

Motivation and job satisfaction

Mark A. Tietjen and Robert M. Myers

Palm Beach Atlantic College, West Palm Beach, Florida, USA

The movement of workers to act in a desired manner has always consumed the thoughts of managers. In many ways, this goal has been reached through incentive programs, corporate pep talks, and other types of conditional administrative policy. However, as the workers adjust their behaviour in response to one of the aforementioned stimuli, is job satisfaction actualized? The instilling of satisfaction within workers is a crucial task of management. Satisfaction creates confidence, loyalty and ultimately improved quality in the output of the employed. Satisfaction, though, is not the simple result of an incentive program. Employees will most likely not take any more pride in their work even if they win the weekend getaway for having the highest sales. This paper reviews the literature of motivational theorists and draws from their approaches to job satisfaction and the role of motivation within job satisfaction. The theories of Frederick Herzberg and Edwin Locke are presented chronologically to show how Locke's theory was a response to Herzberg's theory. By understanding these theories, managers can focus on strategies of creating job satisfaction. This is followed by a brief examination of Kenneth Blanchard and Paul Hersey's theory on leadership within management and how this art is changing through time.

Management Decision
36/4 [1998] 226–231

© MCB University Press
[ISSN 0025-1747]

Herzberg and job satisfaction

Concept of attitude

Herzberg *et al.* (1959) proposed that an employee's motivation to work is best understood when the respective attitude of that employee is understood. That is, the internal concept of attitude which originates from a state of mind, when probed, should reveal the most pragmatic information for managers with regard to the motivation of workers. In his approach to studying the feelings of people toward their work, or their attitudes, Herzberg *et al.* (1959) set out to answer three questions:

- 1 How can one specify the attitude of any individual toward his or her job?
- 2 What causes these attitudes?
- 3 What are the consequences of these attitudes?

The order of these questions is empirically methodical and, for Herzberg, the final question, which would demonstrate the relationship between attitude and subsequent behavior, was particularly important. In response to the "fragmentary nature" of previous scholarship, the combination of the three questions resulted in a single unit of study – the factors-attitudes-effects (F-A-E) complex. Herzberg described his new approach as idiographic (Herzberg *et al.*, 1959). Contrary to the statistical or nomothetic approach which places more emphasis on a group's interaction with a particular variable, the idiographic view was based on the premise that the F-A-E complex should be studied within individuals.

The method Herzberg used placed emphasis of the qualitative investigation of the F-A-E complex over a quantitative assessment of the information, though results were quantified at a later point. The design of Herzberg's experimentation was to ask open-ended questions specifically about a worker's experiences when feelings about his/her job were more positive or negative than usual (Herzberg *et al.*, 1959). He preferred such an approach over the ranking of pre-written (and assumed) factors compiled and limited by the experimenter. Each interview was

semistructured in nature so that a list of questions was the basis of the survey, but the interviewer was free to pursue other manners of inquiry.

The purpose of this discussion on attitude was to summarize in short, the importance of attitude as a starting point of the dual-factor theory of Herzberg, and briefly show his approach to experimentation and research.

Motivation and hygiene factors

As a result of his inquiry about the attitudes of employees, Herzberg *et al.* (1959) developed two distinct lists of factors. One set of factors caused happy feelings or a good attitude within the worker, and these factors, on the whole, were task-related. The other grouping was primarily present when feelings of unhappiness or bad attitude were evident, and these factors, Herzberg claimed, were not directly related to the job itself, but to the conditions that surrounded doing that job. The first group he called motivators (job factors):

- recognition;
- achievement;
- possibility of growth;
- advancement;
- responsibility;
- work itself.

The second group Herzberg named hygiene factors (extra-job factors):

- salary;
- interpersonal relations – supervisor;
- interpersonal relations – subordinates;
- interpersonal relations – peers;
- supervision – technical;
- company policy and administration;
- working conditions;
- factors in personal life;
- status;
- job security.

Motivators refer to factors intrinsic within the work itself like the recognition of a task completed. Conversely, hygienes tend to include extrinsic entities such as relations with co-workers, which do not pertain to the worker's actual job.

