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ABSTRACT

This thesis explores generation Y motivators. They are a growing group of young people among the general workforce, and they have different behavior and motivators at work. This paper explores effective motivating factors for this group of employees by studying a company, LinkedIn, which successfully motivates generation Y employees. Data is gathered through several interviews done with LinkedIn employees working at their Dublin office. The data is analyzed with the help of a motivational theory called self-determination theory and its main concepts autonomy, relatedness and competence. Other insights from earlier studies done on generation Y motivation are used to support the analysis as well. The results and analysis are consistent with theory and earlier studies, and can even show some interesting factors generation Y employees value, such as high value for manager flexibility and sharing similar values with the company they work for.
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1.0 INTRODUCTION

We all would like to work in a workplace which puts emphasis on motivational factors and has world class processes to promote employee motivation. All works should be meaningful, challenging and even fun. However, many employees would not characterize their work and work environment with those words. Too often organizations, private and governmental, do not engage nor motivate employees despite the fact that organizations are typically applying different ways to motivate employees. More and more voices are speaking up and suggesting that currently, most organizations are using the wrong types of motivators. One example is highly appreciated and valued author and motivational researcher Daniel Pink (Pink. 2015). He suggests that motivators have a contingency, i.e. they need to fit to their environment. There is no single right way to motivate people. (Pink. 2009).

What makes motivating difficult is the different characteristics of people. When talking about motivating people, one size does not fit all (Pink. 2009). One of the big differentiators is the differences between generations at work. The generations are raised in different ways, which reflects in their behavior, motivational patterns and habits at work (Raines. 2002). In addition to having many common characteristics, each age group has some very specific pronounced motivational factors. Behavioral researchers differentiate between these groups with labeling them and associating them with different attributes. In practice this means that creating motivating work and work environment to young employees is different from doing it to older employees (Raines. 2002).

The newest and fastest growing group is generation Y, also called “millennials” and “Y’ers”. They are the group born from the 1980’s to 2000 (most common definition) (Businessdictionary. 2015).

There are several companies with plenty of young employees. These companies obviously need to focus on the requirements of Y-generation employees, or they’ll end up with unmotivated employees. There are many companies who are highly ranked by “generation Y’ers”. Some of these are already successfully motivating their millennials but so many others are still struggling
with disengagement and poor results. One example of the companies who actually succeeds with engaging generation Y is the business oriented social networking company LinkedIn. They have been described by many as a sought after employer and have been ranked as one of the top workplaces worldwide (Forbes. 2014, Glassdoor. 2014) LinkedIn targets young professionals to their talent pool and they are quite renowned in the business for having a dynamic corporate culture which specifically attracts younger employees.

2.0 Problem Formulation & Research Question

_In this chapter, the background to our problem is inspected further. A purpose is given for the research of a social media website called LinkedIn._

The problem many companies face today is, as mentioned earlier, their failures to motivate employees. This leads to problems in engagement, job satisfaction and general happiness (Deci et al. 2001). Although this subject has been touched upon before by researchers, there is still a considerable gap in information here, especially concerning motivation specifically tied to the millennials (Kultalahti & Viitala. 2014). Motivated workers are more productive compared to unmotivated employees (Deci & Ryan. 2000), so companies need to find the best and most effective ways to motivate employees.

As stated before, generation Y differs significantly from older generations (Arsenault. 2014). The Y-generation is quite demanding, have high confidence, are goal- and achievement oriented, expect an intrinsically fulfilling workplace, and they are used to working in teams (Raines. 2002, Goldstein, 2012), even more so than older generations. Y’ers require encouragement and mentoring, they want to learn new things and improve themselves (Raines. 2002). If the Y-generation workers do not get what they expect, they get easily discouraged and distracted (Mitjonen, 2014). There is a gap in older management's understanding of generation Y
employees; older managers motivate (and manage) employees in ways that aren’t always a great fit for the young employees (Raines. 2002).

Generation Y’ers have a different set of motivators (Asghar. 2014), the kind of motivators that have been established to often be of the intrinsic kind (Kultalahti & Viitala. 2014). Intrinsic motivators are tied to a person’s internal will to accomplish something, such as a will to complete a work assignment, or the will to lose weight, and so on. Generation Y’ers demand intrinsic motivators: a satisfying work environment is a bigger concern to them compared to earlier generations (Raines. 2002).

The problem of motivating young employees becomes a reality when they show one of the biggest and most influential traits of their generation: they are more prone to quit their work and find a new place that is more interesting and motivating. Compared to earlier generations, the Y generation isn’t afraid to leave and try to find better career opportunities in other companies (Mitjonen. 2014). Therefore, if a company fails to motivate their young employees, they’ll face pressure of constantly finding new employees, something that requires resources and time. To keep the employees and to save expenses, it is very important to understand what the intrinsic motivators for the Y generation are. In addition to this, a lack of motivation and engagement causes employee turnover and absenteeism (Sorcha. 2006). Therefore, a motivating and engaging workplace is also a social concern of the entire society.

LinkedIn is a company that is renowned for successfully motivating its employees. Glassdoor.com is a web portal which gives information about companies given from their employees. They have information on things such as salaries, company reviews, interview questions and such, all given from anonymous but verified employees. They have rated LinkedIn among the 50 best workplaces for 2 years in a row, and even featured them in the top 3 last year. In addition to this, Forbes ranked them in the top 3 places to work at in 2014 (Forbes. 2014).

In particular, it is the intrinsic factors and the psychology behind them that will be examined. This is because these types of motivators are so prominent in the values of generation Y. The research focuses on a specific company that is highly praised by the society and especially young
workers, who are working consciously with intrinsic motivation, and therefore the research question is:

*Which intrinsic factors contribute to a motivating work environment in an organization that successfully motivates generation Y employees?*

## 2.1 Purpose

The purpose of this research is to find the critical intrinsic factors leading to a motivating work environment and motivated employees through studying a company which succeeds in motivating young employees.

