

JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATION: WHAT ARE THE DIFFERENCE AMONG THESE TWO?

Tan Shen Kian
Email: shenkian@yahoo.com

Wan Fauziah Wan Yusoff
Faculty of Technology Management and Business
University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia
Email: fauziah@uthm.edu.my

Sivan Rajah
Faculty of Technical and Vocational Education
University Tun Hussein Onn Malaysia
Email: schruti06@yahoo.com

ABSTRACT

Motivation and Job Satisfaction as the most discussed topic in Organizational behaviour have accumulated huge numbers of empirical researches over years. Both these two factors have been proven as main contribution factors towards effectiveness and efficiency of business organizations. Although most of empirical researches have concluded their finding with positive relationships between Motivation and Job Satisfaction, as well as complement relationship between Motivation and Job Satisfaction towards other organizational variables. However, conclusion cannot simply draw that Job Satisfaction equal to Motivation or vice versa. As such, this article literally declares separate treatments for the two Motivation and Job Satisfaction so that factors under these two categories of studies that may affect organizational variable can be more identifiable.

Key Words – Job Satisfaction, Motivation, Content Theory, Process Theory, Affective Job Satisfaction, Cognitive Job Satisfaction

Introduction

The study of Organizational Behaviour always start with clear definition as consciously coordinated social unit composed of two or more people that functions on a relatively continuous basis to achieve a common goal or set of goals. As it, individuals' attitudes and behaviour within organizations mostly decide success or failure on overall performance. Among variety of organizational success factors resulted from individual attitudes and behaviour introduced by various researchers, Job Satisfaction and Motivation were found as the most discussed topic. Further studies on these two factors have contributed in-depth definitions and empirical evidences in enhancing its practicability. However, due to its similar factors of input, high correlations and complement role between each other, these two organizations' success factors have becoming ambiguous. Furthermore, since most of the Motivation theories are developed based on the idea of Job Satisfactions as well as high appearance of Job Satisfaction in most of Motivation theories, distinction between Job Satisfaction and Motivation may be mistakenly taken as unanimous in terms of its meanings and purpose.

It is important for corporates and graduates to understand that Motivation and Job Satisfaction are different to each other. These two organizational factors are contributing to different aspects of employees' psychology and physiology operations, for example, directions of effects towards individuals' attitudes and behaviour resulted from a same influence factor. Following part will further explain the similarities and differences between Job Satisfaction and Motivation.

Literature Review

Motivation

The term motivation has being discussed and conceptualized by various researchers. In early years Wiseand and Rush (1988) explained motivation as the willingness of an individual to do something and conditioned by actions to satisfy needs. Later Wregner and Miller (2003) described motivation as something that energized individuals to take action and which is concerned with the choices the individual makes as part of his or her goal-oriented behaviour. Following the recent definition contributed by Fuller *et.al.* (2008), motivation is a person's intensity, direction and persistence of efforts to attain a specific objective. From the statement provided, intensity as further elaborated is how hard an individual tries to attain the specific objective while direction is the channel to intensity towards the correct objective; whereas persistence refers to how long someone maintains an effort to attain the specific objective. Motivation is defined by Saraswathi (2011) as the willingness to exert high levels of effort, toward organizational goals, conditioned by the effort's ability to satisfy some individual need. Three key elements in the definition are further provided as effort, organization goal, and need.

Definitions of motivation contributed by various researchers above are apparently in similar meaning as drive, energize and action. Researchers are agreeing on individuals' motivations start with cognitive recognition of a desire that is not present at the time the individual noticed, followed by mental desire to achieve something, thus following by physical actions to obtain the desire.