The relationship of satisfaction and dissatisfaction

The most significant and basic difference between Herzberg's two factors is the inherent level of satisfaction/dissatisfaction within each factor. If motivation includes only those things which promote action over time, then motivators are the factors that promote long-running attitudes and satisfaction. According to Herzberg *et al.* (1959), motivators cause positive job attitudes because they satisfy the worker's need for self-actualization (Maslow, 1954), the individual's ultimate goal. The presence of these motivators has the potential to create great job satisfaction; however, in the absence of motivators, Herzberg says, dissatisfaction does not occur. Likewise, hygiene factors, which simply "move" (cause temporary action), have the potential to cause great dissatisfaction. Similarly, their absence does not provoke a high level of satisfaction.

How does Herzberg base this non-bipolar relationship? Job satisfaction (House and Wigdor, 1967) contains two separate and independent dimensions. These dimensions are not on differing ends of one continuum; instead they consist of two separate and distinct continua. According to Herzberg (1968), the opposite of job satisfaction is not dissatisfaction, but rather a simple lack of satisfaction. In the same way, the opposite of job dissatisfaction is not satisfaction, but rather "no dissatisfaction". For example, consider the hygiene factor, work conditions. If the air conditioner breaks in the middle of a hot summer day, workers will be greatly dissatisfied. However, if the air-conditioner works throughout the day as expected, the workers will not be particularly satisfied by taking notice and being grateful.

Motivation vs. movement in KITA

Integral to Herzberg's theory of motivation is the difference between motivation and movement. He compares the two in his discussion of KITA (Herzberg, 1968) – the polite acronym for a "kick in the —". There are three different types of KITA:

- negative physical KITA;
- negative psychological KITA;
- positive KITA.

In today's litigious society, it is probable that most managers will deal less and less with workers utilizing negative physical KITA, or physical contact to initiate action out of an indolent employee. Negative psychological KITA is also rather useless in motivating workers; the primary benefit, though malicious, is the feeding of one's ego, also known

as a power trip. What about positive KITA? Positive KITA can be summarized in one word – reward. The relationship is "if..., then...". If you finish this task in one week, then you will receive this bonus. Though many managers give incentives to motivate, Herzberg says that positive KITA is not motivational. Positive KITA, rather, moves or stimulates movement. When the worker receives the bonus on completion of the task, is the individual any more motivated to work harder now? Was there a lasting effect because of the conditional bonus? No, the worker was simply moved temporarily to act. There are, however, no extended effects once the bonus is received.

Recalling motivator factors, Herzberg (1968) concludes that only these factors can have a lasting impression on a worker's attitude, satisfaction and, thus, work. Furthermore, workers perform best (Steininger, 1994) when this stimulation is internal and work-related.

Locke's theory on job satisfaction

Locke's composite theory of job satisfaction is the product of many other concepts which he has developed through study and research on related topics such as goal-setting and employee performance. Likewise, his explanation of job satisfaction is in part, a response to some of Herzberg's proposals. Thus, Locke's criticism of Herzberg will be the initial discussion, followed by his theory on values, agent/event factors, and finally an adjusted view of job satisfaction.

Criticisms of Herzberg

Locke's assessment of Herzberg's two-factor theory can be summarized in brief by the following conclusions about Herzberg's thinking:

- 1 Job satisfaction and dissatisfaction result from different causes.
- 2 The two-factor theory is parallel to the dual theory of man's needs, which states that physical needs (like those of animals) work in conjunction with hygiene factors, and psychological needs or growth needs (unique to humans) work alongside motivators (Locke, 1976). With these propositions as the basis for Locke's understanding of Herzberg, the following is a list of Locke's criticisms:
 - mind-body dichotomy;
 - unidirectional operation of needs;

- lack of parallel between man's needs and the motivation and hygiene factors
- incident classification system;
- defensiveness;
- the use of frequency data;
- denial of individual differences.

According to Locke's (1976) first critique, Herzberg's view of man's nature implies a split between the psychological and biological processes of the human make-up. The two are of dual nature and function apart, not related to one another. On the contrary, Locke proposes that the mind and body are very closely related. It is through the mind that the human discovers the nature of his/her physical and psychological needs and how they may be satisfied. Locke suggests the proof that the basic need for survival, a biological need, is only reached through the use of the mind.

With regard to Herzberg's correlation between hygienes, motivators, physical and psychological needs, it can be inferred that the first set are unidirectional, so too are physical and psychological needs (Locke, 1976). Locke notes there is no justification for this conclusion. Providing the example of the physical need, hunger, he writes that acts like eating can serve not only as aversions of hunger pangs, but also as pleasures for the body.