## 3.0 Theory

*This chapter will focus on the theoretical foundations and earlier studies done on the subject motivation and generation Y. A theoretical framework is given for the main motivational theory, the Self-determination theory.*

### 3.1 Earlier Studies on the Subject

Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) set out to find motivating factors for employees belonging to the Y generation. Their findings consist of evidence indicating the importance of flexibility, openness and the colleagues. Regarding the colleagues, the employees want them to be supporting and
trustworthy. They also value equality and fairness in the workplace. Autonomy is another key word. Deciding when and how one works are important to this new generation. The “when” of it is vital because there is a strong will among these individuals to have a harmony between work life and free time. They do not mind working hard or overtime, but demand it to be rewarded with free time in the future, or with other fitting rewards (monetary or otherwise) that can be of use in their “home life”. When describing their optimal kind of working tasks, many of them seem to picture themselves working in projects. This further emphasizes their view on changing tasks, creativity, and close bonds with their colleagues as something essential.

Regarding the supervisors role in the employment, the Y’ers feel they need a motivating and communicating boss. Otherwise the employees feel disengaged and not included. Another find is that job security is of less importance compared to previous generations. They value learning opportunities, however brief, much more.

Adam Bawany (2014) writes that generation Y employees need a different kind of attention from the leaders to become motivated. Y’ers have high needs and expectations toward their leaders. According to Bawany, generation Y’ers prefer relationship-oriented leaders, but managers still use more task-oriented management. Bawany says that managers can easily motivate their employees with simple talks and “a simple pat on the back and words of encouragement”.

Luscombe and others (2013) agrees with Bawany: generation Y’ers have a need to be valued and approve of conversations with the leaders, all of which add to employee motivation. Generation Y’ers also value opportunities of training and professional development, and even flexibility in their work (Luscombe et al. 2013). Finally, Lim (2012) argues that intrinsic motivators differ between cultures, and therefore are not as easy to generalize on a global scale.

3.2 THEORETICAL FRAMEWORK

Motivation can be described as a will to move towards something, or a type of energy to work toward a certain goal (Deci & Ryan. 2000). A person is motivated when he feels he needs and
wants to accomplish a certain goal or excel at a task, and unmotivated when he feels the opposite. Motivation has many different sources, such as interest, curiosity, fun, or a reward. Motivation drives us towards a certain type of behavior, action or goals. An even deeper look includes psychological processes that cause the arousal, direction, and persistence of behavior leading to goal-oriented action (Mitchell. 1982).

### 3.2.1 Motivation at Work

Motivational concepts applied to the working environment help build work motivation. Heathfield (2014) defines work, or employee, motivation: “Employee motivation is the combination of fulfilling the employee's needs and expectations from work and the workplace factors that enable employee motivation - or not.” In a working environment, multiple factors build towards a motivating environment, being both external and internal factors. Some factors are interest towards tasks, pay, work conditions, promotion possibilities and so on. These factors lead to action towards completing assigned tasks at work. Some factors in a working environment can become discouraging, i.e. factors reducing motivation, such as bad managers or unsupportive colleagues (Forbes. 2014).

The motivation factors this research explores will be related to freedom over working hours (time management), freedom over tasks (task management), the social environment at the office and outside, and the competence of the employees. These factors are supported by the main theory of this research, the self-determination theory.

### 3.3 Self-determination Theory (SDT)

The main theory of this research is the Self-Determination Theory. It is a rather new motivational theory, first published in 1985 by Edward Deci and Richard Ryan. It has high focus on different
forms of intrinsic motivation, and therefore suits perfectly for the needs to analyze the Y-generation at work. Due to the theory being recently published, its concepts should be up-to-date and match well with the thought processes of the current generation.

SDT is a framework for human motivation and personality, a theory focusing on human motivation, development and wellness (Deci & Ryan. 2008). It focuses on types of motivation in addition to amounts, and is particularly focused on autonomous motivation, a form of motivation that is integrated into a person’s sense of self. Intrinsic motivation is a part of autonomous motivation. SDT defines intrinsic motivation as motivation that comes from within: interests, curiosity, care or abiding values leading to cognitive and social development and acts as a source for enjoyment and vitality (Deci & Ryan. 2000, 2008). The theory also has high focus on social conditions improving and diminishing motivation. It even focuses on a person’s extrinsic and intrinsic life aspirations. The theory is not only concerned with what causes intrinsic motivation, but also on what elicits and sustains it (Deci & Ryan. 2000).

A major focus of the theory is if motivation is autonomous or not (Deci & Ryan. 2002). Autonomous parts of motivation may include choice, acknowledgement of feelings, and opportunities for self-direction. When people are autonomously motivated, they experience volition and self-endorsement of their actions (Deci & Ryan. 2000, 2008). Deci and Ryan (2007, 2008) have consistently been able to show that autonomous motivation leads to greater psychological health and more effective performance on heuristic activities, in addition to greater long-term persistence and, simply, better performance.

Many activities tend to start out of curiosity, interest, or simply because it is fun. Intrinsic motivation is something that exists between an individual and activities; not all activities are intrinsically motivating (Deci & Ryan. 2000). Skinner (1953) argued that all activities need to be rewarding, so from this perspective, the reward is the activity itself.

SDT suggests that three conditions need to be met in order for a person to feel healthy and motivated (Deci & Ryan. 2000). These are relatedness, autonomy (not to be distracted with concept autonomous motivation) and competence. These three foster volitional, high-quality forms of motivation, and if these factors are missing or unsupported, will cause a negative
impact on wellness and motivation (Deci & Ryan. 2000). These factors will be the starting point for the interviews and data analysis of this research.

**Chart 1: Self-Determination theory: an overview based on Deci & Ryan. (Nhu. 2014)**

Relatedness is the individuals need to feel connected to others: “to be a member of a group, to love and care, and to be loved and cared” (Van den Broeck et al. 2010). The needs become satisfied when a person feels communion with others, when they feel they belong. Close and intimate relationships are a requirement, and it is even expected that people have a tendency to socially integrate with others (Van den Broeck et al. 2010). Relatedness is a common factor at work, influencing motivation, engagement and happiness in general.

Competence is an individual’s willingness to effectively engage with the environment. This can include a propensity to explore and manipulate the environment to engage in challenging tasks and to extend skills (Van den Broeck et al. 2010). In other words, a person needs sufficient amounts of challenge to feel useful, and wants the challenges to be of such nature that the person can learn from them. Competence can produce both satisfaction and frustration: the first allowing
a person to adapt to complex and changing environments and to improve skills, and the latter causing a feeling of helplessness and discouragement (Van den Broeck et al. 2010).

