI veka v kontekste moderni-zatsii vysshego obrazovaniya* [Model of a specialist of the XXI century in the context of modernization of higher education], Part I, Materials of the All-Russian Scientific and Methodological Conference, September 15—17, 2004, Tuapse, p. 88—92. (In Russ.)

7. Drake, A.R., Wong, J., Salter, S. 2007, Empowerment, Motivation, and Performance: Examining the Impact of Feedback and Incentives on Nonmanagement Employees, *Behavioral Research in Accounting*, no. 19, p. 71–89.

8. Erbas, B.C., Erbas, C. 2004, Employee Incentive Mechanism Design for Technology Firms, *Journal of Integrated Design & Process Science*, Vol. 8, no. 1, p. 91–111.

9. Fulghieri, P., Sevilir, M. 2011, Mergers, Spinoffs, and Employee Incentives, *Review of Financial Studies*, Vol. 24, no. 7, p. 2207–2241.

10. Gentsch, A., Weiss, C., Spengler, S., Synofzik, M., Schütz-Bosbach, S. 2015, Doing good or bad: How interactions between action and emotion expectations shape the sense of agency, *Social Neuroscience*, Vol. 10, no. 4, p. 418–430.

11. Gordon, A.A., Kaswin, J. 2010, Effective Employee Incentive Plans: Features and Implementation Processes, *Cornell HR Review*, p. 1—6.

12. Ibarra, H., Carter, N.M., Silva, C. 2010, Why Men Still Get More Promotions Than Women, *Harvard Business Review*, Vol. 88, no. 9, p. 80–85.

13. Ilies, R., Wilson, K. S., Wagner, D. T. 2009, The Spillover of Daily Job Satisfaction onto Employees' Family Lives: The Facilitating Role of Work-Family Integration, *Academy of Management Journal*, Vol. 52, no. 1, p. 87–102.

14. Ismail, M.A.F., Shimada, S. 2016, 'Robot' Hand Illusion under Delayed Visual Feedback: Relationship between the Senses of Ownership and Agency, *PLoS ONE*, Vol. 11, no. 7, p. 1–9.

15. Kaźmierczyk, J. 2011, Technologiczne i społeczno-ekonomiczne determinanty zatrudnienia w sektorze bankowym w Polsce, Warszawa, p. 234.

16. Kopertyńska, M.W. 2009, *Motywowanie pracowników: teoria i praktyka*, Warszawa, p. 319.

17. Park, R., Appelbaum, E., Kruse, D. 2010, Employee involvement and group incentives in manufacturing companies: a multi-level analysis, *Human Resource Management Journal*, Vol. 20, no. 3, p. 227–243.

18. Penc, J. 2000, *Motywowanie w zarządzaniu*, Kraków, Wydawnictwo Profesjonalnej Szkoły Biznesu, p. 285.

19. Pierścieniak, A., Krent, D., Jakieła, K. 2013, Motywacja wewnętrzna jako kluczowy czynnik zaangażowania pracownika, *Przedsiębiorstwo i region*, no. 5, p. 38–47.

20. Podmoroff, D. 2010, 365 sposobów na codzienne motywowanie i nagradzanie pracowników, Warszawa, Wolters Kluwer, p. 228.

21. Rehu, M., Lusk, E., Wolff, B. 2005, Incentive Preferences of Employees in Germany and the USA: An Empirical Investigation, *Management Revue*, Vol. 16, no. 1, p. 81–98.

22. Robbins, S.P., Judge, T.A. 2012, *Zachowania w organizacji*, Warszawa, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, p. 404.

23. Romashkina, G.F., Andrianova, E.V. 2007, Motivation in the world of work: ideal models and behavior, *Izvestiya Ural'skogo federal'nogo universiteta. Seriya 3: Obshchestvennye nauki* [Izvestiya Ural Federal University. Series 3: Social Sciences], Vol. 51, no. 3, p. 50—55. (In Russ.)

24. Sekuła, Z. 2010, *Motywowanie do pracy: teorie i instrumenty, Warszawa*, Polskie Wydawnictwo Ekonomiczne, p. 232.

25. Scheers, L. van, Botha, J. 2014, Analysing relationship between employee job satisfaction and motivation, *Journal of Business and Retail Management Research (JBRMR)*, Vol. 9, no. 1, p. 98–109.

26. Soniewicki, M. 2015, *The company's international competitive advantage* — *the role of knowledge*, Warszawa, Difin, p. 188.

27. Steers, R. M., Porter, L. W. 1983, *Motivation and work behavior*, New York, McGraw-Hill, p. 658.

28. Voronov, V.V., Lavrinenko, O. Ya., Stashane, Ya.V. 2004, Assessment of the dynamics of interregional differences (European experience), *Sotsiologicheskie issledovaniya* [Sociological research], no. 1, p. 29–39.

29. Wang, H., Lim, S.S. 2008, Real options and real value: the role of employee incentives to make specific knowledge investments, *Strategic Management Journal*, Vol. 29, no. 7, p. 701—721.

30. Wang, H.C., Barney, J.B. 2006, Employee Incentives to Make Firm-Specific Investments: Implications for Resource-Based Theories of Corporate Diversification, *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 31, no. 2, p. 466–476.

31. Whiting, K. 2014, Catch the waves: motivating today's young workforce, *Supervision*, Vol. 75, no. 10, p. 9–10.

32. Wyrwa, J. 2015, Organizational restructuring as a way of counteracting a crisis in an enterprise, *Scientific Journal of Polish Economic Society in Zielona Góra*, no. 2, p. 127–143.

The authors

Dr Jerzy Kaźmierczyk, Scientific Research Centre of Financial and Economic Institute, Tyumen State University, Russia; Department of Education and Personnel Development, Poznan University of Economics, Poland. ORCHID ID: orcid.org/0000-0002-5976-021

E-mail: jerzy.kazmierczyk@ue.poznan.pl

٢

Elżbieta Żelichowska, Department of Education and Personnel Development, Poznan University of Economics, Poznań, Poland.

E-mail: zelichowska.e@gmail.com

To cite this article:

٢

Kaźmierczyk J., Żelichowska E. 2017, Satisfaction of Polish Bank Employees with Incentive Systems: An Empirical Approach, *Balt. Reg.*, Vol. 9, no. 3, p. 58–86. doi: 10.5922/2079-8555-2017-3-5.