The third criticism which pertains directly to the previous two, is simply the lack of a parallel relationship between the two groupings of factors and needs (Locke, 1976). Their relation is hazy and overlapping in several instances. A new company policy (hygiene) may have a significant effect on a worker's interest in the work itself or his/her success with it. The correlation lacks a clear line of distinction.

Locke's critique of Herzberg's classification system (Locke, 1976), common to the preceding criticism, claims that the two-factor theory is, in itself, inconsistent in categorizing factors of satisfaction. The two-factor theory merely splits the spectra of satisfaction into two sections. For example, if an employee is given a new task (which is deemed a motivator) this is considered responsibility. However, if a manager will not delegate the duty, the situation takes the label of supervision-technical. Locke states that the breakup of one element (like responsibility) into two different types of factors results from the confusion between the event and the agent.

The phenomenon of defensiveness (Locke, 1976) is a further criticism of Herzberg's work, whereby the employees interviewed

tend to take credit for the satisfying events such as advancement or recognition, while blaming others such as supervisors, subordinates, peers, and even policy, for dissatisfying situations. Locke does not feel that Herzberg addressed this fallacy sufficiently for the importance it has in assessing validity of his results.

Herzberg's use of frequency data placed emphasis on the number of times a particular factor was mentioned. However, as the scope of 203 accountants and engineers was narrow, it is likely that many workers, though unique, experienced similar difficulties. Herzberg *et al.* (1959) concludes that those most listed are the most satisfying or dissatisfying. Even though, for example, a dissatisfying factor is recorded numerously, this does not necessarily imply that this factor is a significant problem or even irritates a worker as much as an infrequent problem which causes a greater level of dissatisfaction. Locke suggests the measurement of intensity rather than frequency (Locke, 1976). For instance, an employee could mention a time when he or she succeeded or failed and rank its level of intensity.

Concurrent with the previous criticism, the denial of individual differences pertains to the incorrect minimization of diversity within the sample. Locke (1976) concedes that though an individual's needs may be similar, his or her values are not. Values, furthermore, have the most significant impact on emotional response to one's job. Therefore, since individuals have unique values and do not place the same importance on money or promotion, for example, the study deprives them of that which makes them distinct from others. Values are of crucial importance in Locke's theory of job satisfaction, as evidenced in his response to Herzberg's theory.

Locke's concept of values (vs. needs)

Locke defers to Rand's (1964) definition of value as "that which one acts to gain and/or keep". From this definition, the distinction between a need and value must be discerned. A comparison (Locke, 1976) of the two is found in Table I.

Distinguishing values from needs, Locke (1970) contends that they have more in common with goals. Both values and goals have content and intensity characteristics. The content attribute answers the question of what is valued, and the intensity attribute, how much is valued. With regard to finding satisfaction in one's job, the employee who

performs adequately on the job is the individual who decides to pursue his or her values.

Though Locke's discussion continues into more technical areas, the following section presents Locke's conceptualization of values in contrast to needs. As values are a point at which Locke's theory of job satisfaction begins to separate from the theory of Herzberg, so too are agent and event factors a source of divergence between the two theorists.

Table I

Comparison of needs and values

Needs	Values
Needs are innate, a priori	Values are acquired, a posteriori
Needs are the same for all humans (Locke, 1976; Maslow, 1962)	Values are unique to the individual (Locke, 1976)
Needs are objective: they exist apart from knowledge of them	Values are subjective: they are acquired through conscious and sub-conscious means
Needs confront man and require action	Values ultimately determine choice and emotional reaction

Agent/event factors

An event, or condition, is that which causes an employee to feel satisfaction (Locke, 1976). An agent refers to that which causes an event to occur (Locke, 1976). Events, therefore, are motivators, in Herzberg's terms. Conditions such as success/failure or responsibility motivate workers and have the potential to evoke satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Agents, conversely, are comparable to hygiene factors; the customer or supervisor, for instance, causes an event, which then causes a feeling of satisfaction or dissatisfaction. Whereas Herzberg's factors limit the chance of equal outcomes for positive and negative results, the event categories include both positive and negative possibilities for satisfaction. They are discussed in Table II (Locke, 1976).