Content-Process Theories of Motivation

Variety of workplace motivation theories are classified as either process theory or content theory (Campbell *et. al.*, 1970). Based on Content theory that emphasize on factors and needs that encourage and inspire employees' behaviour as well as performance. Content theories of motivation are focusing on employees' internal factors that energize and direct their working behaviour (Lynne, 2012). Motivation theories that are categorized under content theories regards motivations as the product of internal drives that compels individuals to act or move toward their satisfactions. The content theories of motivation are based in large part on early theories of motivation that traced the paths of action backward to their perceived origin in internal drives. Major content theories of motivation are Maslow's hierarchy of needs, Alderfer's ERG theory, Herzberg Two factors Theory, and McClelland's Theory of Needs (Lynne, 2012). In short, content theories are based on various factors which will influence job satisfactions. Motivation theories classified under Content theory undertake that all employees in the organization have the same set of needs, therefore allowing organizations to predict the characteristics that should be present in the job (Lynne, 2012).

Oppositely, process theories emphasized on employees' behaviours that driven by their individual needs. Employees will gain their motivation when their expectations and values are met in their job. This theory included the process by which variables such as employees' expectations, needs and values, and comparisons interact with their job tasks to determine Motivation. It concerned with determining how individual behaviour is motivated and maintained in the self-directed human cognitive processes. Variety of workplace motivation theories that classified under process theory shares a same notion where employees' diverse needs and the cognitive process behind these diversities are given attentions (Lynne, 2012). In these theories, attentions are given on sources and causes of employees' behaviours, as well as the motives that affect the intensity and direction of those behaviours. The major process theories of motivation are Vroom's expectancy theory, Adam's equity theory, Latham & Locke's goal-setting theory, and Skinner's reinforcement theory.

Job Satisfactions

The concept of Job Satisfactions was widely discussed by various researchers. The most popular definition was provided by Locke (1976), where Job Satisfaction is simply a positive emotional state of feeling resulted from jobs, thus fulfil individuals' value towards their jobs. This definition further suggests that job satisfaction contains an affective component (emotional state) and cognitive component (appraisal) of Job Satisfaction (Organ & Konovsky, 1989). Affective Job Satisfaction states the individual's immediate feeling state towards job-related factors. It is the extent of pleasurable emotional feelings individuals have about their jobs overall. The positive emotional of feeling may include feeling good about the job individual being delegated, and the particular feeling is experienced from their appraised work performance, recognised professions, and even completion of work task (Megginson *et. al.*, 1982). On the other hand, the Cognitive Job Satisfaction is tied to the expectations and standards of comparison in terms of which current circumstances are being evaluated. It is the extent of individuals' satisfaction with particular facets or aspects of their jobs.

Personal evaluation and perceptions towards Affective or Cognitive condition when operating his/her job or outcome arises as having his/her job completed (Schneider and Scyder, 1975) has further explained how the positive emotional state of feeling arrived. The point is where the job on-going or completed is able or not, to supply extra senses of feelings that will match with individuals' evaluations and perceptions. Therefore, individuals will evaluate their jobs against aspects that are important to their dispositions (Sempane *et. al.*, 2002). On other words, Job Satisfaction will arise only if job tasks are delegated to the right individual where natures of the tasks are complement to the individual's value that will in turn gratify positive feeling towards the task delegated.

Discussions

Job Satisfactions towards Motivation Theories

The role of Job Satisfaction towards Motivation cannot be neglected. In fact, most of the Motivation theories have used Job Satisfaction as groundwork in practice. For example, well-known Maslow Hierarchy of Need as fundamental for most of Motivation theories has used Job Satisfaction as foundation of theory development. The theory builds up from satisfactions on hierarchical ladders of human needs as motivation factors. Once individual has satisfied current stage of need, he/she will not motivate unless he/she is trying to move up to upper stages. Obviously, the theory clearly stated that importance of job-related satisfactions towards activation of employees' motivation.

Besides, Alderfer's ERG Theory and McClelland's Theory of Needs have also found a strong implementation on Job Satisfaction towards Motivation. The ERG theory is an extension of Maslow's hierarchy of needs that re-categorised Maslow's five motivational needs into three categories as Existence, Relatedness, and Growth. The major distinct of ERG towards Hierarchy of Needs is that it does not suggest that lower-level needs must be completely satisfied before upper-level needs become motivational. McClelland's Theory of Needs suggests three of the primary needs as affiliation (nAff), power (nPow), and achievement (nAch). As supported by Pan (2005), Job Satisfaction is an attitude of a person's subjective judgement and feeling towards the level of satisfaction on job-related factors. Thus, the main point of the two theories are when these job-related needs are strong in a person, satisfaction in receive the particular needs has higher potential to motivate behaviour.