Autonomy can be described as a person’s sense of having a choice and psychological freedom over his actions (Van den Broeck et al. 2010). Self-determination theory assumes autonomy to be something subjective: an action doesn’t have to be decided by oneself, but rather, one needs an intrinsic, meaningful rationale to complete a task. In a working environment, autonomy can relate to freedom over working hours (time management), tasks (task management), control over actions, etc.

4.0 Method

This chapter is focused on research methods used to gather information and empirical data. The methods used are literature reviews and interviews. In addition to this, the chapter also focuses on the operationalization of theory to action, and considers the ethical aspects of the research. Finally, a review of the validity and reliability of the research are analyzed.

4.1 Research Strategy

The focus of this research is of qualitative nature. The purpose of the paper is to research methods and factors a company uses to motivate young employees. In the case of this research, they are measured qualitatively due to data collection methods mentioned later. Motivation can be researched both quantitatively and qualitatively, but the purpose of this paper is to find factors that, for this cause, aren’t solely quantitatively measurable. Also, there is no single unit of measure for the study; the results are interpretational. The study is of explorative nature, the aim
is to find how the case company’s ways of motivating can be analyzed through existing theoretical frameworks. The paper explores a real working environment, something Yin (2011) describes as suitable for a qualitative study.

The primary data for the research will be gathered via in-depth interviews from employees of our case company, the data is not available from earlier research. Primary data will be the focus of the research, and is the data that will be analyzed later. The strategy to gather the sample was to find informants who were easily available, i.e. the convenience sampling. The decision to interview employees from the Dublin office was also based on convenience due to existing contacts working there. The primary data is gathered with open interview questions. This is due to the fact that the ways of the case company are rather unknown to the authors, so there are neither expected results nor existing similar researches on the company to base the questions on. This creates a requirement to gather in as much detailed data as possible.

Some of the interview questions had a quantitative nature, but they were not the main focus of the interview or the analysis; they were used to find the intensity of the interview subjects thoughts regarding certain factors.

4.1. DATA COLLECTION

The interviews were done via video conference calls, with complementing information gathered via e-mail. The interview process started with reaching out to possible interview subjects via e-mail. After they agreed to an interview, a preliminary interview guide was sent to them to prepare them. Then, at a suitable time for the informants and the authors, the answers were collected via conference calls and e-mails.

For this research, a semi-structured form of interview is used, where there’s a list of themes/questions (Saunders et al. 2009), but the conversation is free to flow toward a desired direction. A semi-structured interview suits well for this study study where relationships between variables are explored (Saunders et al. 2009), in this case the variables being generation Y and
motivation. Due to the complexity of the research topic and the qualitative nature of this research, semi-structured interviews were chosen due to their capability to provide plenty of qualitative data (Saunders et al. 2009), which was essential for the interviews.

With a semi-structured interview, it is easy to “pause” the interview in order to get a better understanding of what the subject might feel or think. “Pauses” happened constantly in our interviews from both parts. They helped to move the interviews toward desired topics and thoughts. A semi-structured interview also allowed the interview to lead into areas the interviewer/subject might not even have considered to be relevant (Saunders et al. 2009). The semi-structured form allowed the gathering of data which would not have been obtained from questionnaires due their lack of depth.

### 4.2 Population

The sample of the research will consist of LinkedIn employees who are a part of the Y generation. In-depth interviews were done with 10 LinkedIn employees who all belong to the group. The interview formula was sent to 16 employees, and 10 of them agreed for an interview. The interviews lasted from 15 minutes to approximately 40 minutes. The informants were chosen with help from our previous contacts at LinkedIn, and they based their choices on availability. Some of the informants were previous contacts and the rest were names we received from them. The informants age varied from 25-32, and included both genders, although most of them were male. All of the data was gathered from LinkedIn’s Dublin office. The informants had varying nationalities.

A relatively high percentage of the interview candidates decided not to answer our interview requests, we only received an answer from 62.5% of the recipients. Many of them felt they did not want to spend the required time to answer the questions, or they lacked enthusiasm to help the research. They had neither commitments nor responsibilities to answer the questions, and therefore lacked engagement towards our cause. Finding candidates for the sample took a lot of
time and effort, and due to a limited timeframe, difficulty contacting the candidates, difficulty finding new ones, difficulty finding suitable timeframes to execute the interviews; it was simply not possible to try to find more informants.

The initial goal was to get at least 15 interviews, depending on how different they are from each other. However, as results started flowing in, a clear trend in the answers was seen. Saturation can be defined as the point where no new information or themes can be observed from the gathered data (Guest et al. 2013). The first 8 interviews all produced very similar results. According to Guest et al (2013), saturation can be met at as early as six results, but usually can be concluded to happen at 12. With this in mind, a few more interviews were done, and the results were of similar nature. After 10 interviews, no new trends were seen, and therefore it was concluded that the amount of information was enough.

4.3 VALIDITY AND RELIABILITY OF THE RESEARCH

There are several threats to reliability of data. (Saunders et al. 2009) The main threats for reliability in this research are the participant and observer biases. According to Saunders et al (2009), participant bias is when a participant (informant) answers the interview questions in a biased way due to belonging to a certain group or being “forced” by someone else. Observer bias is when the observers (us, the researchers) analyze or interpret the data in a biased way (Saunders et al. 2009). Participant bias might be relevant since some of the informants were earlier contacts of the authors, and might change their way of answering due to this. The same reason may also cause observer bias; the informants might be analyzed in a different way due to this. The biases will be reduced by providing participants with anonymity, neutral questions and an objective approach from the researchers.

A concern not related to any of the biases is the Y-generation in general. Many of them have not been in work life for a significant amount of time, and may not yet have resentment or feelings of annoyance towards working in general. These are factors that might show up in any individual
after 5, 10, 20, 40 years of working. They are very individual, and it is difficult to say when, if ever, one gets bored of working. If the same informants were to be interviewed 15 years from now, they might have a completely different view on working in general. Since all of our informants are quite young and rather new to work life, this might be relevant for generalization of the results.

As said by earlier research done by Lim (2012), intrinsic motivators have high differences depending on cultures. Therefore, the results of this research may not be valid in places with highly differing cultures from European ones.

4.4 Ethical aspects

As the authors of the research, our responsibility is to do no harm to any of the informants or the case company (Sagepub. 2014). The interviews are all done anonymously to protect the informants, partly to keep them away from harm, partly to guarantee the truthfulness of the answers. The departments, positions and other personal information about the informants are not presented in order to keep their identity anonymous. The nature of the research is to provide positive information to others, so regardless of the answers, the informants should not receive any negativity for their answers. The informants were happy to answer our questions; no one showed any concern to answer. The discussions with the informants were highly confidential to keep them anonymous; no private information will be provided to others.