The clarification of factors which motivate versus the means through which the motivation occurs leads to an adjusted view of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

An adjusted view of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction

Defined as a positive emotional state (Locke, 1976) which results from the appraisal of one's job experiences, satisfaction (Locke *et al.*, 1975), then, becomes a function of the perceived discrepancy between intended and actual performance, or the degree to which one's performance is discrepant with one's set of values. The closer the expected is to the outcome, and the greater the achievement of one's values, the higher the yield of

satisfaction (Locke, 1976). As long as the aforementioned agents can be viewed as facilitators in the attainment of the worker's goals and the acknowledgment of the worker's values, the employee will be satisfied.

Life-cycle theory

To this point, focus has been placed on the factors that influence employees to be either motivated or merely moved, satisfied or dissatisfied. However, the role of the leader played by each manager directly influences in what manner the employee will be motivated and find satisfaction. Additionally, since their important 1969 article "The life-cycle theory of leadership" (Maslow, 1954), Kenneth Blanchard and Paul Hersey have revisited the role of the manager as leader, reevaluating that role in the 1990s.

The role of leadership in motivation

The life-cycle theory was developed to illustrate the important relationship between task and relationship-oriented dimensions of management. The theory helped managers to see how they should adjust according to the level of maturity within each worker. It also portrayed the dynamics of high and low propensities of task and relationship-oriented managers when mixed with differing circumstances as well as diverse groups of employees. In drawing attention to the two-faceted focus of managers – that is task and relationships – the life-cycle theory was very effective in explaining what was referred to as the "superior/subordinate" relationship.

In reassessing their joint discovery of the life-cycle theory, Blanchard and Hersey renamed the theory of leadership "Situational Leadership". Implied in the newer title was an emphasis on "task behavior" and "relationship behavior" rather than attitude. Whereas some attitudes were clearly better than others, no one leadership style is best. For example (Maslow, 1954), all managers should have the attitude that both production and people are very important. However, this particular attitude can be expressed through numerous different leadership styles depending on the manager. Since the original theory was posed, they have assigned descriptors to quadrants of high and low task and relationship behaviors. The four quadrants are telling, selling, participating, and delegating, and each inherently displays the respective balance a manager uses in his or her balance of task and relationship behavior.

Blanchard and Hersey's clarification of leadership style provides a stepping stone for all managers dealing with a new and diverse

Table II
Agent/event factors

Events	Agents
1. Task activity – employee can enjoy or not enjoy work	1. Self – the respondent
2. Amount of work – amount of work is just right, or the amount is too much or too little	2. Supervisor – superior of respondent
3. Smoothness – work went smoothly, or work was characterized by interruption and distraction	3. Co-worker – colleague or peer at same level
4. Success/failure – employee finished task, completed problem, or he/she failed to finish or reach a goal	4. Subordinate – person at lower level
5. Promotion/demotion or lack of promotion – worker was promoted, or not promoted, though he/she expected promotion	5. Organization, management, or policies – no particular person(s)
6. Responsibility – responsibility was increased, a special assignment was given, or responsibility was not increased as desired, did not receive special assignment	6. Customer – includes students, patients, buyers
7. Verbal recognition of work/negative verbal recognition of work – worker was praised, thanked, complimented, or worker was criticized, blamed, or not thanked	7. Nonhuman Agent – nature, machinery, weather, "God"
8. Money – worker received monetary raise or bonus, or did not receive desired raise or bonus	8. No Agent – luck, Murphy's law; or unclassifiable
9. Interpersonal atmosphere – there was a pleasant atmosphere where people got along well, or the atmosphere was unpleasant where people got along poorly	
10. Physical working conditions pleasant/unpleasant – temperature, machinery, hours of work were pleasant and manageable, or they were unpleasant	
11. Uncodable or other – there was a good outcome of a union election, or there was an accident, or poor outcome to a union election	

work force as compared to that of the 1970s and 1980s. Emphasizing this change, the authors (Blanchard and Hersey, 1996) exhort that "leadership is done with people, not to people".

Conclusion and implications

In the manager's search for knowledge on motivation of employees or the enhancement of job satisfaction, Herzberg's concept of attitude as a force powerful in determining output has been complemented by Locke's formulation of value and its importance to work goals and subsequently job satisfaction. Additionally, the situational theory of leadership serves to aid management in its balance of task and relationship. "Attitude is everything", goes the familiar phrase. Indeed, attitudes serve as the bottom line in specifying behavior. However, they do not act alone. The values, or worldview, a worker carries into the job form the foundation by which attitudes develop. Therefore, managers must acknowledge both the significance of attitudes and values to the actions of the worker.