Another Herzberg's Two-factor theory was almost fully developed based on the implementation of Job Satisfaction. The theory has included variety of Job Satisfaction factors and further categorised into two groups named Hygiene Factors and Motivators. The tricks introduced by Herzberg, is where satisfaction on Hygiene Factors will prevent employees from dissatisfy their job, satisfactions on Motivators will further motivate them. Obviously, this theory is found strong implementations of Job Satisfaction in order to produce Motivation. The setting of theory clearly explained employees' motivation will only follow by satisfaction in Motivators that have Personal Characteristic factors within, whereas satisfaction in Hygiene factor that found similar with Environmental factors will only prevent them from dissatisfaction. Recent empirical researches have even found that satisfaction on both Hygiene factors and Motivators have effected employees' motivations. For example, an empirical research carried out by Wan Fauziah et. al. (2013) that employed Herzberg's Hygiene-Motivator factors has determined circumstance where older generation of workers will respond to Personal Characteristic Factors or Motivators to exhibit Citizenship Performance, whereas younger generation of workers are responded from Environmental or Hygiene factors. As supported by Aziri (2011), Job Satisfaction include collections of feelings an beliefs that people have about their current job, the research above have further proven that individuals' motivation to perform something were raised by Job-Satisfaction factors, regardless of Hygiene factor or Motivators.

In terms of Process Theory of Motivation, following the earlier definitions, process theories explained individual' motivation arise when their cognitive process of expectations, needs and values are match with job-related factors. As supported by Sempene et. al. (2002) in defining Job Satisfaction, individuals will evaluate their jobs against aspects that are important to their dispositions. Hence, the statement is bring forward in explaining Process theories of Motivation as higher consistency between evaluated job-related factors and individuals' cognitive factors will first result in better Job Satisfaction, and increased in motivation will be the consequence.

Among various Process theories of Motivation, Expectancy theory introduced by Vroom (1964) and Equity theory from Adams (1965) have found strong fill-in from theory of Job Satisfaction. Expectancy theory states that employee's motivation is an outcome of how much an individual wants a reward (Valence), following by the assessment that the probability of the effort will lead to expected performance (Expectancy), and the belief that the performance will lead to desired reward (Instrumentality). On the other hand, Equity theory suggests that individuals will constantly engage in social comparison by comparing their efforts and rewards with those of relevant others. Levels of motivations are resulted from the perception of individuals about the fairness of their rewards relative to others. Fairness experienced by employees in workplace will turn up sense of Job Satisfaction that will follow by Motivation. Directly, constructions of the two theories have shared same notion where satisfactions in either individuals' expectations or fairness will trigger Motivation. Obviously, these two theories found strong connection towards Cognitive Component of Job Satisfaction were these two theories have demonstrated the importance of satisfaction on individuals' job-related perceptions, expectations and values in order to encourage Motivation.

Goal-setting theory introduced by (Locke & Latham, 1990; 2002) emphasizes the importance of specific and challenging goals in achieving motivated behaviour. A goal is defined simply as what the individual is consciously trying to do. Several factors may moderate the relationship between specific and challenging goals and high levels of motivation. According to the theory, goals motivate people to develop strategies that will enable them to perform at the required goal levels. Job Satisfaction again can be found within implementation of this theory. The part where Job Satisfaction play within this theory is where accomplishing the goal can lead to job satisfaction and further motivated individual for the next goal. To demonstrate, when individual is achieving or completed his/her goals where the three stated factors (Goal Commitment, Self-Efficacy, Challenging Goals) are existed, he/she will be motivated as factors of Job Satisfactions have being fulfilled by positive emotional of feelings. The feeling may include appraised work performance, recognised professions, and even completion of work task that match with individual's evaluation and perceptions (Schneider & Scyder, 1975; Megginson et. al., 1982).