Finally, it is our ethical responsibility to show the results as they were presented to us; i.e. showing the truth in our writing and not manipulating the data in any way.
4.5 Operationalization

The interview questions were formulated on the basis of Self-determination theory. With the open interviews, the questions were formulated in a way so they could be related to self-determination theory’s three main points: competence, autonomy and relatedness. 3 questions were related to relatedness, 3 to competence, and one to autonomy; and in addition to that, we had 4 questions focusing on aspects specific to LinkedIn in relation to earlier workplaces or other experiences. The purpose of the questions is to find out which of these criteria the informants found most important for their general work experience, satisfaction and motivation. The theory was operationalized to a form of questions that would be easily understandable to the informants, yet produce us the results we look for.

Some of the questions had a numerical answer, on a scale from 1-5. The purpose of these questions was not to gather specific information for the discussion, but rather to see how strongly the informants felt about the aspects. The numbers were used to see which of the factors are most important to the informants, and to enhance our understanding of the importance of specific motivating factors. The difference between the numerical answers and the qualitative interview questions was that the qualitative ones are the base for the main analysis, and the numerical answers provide supportive data.

The questions related to relatedness were questions 3-5 (see appendix 1). The questions are aimed to find how important the informants find many socially related factors, and how they affect their happiness and motivation at work. As described in the theory section, relatedness is an individual’s need to feel connected to others, or be a part of a group. The decision was to find out how the informants feel about their colleagues and relationships at work, and if they enhance satisfaction at work. Another aim was to know how the informants relationship with their supervisors affect motivation (question 4, appendix 1), and how big of an emphasis they put on that factor. Finally, the final relatedness-question is aimed to explore which parts of LinkedIn’s corporate culture improve the informants feeling of relatedness.
In our interviews, we called the relatedness-related questions as “social” related questions to not confuse the informants with unnecessary concepts.

The questions related to competence were numbers 6-8 (appendix 1). As described in the theory, competence includes a will to explore the environment and engage in challenging tasks and to extend skills. The questions were planned in a way to find out if the informants have challenging and varying tasks, and how much they value said tasks. Another purpose was to find out how much emphasis the informants put on the importance of work tasks, if they cause frustration and/or satisfaction, and if the tasks cause a feeling of usefulness. Even the tenth question, under LinkedIn specifics, is somewhat related to competence, since it addresses the will to learn new things, ie. engaging in extending skills.

The ninth question (appendix 1) was formulated with autonomy in mind. As described by the theory, autonomy is a person’s sense of having a choice and freedom over his actions. The questions focus on flexibility of working hours, how the informants use them, and how important they find flexibility to be. Some focus was also put on the flexibility of task management, i.e. if the informants can control their tasks and if they have variety in them.

The final 4 questions (10-12, appendix 1) were not specifically related to any of the three main factors of SDT; rather, they were very open and invited the informants to show their feelings of any specific intrinsic factors about LinkedIn they found extremely satisfying. The answers were then divided into the three categories. The questions were a separate category due to the open nature: they can produce such a wide set of answers that it was difficult to categorize them under any single factor of self-determination theory.

Most of the questions asked were quite open, which lead to information being divided across the sections; for example, with the competence related questions, some answers could also be tied to autonomy, and the question related to corporate culture produced answers not belonging solely to relatedness.
5.0 Results

In this chapter, general information and the results of the interviews are presented.

5.0.1 LinkedIn Background

Our case company is LinkedIn, a company known for its engaging work environment (Sharma. 2014, Glassdoor.com. 2014, Forbes. 2014). LinkedIn was founded in California in 2002, and they launched their website in 2003. The company was founded by Reid Hoffman, an American entrepreneur and a graduate from the renowned Stanford University. They are a social media site for networking working professionals. Their website has over 300 million users in 23 different languages in over 200 countries. Even in Sweden, there are over 1 million registered users. Currently, the company has over 6000 full-time employees in 30 cities around the world, including Stockholm and our case office in Dublin.

LinkedIn is a public company, traded in the New York Stock Exchange. They entered the stock market in May 2012, with a pricing of $45/share, with share prices increasing dramatically in the following years. Currently, the website experiences very high traffic, and are the 13th most visited website globally (Alexa. 2014). LinkedIn’s success has this been phenomenal. The success of the company combined with the intrigue of the social Medias has led to them being a very popular place of employment (Forbes. 2014).

5.1.0 Interview Results

The results will be divided according to the theoretical framework of the questions, i.e. relatedness, autonomy and competence.
5.1.1 Relatedness

The interviewees were consistent in their answers regarding the importance of relatedness. They all valued the colleagues, supervisors and openness in the workplace highly. Some informants mentioned the fact that building strong relationships with colleagues and supervisors is easy at LinkedIn; it is even encouraged, with one describing the atmosphere as “Open, honest and constructive”. There is a lot of emphasis on this, especially in the beginning of a LinkedIn career when one is new to the company. There are plenty of outside work activities with the purpose of bonding, making connections and strengthening an open and relaxed work environment. Some examples mentioned were sporting events, after work gatherings and friendly sales competitions. Every year all of LinkedIn meet at a week-long conference in San Diego. The informants appreciate this tradition since it motivates them when they have it to look forward to, as well as it being an instrument to increase their group feeling of the company as a whole. Every month the company hosts an “InDay”. This day is dedicated to doing something which reflects one’s own and the company values. One statement was “LinkedIn is a really modern company in terms of valuing its employees; you can tell they really invest in and spend money on the employees.”

Openness is reflected in the general atmosphere of the office, the informants describe it as “relaxed and casual”. No particular dress code is practiced during working hours, and there are no discernable status differences between persons from different levels in the company hierarchy. The informants still think that a professional level is maintained during work. They believe this is important, and they all seem to share LinkedIn’s vision and values. They also believe they are doing well for the society. “We have a clear company vision and mission that I can see us reach”, is an example of an employee who very much feels as part of the whole. This helps a lot towards their feelings of inclusiveness and relatedness. “We have an extremely strong company culture”, one informant said.