However, whereas the values are much more subjective to the worker and have developed over the individual's life, attitudes can be impacted or influenced much more easily.

In seeking to create specific boundaries and clarification of his categories, Herzberg noted that factors which cause extreme satisfaction and extreme dissatisfaction were not identical for the most part. Though Locke's response places the event factors on the same spectrum, the dual-factor findings of Herzberg are significant in that they pioneered a new way of thinking, drawing attention to the integral role that management has in cultivating satisfaction within workers. Locke's clarification of that which motivates and the means through which someone is motivated in the agent/event theory, draws more practical application to the way factors at work contribute to the experience of the worker as understood through satisfaction/dissatisfaction.

What Herzberg offers in his distinguishing between motivation and movement is applicable for all management. A kick in the pants gets the job done, to be sure. However, it

affects no lasting positive change within the worker. This is not a call to cancel incentive programs but to encourage consideration of a refined definition of motivation. This new definition deals primarily with an adjustment in performance as a function of an adjustment in the work of the employee.

Likewise, both theories point to the work itself as containing the most potential for causing satisfaction. Enhanced, sustained performance on the job results not so much from the fully furnished office or the temperature of the work environment, but the basic duty assigned in the job description and all those intrinsic feelings that produce positive attitudes about that duty. Although aspects of one's personal life as well as non-job factors at work influence the behavior and eventually the satisfaction of the worker, it is the work itself which brings fulfilment and Maslow's higher order of needs into being. For management, this means that when a worker's performance steadily declines, it is not due to a lack of perks or enforcement on the part of management. Instead, the task of the employee should be altered in such a way that the fulfilment gained from doing the job is expected daily.

References

- Blanchard, K.H. and Hersey, P. (1996), "Great ideas", *Training and Development*, January, pp. 42-7.
- Herzberg, F. (1968), "One more time: how do you motivate employees?", *Harvard Business Review*, pp. 53-62.
- Herzberg, F., Maunser, B. and Snyderman, B. (1959), *The Motivation to Work*, John Wiley and Sons Inc., New York, NY.
- House, R.J. and Wigdor, L.A. (1967), "Herzberg's dual-factor theory of job satisfaction and motivation: a review of the evidence and a criticism", *Personal Psychology*, pp. 369-89.
- Locke, E.A. (1970), "The supervisor as 'motivator': his influence on employee performance and satisfaction", in Bass, B.M., Cooper, R. and Haas, J.A. (Eds), *Managing for Accomplishment*, Heath and Company, Washington, DC, pp. 57-67.
- Locke, E.A. (1976), "The nature and causes of job satisfaction", in Dunnette, M.D. (Ed.), *Handbook of Industrial and Organizational Psychology*, Rand McNally, Chicago, IL, pp. 1297-349.
- Locke, E.A., Cartledge, N. and Knerr, C.S. (1975), "Studies of the relationship between satisfaction, goal-setting and performance", in Steers, M.R. and Porter, W.L. (Eds), *Motivation and Work Behavior*, McGraw-Hill, New York, NY, pp. 464-73.
- Maslow, A.H. (1954), *Motivation and Personality*, Harper & Row Publishers, New York, NY.
- Maslow, A.H. (1962), *Toward a Psychology of Being*, Van Nostrand Reinhold Company, New York, NY.
- Rand, A. (1964), "The objectivist ethics", in Rand, A. (Ed.), *The Virtue of Selfishness*, Signet, New York, NY, p. 15.
- Steininger, D.J. (1994), "Why quality initiatives are failing: the need to address the foundation of human motivation", *Human Resource Management*, Vol. 33 No. 4, pp. 601-16.

Application questions

- 1 How is it possible to affect the attitudes of employees in your organization, such that attitude does not become a factor which leads to dissatisfaction?
- 2 Does recent company policy reflect an attempt to move employees through reward/punishment conditions or motivate employees through the enhancement and even reconfiguration of tasks within a job?
- 3 In diagnosing problems experienced by employees and pinpointing their sources, does management often confuse agent and event factors?
- 4 Is management doing its job in balancing the task with relationships?