Variety of Motivation theories has being discussed. Apparently, Job Satisfaction plays the most important linchpin in deciding employees' Motivation. As supported by Dawson (2005), where employee satisfaction is associated with positive employee behaviour, motivation and satisfaction seems to be synonymous terms. In fact, these Motivation theories such as Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Alderfer's ERG theory, Herzberg Two factors Theory, and McClelland's Theory of Needs have validated strong demand on satisfaction on their own proposed job-related factors to decide the existence of Motivation. In short, according to the discussions above, employees who are high in Job Satisfaction may subsequently increase their motivation; contrariwise, employees' motivation may not increase if their preferred Job Satisfaction factors are not fulfilled.

Similarities and Differences between Motivation and Job Satisfactions

Motivation and Job Satisfaction were discussed with bunches of parallels. In fact, Job Satisfactions is usually linked with Motivation (Aziri, 2011). No doubt, Content-Process theories of Motivation have found similarities with Affective-Cognitive of Job Satisfaction theories. To elaborate, Content theories of Motivation and Affective Job Satisfaction are focusing on individual's internal factors and needs that they experienced from jobs; the difference is Affective Job Satisfaction will answer positive or negative emotions towards the particular experience, while Content theories of Motivation undertake the experience and further increase or decrease efforts towards their jobs. In contrast, Process theories of Motivation and Cognitive Job Satisfaction are comparing individuals' expectations, value, perceptions and needs towards their jobs. Well match between personal factors such as expectations, value, perceptions and needs towards jobs, according

to Content theory of Job Satisfaction, will attach positive emotion towards the job; while for the Process theories, the personal factors will decide individuals' motivation level. For example, an empirical research from Singh and Tiwari (2011) has found a strong positive correlation and functional relationship between Motivation and Job Satisfaction of the employees. Another empirical research conducted by Nadia and Shagufta (2011) also concluded with same findings. Sample of the study that consist of 80 middle managers from different banks in Pakistan have reported a positive correlation between work motivation and Job Satisfaction. These two finding have indicated that changes of the value of Job Satisfaction have positive significant impact on the value of Motivation.

As discussed earlier, the linkage of Job Satisfaction and Motivation may due to their close related factors. Organizational factors that individuals' experienced may motivate them to exert additional efforts, at the same time fulfil their emotional demand that leads to Job Satisfactions. According to Chess (1994), certain motivation factors are contributing to the prediction of Job Satisfaction. Further shared factors between Motivation and Job Satisfaction were found from literatures such as Power (Hoole & Vermeulen, 2003), Job Security (Davy, et. a., 1997; Ritter & Anker, 2000), Financial Rewards (Thomson, 2003), Promotion (Hoole & Vermeulen, 2003), as well as Promotion (Moynihan & Pandey, 2007). Summarize from above statements, it is possible that same input factors will turn up both Motivation and Job Satisfaction.

Nevertheless, conclusion cannot be drawn that Job Satisfaction means Motivation. To support such statement, comparisons between the definitions of the two studies is needed to distinguish differences of the two field of study. According to Hersey and Blanchard (1988), motivation and satisfaction are quite different from each another in terms of return and performance. Definitions provided for Motivation and Job Satisfactions earlier have provided clear distinctions between each other. Whiseand and Rush (1988) explained Motivation as the individual's pay-out in doing something and to satisfy needs; whereas Job Satisfaction defined by Locke (1976) is simply a positive emotional state of feeling resulted from jobs. Motivation is influenced by current interpretation or forward-looking perceptions about the relationship between performance and return; whereas satisfaction involves how people feel about the returns or rewards they have received for their current past performance. In other words, following Carr (2005), motivation is result of expectations of the future while satisfaction is result of past events. In terms of employees' feelings and their jobs, definitions of Motivation claimed that it is an inverse relationship where employees' feeling towards jobs will decide quality of the jobs (Wregner and Miller, 2003; Fuller *et.al.*, 2008). In contrast, definitions of Job Satisfaction were discovered a reverse relationship where job itself decide employees' positive or negative feeling towards the particular job (Megginson et. al., 1982; Sempene et. al., 2002; Robbins & Judge, 2010).