LinkedIn supplies a number of benefits for their employees. This greatly helps in making them feel included and appreciated. The informants say they get free food: their cafeteria provides
them with breakfast and lunch every single day; and on top of that, there are several mini
kitchens filled with unlimited snacks and drinks. There are many perks, but the ones appreciated
the most are insurances (life, dental, health etc.), free gym, funding for courses and open bar
tabs.

When speaking of their colleagues, words like supportive and competent were used frequently.
The informants found it important that their closest colleagues are both good at collaboration,
honest (trustworthy), and skilled at their job, in order for themselves to be motivated. The need
for competent and experienced colleagues is according to the informants important in order for
them to grow and advance, something they all strive to do. All of the informants graded the
colleague variable with a 4 or higher when answering how important that is to their overall work
satisfaction. Only one subject mentioned briefly that he thought some of his colleagues were a bit
inexperienced, which sometimes in specific situations led to discouragement. The informant still
rated the colleague variable with a 5.

Regarding their supervisor, the informants’ desire for relaxed relationships shines through. Their
close working environment is very non-hierarchical and flat. Communication in the form of
feedback and suggestions are welcomed and not looked down upon. Booked meetings with an
agenda happen seldom. Instead, communication with supervisors is more often done with
“casual chats by the desks” where feedback and performance evaluation is discussed, with one
describing his relationship as “informal and casual”, and another informant as a bit stiffer, yet
flexible. Although almost all of our subjects said they appreciate the fact that they aren’t micro-
managed, they still described their supervisors as being able to customize their management style
to each individual, and valued this aspect highly. If someone strives with close supervision, that
approach is practiced by the supervisor in that particular case. This adjusting management style
makes the relationships with the employees very personal, something all the informants believe
to increase their feelings of relatedness. Regardless of which style one falls to, all the informants
confirm that advancing and pushing upwards is greatly supported by the higher ups.

All of our informants graded the importance of the supervisor as a 4 or higher, with high
emphasis on flexibility and supportiveness.
5.1.2 Competence

Talent is highly valued at LinkedIn, with one informant describing it like this: “Talent is our number one operating priority”. The informants say that skilled colleagues, as well as feeling professional and doing a good job, are highly motivating. The colleagues at LinkedIn are described as being more professional and experienced than other similar employers, “a bit more mature”, as one informant put it, although a few statements from the informants described some scenarios where some colleagues in new positions came across as inexperienced. They believe this is because internal hiring is big in LinkedIn which means sometimes an employee gets new working tasks which he doesn’t fully master, this at least in comparison to a completely new recruit, hired specifically for those particular skills.

Being structured is an important trait for a LinkedIn employee, according to the informants. They feel like they are pleasing their customers and making a difference in the company thanks to their competence. “I feel like I am part of creating new business lines for LinkedIn”, being example of an employee feeling that his work matters and makes a difference in the company.

Interesting tasks and assignments are something the informants value highly. One informant put it like this: “If everything was already figured, the work would become boring”. If the work isn’t interesting, they feel disengaged and that their competence is not coming to full use. This also goes hand in hand with the importance of variety in the tasks. “We are under hyper growth which makes it exciting to work here”, one informant wrote. A growing company means lots of new challenges and more variety. All the informants ranked the importance of variety highly, although not as high as the importance of interesting tasks. Nevertheless, these variables are very close. All of the research subjects graded interesting tasks with 4s while this was almost the case with the variety aspect, with the exception of one informant who graded it only a 3. The work at LinkedIn and the tasks our informants do are by themselves considered interesting. This can be related to the autonomy aspect since they find it interesting when they can choose how they work. Some examples of less interesting and simply boring tasks were brought up. All of those examples are consistent with the fact that variety is valued. Some of the informants found some
repetitive administrative tasks to be discouraging and boring, such as logging work progress in their CRM (customer relationship management) system.

The question about favorite tasks resulted in unanimous answers. All the informants found group tasks to be particularly enjoyable, especially in group projects. This is because a project often means working with new people, new challenges and also working tightly with colleagues and with clear goals in mind. Goal setting is something almost all informants described as a big motivator. Being goal oriented and striving towards an end with rewards waiting was considered motivating. “There is great pleasure in reaching a goal” and “the success is sweeter after overcoming a big challenge” are some of the informants’ opinions regarding working towards goals. Seeing results in the form of direct positive feedback from customers is also one of the most rewarding and motivating scenarios according to most informants.

Challenging tasks is also something the interviewees’ rate highly. All of them rated it a 4 or higher, they clearly demand that their competence is matched in their tasks. There seems to be a fine line concerning the level of challenge that motivates the employees effectively. If the challenge is too great, the pressure can become too much, and thus becoming discouraging. Most informants felt they are adequately challenged by their tasks. One informant though described his work as too repetitive and after a while not nearly challenging enough. He felt this sometimes had a negative impact on motivation and performance.

Learning and growing are also of significant importance for the informants. They need to feel progression in their competence in order keep things interesting and not feeling stagnant. According to our subjects, there are plenty of opportunities for this at LinkedIn. Furthering one’s skills is highly encouraged by management, so there are possibilities for getting courses and educations etc. financed by LinkedIn. The sales staff has bi-weekly casual coaching meetings with their superiors. This is in order to always keep a positive momentum going. Peer to peer support is practiced, with employees sharing views and knowledge, and lessons are learnt from the more experienced workers. This phenomenon is a big deal at LinkedIn, where progression is always promoted.
5.1.3 AUTONOMY

Autonomy is something the informants valued greatly. Almost all of them graded this variable with a 5. They thrive when they feel they have responsibility. Some examples of their comments are “you feel like you are your own boss” and “I own my own success”. As was clear when interviewing them regarding their relationships with their supervisors, they enjoy not being micro managed. Personal time management is clearly stated as being motivating. The informants say they sometimes can choose to work from home, or decide if they want to cut some days short. They are aware though, that in order to be at top performance, there is no room for cutting down on the working hours. The usual way seems to be to work at the office from 8.am-9.am to 4.pm-5pm. Many of them voluntarily work outside of the office hours as well. They do this partly because they are interested by the work and partly because it justifies them taking shorter days in the future, if necessary. Even though they can decide for themselves how many hours they work, there are underlying expectations on them on what is an appropriate time spent at work. All the informants are perfectly fine with this, and they all think these unofficial expectations are fair.

Regarding the work they do and the specific tasks they perform, autonomy is limited but not non-existent. Our informants work mainly in sales and relationship managing, and here there are rather specific expectations. With this said, the means to reach these goals are relatively free of choice, thus adding to the autonomy of the employees.