In perspective of impact towards organizations, plenty of empirical research has reported discrepancies between Motivation and Job Satisfaction. For example, a research carried out by Kim (2006) has investigated Motivation and Job Satisfaction as predictors for Altruism and Generalised Compliance extracted from Organisational Citizenship Behaviour (OCB) among 1584 civil servant in Korea. The empirical research have indicated positive relationship between OCB and Workplace Motivation; conversely, unconfirmed relationship between Job Satisfaction and OCB. Another empirical research conducted by Tella et. al (2007) that stress on Motivation, Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment also trace down discrepancies. With a sample of 200 library personnel in all research and academic library in Nigeria, findings revealed a complicating relationship between the three variables. In detail, the research concluded positive correlations between Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction, as well as Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment; however, a negative correlation between Motivation and Organizational

Commitment. As discussed earlier, Job Satisfaction is define as attitudes towards job-related emotions whereas Motivation is behaviour pay-out as resulted from drive factors; it is possible that not every time these two theories will turn up same effects towards selected organizational behaviours.

Conclusion

Theories of work motivations have addressed connections between Job Satisfaction and Motivation, Additionally, clarifications on how satisfaction and motivation differ from each other also discussed. Keystone for this article has summarized clear distinguishes where, from work-related variables, Job Satisfaction is an emotional response that will results in broad behavioural actions towards working environment; while Motivation is a behavioural actions that may return with specific emotional response. Hence, it can be rephrases as Job Satisfaction is an attitude from experienced objects, whereas motivation is behaviour towards identified objects. According to the Principle of Compatibility, it is possible for employees to satisfy with their jobs but not motivated. It is further concluded as Motivation and Job Satisfaction are not synonymous with each other. Discussions above have clearly proven that Motivation and Job Satisfaction are sharing similar dependant variables but they will not guarantee same impact towards organizational behaviours. Clarifications on distinctions between the concepts further ease up overall understanding on Job Satisfaction and Motivation. In conclusion, although Job Satisfaction is found closely stand with theories of Motivation, however, both these two field of studies should be treated separately, so that factors of influences and area of practice can be more identifiable.

References

1. Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in Social Exchange. *Adv. Exp. Soc. Psychol.* Vol. 62, pp. 335-343
2. Adeyinka Tella, C.O. Ayeni, S. O. Popoola, (2007). Work Motivation, Job Satisfaction, and Organisational Commitment of Library Personnel in Academic and Research Libraries in Oyo State, Nigeria. *Library Philosophy and Practice*, April, 2007
3. Aziri B. (2011). Job Satisfaction: A Literature Review. *Management Research And Practice*, Vol. 3 Issue 4 (2011) Pp: 77-8
4. Campbell, J.P., Dunnette, M.D., Lawler, E.E., & Weick, K.E. (1970). *Managerial Behaviour, Performance, and Effectiveness*. New York: McGraw-Hill.
5. Davy, J.A., Kinicki, A.J. & Scheck, C.L. (1997). A test of job security's direct and mediated effects on withdrawal cognitions. *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, 18, 323 – 349
6. Dawson, B. (2005). Motivation leaders to better results. *Journal of Rubber and Plastics*, 37, 11–15
7. Fuller MA, Valacich JS, & George JF (2008). *Information Systems Project Management: A Process and Team Approach*. Upper Saddle River, New Jersey: Pearson Prentice Hall
8. Hersey, P., & Blanchard, K. H. (1988). *Management of organization behavior: utilizing human resource*. Atlanta: Prentice Hall.
9. Kalim Ullah Khan, Syed Umar Farooq, Muahmmad Imran Ullah (2010). The Relationship between Rewards and Employee Motivation in Commercial Banks of Pakistan. *Research Journal of International Studies* - Issue 14.
10. Hoole, C. & Vermeulen, L.P.(2003). Job satisfaction among South African pilots. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 29(1), 52 – 57.
11. Locke, E.A. (1976). *The Nature and Vauses of Job Satisfaction*. In M.D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organisational Psychology*, pp.1297-1343. Chicago: Rand McNally.
12. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (1990). *A theory of goal setting and task performance*. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall.
13. Locke, E. A., & Latham, G. P. (2002). Building a Practically Useful Theory of Goal Setting and Task Motivation. *American Psychologist*, Vol. 57 (9), pp. 705-717.
14. Megginson, L.C., Mosley, D.C.& Pietri, P.H. (1982). *Management Concepts And Applications* (4th ed.) *New York: Harper Collins*.
15. More, H. W., Wegner, F. W. & Miller, L. S. (2003). *Effective Police Supervision*, Cincinnati, Anderson Publishing Co.
16. Moynihan, D.P. and Pandey, S.K. (2007), "Finding workable levers over work motivation, comparing job satisfaction, job involvement, and organizational commitment", *Administration & Society*, Vol. 39 No. 7, pp. 803-32