6.0 ANALYSIS

In this chapter, the results are analyzed with the help of self-determination theory and earlier research. Then, the analysis and results will be discussed and reflected upon.
6.1 RELATEDNESS

According to the results, the informants’ feelings towards motivation caused by relatedness were strong. They valued colleagues highly, some even saying they were the most important factor for their job satisfaction. Therefore, LinkedIn employees get highly motivated by the feeling of relatedness. The background information on previous studies on generation Y characteristics suggested that the Y’ers enjoy working in groups, and get motivated by a good office atmosphere. The results of this research are in line with this, as group works increased the feeling of relatedness and motivation of the informants.

The informants praised their colleagues highly and the importance of them was grand. The “no-asshole policy” of LinkedIn seems to work well; informants did not complain about their colleagues, but rather, gave extremely high praises and compliments. SDT claims that shared values is something a person can build intrinsic interests on. This can be seen with the colleagues: high respect and similar values lead to mutual appreciation which adds up towards higher motivation, according to theory (Deci & Ryan. 2008)

The nice colleagues tie well to the feeling of belonging into a group, something SDT’s views on relatedness build up on. The informants felt the colleagues were mostly very supportive, helping each other reach personal goals and aspirations. None of the informants said the colleagues were directly diminishing their work motivation, but one said that he sometimes feels discouraged by their lack of expertise. This relates well to not reaching goals: one may feel hindered by the others abilities to work and reach goals, and with that, lose some of his personal motivation to work, as was the case with one informant.

The informants felt the office atmosphere was extremely open. They do not use any specific dress code. This helped the informants to form bonds with each other, even with managers due to not having any visible status differences (i.e. managers wearing suits whilst others aren’t). The informants valued the feeling of having low hierarchy as well, and the lack of dress code supports a non-hierarchical atmosphere. The bonds between the employees are created due to intrinsic reasons: the informants showed interest in each other. Some reasons for interest were
previously mentioned shared values and common interests, and also personal interaction due to close collaboration in group projects.

The strong culture at LinkedIn favors building connections between employees. They have plenty of outside work activities supporting employee interaction, and the strong corporate culture is easy to identify with, easy to relate to. It helps the employees to build intrinsic satisfaction when they feel they are a part of something they can relate to, confirmed both by the informants answers as well as theory (Deci & Ryan. 2008).

The culture at LinkedIn received high praise, but also was more of a way for people to build relatedness to each other and the company, and not necessarily a motivating factor itself. Some parts of the culture also helped the informants appreciate the company’s ways, increasing the feeling of relatedness.

The supervisors at LinkedIn seem to be quite flexible and supportive, which all the informants enjoyed tremendously. A bad supervisor can be a major reason for low levels of motivation, but none of the informants had complaints about their managers, which is surprising. Instead, they found the support and flexible ways of management to be very important. The supervisors make sure the employee feels useful and welcomed, and that their work efforts are appreciated.

The informants did not feel threatened by the supervisors either; rather, they valued the relaxed relationships they tend to have with them. The informants valued the feedback and input from the supervisors. It even seems that feedback and suggestions were seen as a way to create a better self in regards to performance, and were definitely not seen as a form of discouragement.

The managers at LinkedIn seem to excel in enabling autonomous motivation, i.e. helping the employees feel volition towards their work. They give the employers plenty of freedom for self-direction, something SDT states as helping autonomous motivation. The informants enjoyed the self-direction, and as one said, “They own their own success”. Deci and Ryan have proven that in addition to increased motivation, the type of freedom also increases performance. With these factors in mind, the collaboration between the employees and their managers is of the highest quality, and a good example for any company struggling with generation Y employee motivation. Earlier studies suggest this vision as well; Y’ers feel motivated when managers
support their autonomous motivation. The flexibility of the managers seemed to increase the feeling of autonomous motivation as well.

It appears that LinkedIn has plenty of similarly wired people working for them. This is proven by the results: high value for colleagues, and not a single complaint about their ways of working. These factors help with building networks, being part of a group, and building intimate relationships with other employees; factors that SDT considers to be highly motivating.

LinkedIn is highly successful in the relatedness-category. It is difficult to say if there is any specific, single factor under relatedness that makes LinkedIn’s working environment so engaging; but rather, they all build up to a very optimal working environment. The informants even managed to describe many aspects of SDT without knowing about them. They have close work colleagues (intimacy), they get plenty of support from them (they feel they are appreciated), and even their supervisors are acting in a supportive and flexible way, enabling autonomous motivation.

In their research, Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) suggest that openness and colleagues are important to the Y generation. This research confirms that, although the term used to describe similar results to theirs is relatedness. In addition to having supportive colleagues and an open atmosphere, LinkedIn also has excellent managers, a motivating factor suggested by both Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) and Bavany (2014). At LinkedIn, the managers give attention and approval to the employees, and in addition to that, try to adapt their ways to fit the person or situation at hand. The adapting and flexible ways were valued very highly.

In short, relatedness is an important motivational factor according to theory, earlier research and this research. LinkedIn succeeds very well in this aspect with ways mentioned above.
6.2 Competence

Competence is essential to the LinkedIn employees. It seems to be important that both the employees and their colleagues are perceived as competent. They need this in order to feel confident to face work challenges and they expect the same from their colleagues since they work so close together at LinkedIn. This is partly in accordance with SDT regarding relatedness. When the employees feel like their co-workers are at the same level and share the same values and ambitions as themselves, they feel more part of a whole and motivation tends to increase (Deci & Ryan. 2008). But the competence in itself also greatly helps with motivating the informants. According to SDT, a big part of intrinsic motivation comes from being able to effectively deal with one’s environment. Competence makes this possible for the workers. LinkedIn recruits with talent high on their agenda. This is evident when looking at their staff and they know this, adding to their confidence and thus also increasing their motivation and ability to deal with difficult tasks in their work environment.

It is important that said competence leads to visible results in order to achieve satisfaction from it (Van der Broeck et al., 2010). The fact that nearly all the informants mentioned statements like “I feel like I am part of creating new business lines” and “I really feel like I am helping the customers” shows that their skills and abilities leads to something concrete. This connection between competences, results and satisfaction is obvious with the LinkedIn employees.