17. Nadia Ayub and Shagufta Rafif (2011). The Relationship Between Work Motivation and Job Satisfaction. *Pakistan Business Review*, July 2011.
18. Organ, D. W., & Konovsky, M. A. 1989. Cognitive Versus Affective Determinants Of Organizational Citizenship Behavior. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 74: 157–164.
19. Pan WY (2005). A Study On The Personal Background, Motivation, And Job Satisfaction Of Museum Volunteers-A Case Study Of Kaohsiung Museum Of History , master thesis, Graduate Institute of Education Administration, National Pingtung Normal University
20. Ritter, J.A. & Anker, R. (2002). Good jobs, bad jobs: Workers' evaluations in five countries. *International Labour Review*, 141(4), 331 – 358.
21. Robbins, S. P., & Judge, T. A. (2010). *Essentials of organizational behavior* (10th ed.). Upper Saddle River, NJ: Pearson Education.
22. Schneider, B. & Snyder, R.A.(1975). Some Relationship Between Job Satisfaction And Organizational Climate. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 60(3), 318 – 328.
23. Sangmook Kim, (2006) "Public service motivation and organizational citizenship behavior in Korea", *International Journal of Manpower*, Vol. 27 Iss: 8, pp.722 – 740
24. Sempene, M.E., Rieger, H.S. & Roodt, G. (2002). Job Satisfaction In Relation To Organisational Culture. *South African Journal of Industrial Psychology*, 28(2), 23 -30
25. S K Singh, Vivek Tiwari, (2011). Relationship between Motivation and Job Satisfaction of the White Collar Employees: A Case Study. *Management Insight*, Vol 7, No 2 (2011)
26. S. Saraswathi (2011): A Study on Factors that Motivate IT and Non-IT Sector Employees: A Comparison. *International Journal of Research in Computer Application and Management*, Vol. 1 (2), pp. 72-77
27. Thomson, D. (2003). Incentive schemes have to work! *Management Today*, 18(10), 46 – 47.
28. Vinokur, K.D., Jayaaratne, S., Chess, W.A. (1994). Job satisfaction and retention of social workers in public agencies, non-profit agencies and private practice: The impact of work place conditions and motivators. *Administration in Social Work* 18 (3)93-121.
29. Vroom, V.H. (1964), *Work and Motivation*, Wiley, New York, NY.
30. Wan Fauziah, S.K. Tan, S. Rajah (2013). Employee Satisfaction and Citizenship Performance among Generation X and Y. *Proceedings of The 20th International Business Information Management Association Conference*. March 25-26, 2013. Kuala Lumpur, Malaysia (ISBN: 978-0-9821489-9-0)
31. Whatmore, Lynne (2012). *Raising Performance through Motivation Part One: Content Theories*. Michael Heath Consulting.
32. Wiseand, P. & Rush, G. (1988). *Supervising Police Personnel: Back to Basics*, Prentice Hall, New Jersey