A big part of these feelings of motivation and satisfaction also comes from one’s feelings of progress, according to SDT. Learning and adapting are key words when interviewing the informants. Their statements confirm that these characteristics strongly parallel motivated individuals. Learning and advancing is something all the informants mentioned in one way or another. This shows that LinkedIn very much intentionally uses the urges to learn to further push their employees. Examples of this range from their strong culture of peer to peer learning, to financed courses and sales coaching, all the way to providing the employees with variety in work tasks. Variety is indeed one of the bests tools for learning and evolving, something our interview subjects clearly respond to.
These findings very much confirm what Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) research shows. Namely that flexibility in ones working tasks is indeed very important. The informants in our interviews also mention that working in projects seems to be their top choice. This of course is because this form of work allows for a flexible way of working, with new people as well as variety in tasks and challenges. Autonomy in the shape of choosing when and how to work is also present when working in projects. According to self-determination theory, Kultalahti and Viitala, as well as this research, autonomy and competence are one of the most essential parts of a young employee’s motivation at work. Projects seem to capture these needs effectively.

Competent colleagues were mentioned by all informants although at least one still commented on a few cases where they felt a colleague was slightly inexperienced. This, according to the informant, was probably because said employee was new to a position, without previous experience from a similar employment outside of LinkedIn. This shows that LinkedIn, instead of hiring a “new” employee from outside the company with the necessary skills, prefer to hire internally. This points to the fact that they favor an employee with their company culture already reinforced and teaching him or her new skills over an employee with relevant skills but without the “LinkedIn spirit”.

6.3 AUTONOMY

The informants valued freedom at work. They have certain freedoms regarding their working hours: they can decide how many hours they work, and when they work. SDT describes this phenomenon as psychological freedom over one’s actions, a factor leading to higher enjoyment, control, and motivation. All the informants valued autonomy highly: a sense of freedom is seemingly integrated into their sense of self. As suggested by earlier studies on generation Y, autonomy and control over free time is built into the individuals, and that was also confirmed by the results of this research.
SDT describes autonomy as something subjective. The informants expressed this by showing their interest for free time, but also by showing an autonomous will to complete their work tasks. In other words, they enjoyed the freedom to choose their working hours, but also enjoyed completing their work tasks, both being autonomous motivators for the employees. Many succeeded in creating a good balance between both completing tasks and working reasonable amounts in the office, and at the same time enjoying the control they have for their working hours. Since no one complained about the lack of free time, they seem to have sufficient control over their time.

The informants did not feel they could control their tasks too much. The limited freedom over task control didn’t seem to bother the informants too much, though, since task variety was decent anyways. Instead, they received intrinsic satisfaction on completing tasks (more on that later), which was enough to keep them motivated and also interested. So, the subjectivity of autonomous motivation was focused more on time management than task management. The freedom to manage working hours increased the informants feeling of control, another opportunity to express self-direction and increase work motivation. Generation Y’ers value free time (as suggested by earlier studies), proven by the results of this research as well. The informants valued time management very much. Lack of task management was found to be more of a discouraging factor (in the sense that lack of it reduced motivation, but having it did not motivate as much as the other factors).

The informants also discussed their autonomy when performing a task. As mentioned shortly when analyzing supervisors, the informants enjoyed not being too controlled by the supervisors. As long as they complete the expected tasks, they are free to perform on the way they find to be suitable. So, the way of completing tasks becomes autonomous since the employees can choose their ways. This is another trait creating freedom at work.

Autonomy over work seemed, for our informants, both a factor creating motivation and sustaining it. Specific autonomous factor named the most was the feeling of being in control; “being your own boss”. Having control over one’s actions (even though it is not 100% the case since they have performance expectations) is a big motivator, as seen by the many 5’s from the
results as well as from a theoretical perspective. Therefore, it can be stated that LinkedIn successfully stimulates the autonomy as a motivator as well.

The general feeling of the answers was that the informants value self-direction highly, supported by the interest of the work. There is an intrinsic will to complete tasks and to be at work, and at the same time, the work leaves sufficient control for working hours and free time. Key words related to SDT for this part are choice and self-direction.

As suggested by earlier research as well, autonomy is of vital importance to motivation. We found out that autonomy over time is more important than autonomy over tasks, as suggested by Kultalahti and Viitala (2014) and Luscombe et al (2013). The need behind autonomy is the importance of free time, as suggested by earlier research. Most of the time, our informants felt they had enough control over their free time, but not as much control over their tasks. However, they did not feel distressed about this. They were more concerned with working hours, as suggested by earlier research and the self-determination theory. Managers enabling autonomy were valued very highly as well.

6.4 Conclusions

Because of their success with young employees, the underlying expectation was that LinkedIn has several very unique ways to motivate them. However, the results showed that in fact, they do not do anything extremely special, but rather, use a multitude of ways that have been proven to work by theory. The interesting factor is, though, that they seem to have a very successful foundation based on all the factors of self-determination theory, instead of trying to use just one factor. One could even assume that the culture and work-environment have been specifically built with this theory in mind.

The results show the highest enthusiasm towards the relatedness factor. It appears that the social environment at LinkedIn is very tight: the connections between the employees extend beyond office hours. The support and intimate relationships help the employees immensely. LinkedIn
has managed to employ a good group of employees: the ones hiring seem to have a great level of intelligence on who they choose to employ, and this clearly shows in the general relaxedness, welcomingness and relatedness in the general office atmosphere. The informants found great joy in being able to relate to each other and the company’s values and culture as well.

The aspects of autonomy and competence were very close to each other, and not far behind relatedness either. Regarding autonomy, the informants enjoy the freedom they have about their working hours, but not as much as the support they receive from their colleagues. Also, management over time was more important than management over tasks.

Finally, the feeling of competence. One factor about competence rose above the others: the opportunity to extend skills and participate in classes etc., i.e. becoming a more competent employee. Also, the informants enjoyed sufficiently complex and difficult tasks, but did not feel them to be as important as autonomy and relatedness. Variety in the tasks was important to the informants, maybe even more so than sufficient difficulty. This was to keep them from feeling bored or stale at work.

The results of this research only validate and support earlier studies found on the subject. Kultalahti and Viitala (2013) name many of the factors we also found out to be motivating.

An interesting finding of this research is how much the informants valued the flexible style of management. They appreciate the managers varying their styles depending on the situation, and agree to it being a motivation booster. This factor does not fit under any single category of STD, but rather is a combination of all the three, autonomy, relatedness and competence. The managers show autonomy by being flexible and allowing flexibility for the employees, they increase relatedness by making the employees feel better, and the managers are highly competent when they are capable of adapting to different situations. All these factors increase work motivation, and the flexible style of management should be used by other companies with generation Y employees as well.

Another interesting finding was how much the informants enjoyed shared values with colleagues and the company culture. Many felt that these factors had a colossal effect on work satisfaction
and helped in building contacts with others; both being very motivating factors according to theory and earlier researches.

A final point of the results this study shows is the fact that LinkedIn really manages to use of so many motivators to keep the generation Y employees motivated. The expectation was not to find an organization who almost flawlessly use of motivators at the workplace, but LinkedIn seemingly succeeds in a brilliant fashion. None of the informants showed any interest in leaving LinkedIn, which, as suggested by Mitjonen (2014), proves that they are motivated enough to enjoy their work and to continue working at the same office.

7.0 SUMMARY

It is clear that LinkedIn works consciously with attracting and engaging personnel that are categorized to generation Y. Furthermore, the informants’ statements show that they are successful in completing these objectives. The employees at LinkedIn feel that they are properly motivated by their employer.

None of the interviewees mentioned or seemed to care much for simple monetary rewards as a prime driving force. This study confirms and further cements earlier research showing younger employees from the new era are drawn more towards intrinsic motivators,

Self-determination theory fits perfectly with the psychology behind the employees of LinkedIn’s motivation. There is a plethora of observations that indicate that “relatedness”, “competence” and “autonomy” are essential factors in the effective motivation of the generation Y’ers. All of those mentioned factors are said to be important and it is difficult to rank them but relatedness seems to be extra essential. Teamwork and the sharing of the company's values and goals are the biggest discernible motivation factors that engage generation Y, especially in comparison to previous generations.
LinkedIn are using a wide array of tools to make their employees feel included. These consists among others of bonding activities, casual relationships with superiors, easy and open communication and a workplace that is more “homely” and comfortable than your average job area. Teamwork is also implemented in almost every part of the work chain. At LinkedIn, they are aware of the impact successful teamwork has on their employees motivation and much of their daily routines consists of working closely with other coworkers.

Regarding “competence” and “autonomy” there is evidence suggesting that LinkedIn are fulfilling these needs for their employees as well. The informants very much feel they can manage their time rather freely. They also feel that they are in charge of their working tasks even though there is room for improvement when it comes to diversity in the tasks. LinkedIn’s strong profile of being a talent magnet adds to the overall atmosphere of competence in the company, something the study proves to be highly valued.

To reconnect with the thesis’s original research question “Which intrinsic factors contribute to a motivating work environment in an organization that successfully motivates generation Y employees?”, there are indeed several prominent intrinsic factors that motivate generation Y more than others. These are the above mentioned pillars of self-determination theory and they have been thoroughly proven to work according to this study. They are as follows:

Autonomy - The employees’ power to control their own environment and situation.

Competence - The employees’ ability to handle their problems and challenges, as well as the feeling that their coworkers meet the same standard, and the ability learn new.

Relatedness - The employees’ need to feel included and a part of a whole, feeling of belonging and sharing.

The purpose of the research was fulfilled.
7.1 SUGGESTIONS FOR FURTHER STUDIES AND PRACTICAL IMPLICATIONS

Motivation at work is an interesting subject, and the effects of motivation have a plethora of effects on a person’s daily life. Therefore, it would be of interest to study different impacts of motivation or motivators on different aspects of life. An example could be how a work environment with strong relatedness affects work efficiency, or if having more control over working hours diminishes the amount of work done.

Another interesting factor to study would be the recruitment process of LinkedIn. As shown by our informants, they have a tremendous working environment. How do they manage to find such a good group of employees, and how do they ensure that no bad candidates are picked?

Finally, hopefully the results and analysis of this research can act as a guide to companies struggling with motivational issues. As shown by the results, LinkedIn is not, and many things can be learned from their ways and cultures. The results may not be directly applicable to companies due to the individualistic nature of motivation and due to differences between cultures. However, the general ideas and principles can work, and with suitable modifications, should be motivating factors in many places.
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APPENDIX 1: INTERVIEW GUIDE

Background:
1. Describe your educational and career background with a few lines of text:

2. Describe briefly your background at LinkedIn. How long have you worked there and what are your main tasks?

Social
3a. How do your colleagues at LinkedIn affect your working experience? (i.e. are they supportive? Inspiring? Trustworthy? Competent?)

3b. How much do you value the colleague aspect at work in relation to your overall work experience? (scale 1-5, 1 being the lowest)

4a. Describe your supervisors managing style and how it affects you at work? (i.e. are they socially supportive? Encouraging? Attentive to your suggestions/issues? Intimidating? Demanding?)

4b. How much do you value your supervisors role in relation to your overall work experience? (scale 1-5, 1 being the lowest)

5. Regarding LinkedIn culture, what specific traditions/habits etc. do you appreciate? (i.e. dress codes, office gatherings, outside work activities)

Task related
6a. How interesting do you find your work tasks? Give examples of interesting/”boring” tasks
6b In what way does this affect your work satisfaction?

6c. How much do you value interesting tasks at work in relation to your overall work experience?
(scale 1-5, 1 being the lowest)

7a. Do you have variety in your tasks?

7b. In what way does this affect your work satisfaction?

7c. How much do you value varying tasks at work in relation to your overall work experience?
(scale 1-5, 1 being the lowest)

8a. Do you find your tasks challenging enough?

8b. In what way does this affect your work satisfaction?

8c. How much do you value challenging tasks at work in relation to your overall work experience?
(scale 1-5, 1 being the lowest)

Autonomy
9a. Do you have an influence on your working hours? (i.e. can you decide over your schedule?) Can you work from home?

9b. How much do you value the autonomy aspect at work in relation to your overall work experience?
(scale 1-5, 1 being the lowest)

LinkedIn specific
10. What opportunities are there at LinkedIn for learning, personal growth, advancing career wise etc.? (i.e. courses, programs, seminars, lectures)

11. What non-monetary benefits do you value at LinkedIn? (i.e. food, game rooms/leisure areas, company yacht)

12. How does LinkedIn stand out in comparison to your previous employments?

13. Are there any other LinkedIn specifics that affect your overall work motivation?

THANK YOU FOR ANSWERING!