

**Title**

**“Employee Satisfaction and Demotivation: An Empirical Study”**

**Author**

Prof. Dr. Vinitaa Agrawal

Professor ABS and Head ASFT

Amity University Rajasthan

Mobile: +91-9928955572

Email: [vinitaa2000@gmail.com](mailto:vinitaa2000@gmail.com)

**Address**

‘Shivam’, Ashok Vihar,

Kacholia Road, Near Baldasji Ki Bagichi,

Chomu, Jaipur, Rajasthan. 303702

## **“Employee Satisfaction and Demotivation: An Empirical Study”**

### **Abstract**

Motivation is the base for every human activity, personal or professional. No task is performed without a drive, urge or need. People are faced with different types of drive or motivation like basic needs, social and intimacy needs, need for power, success, achievement, competition and many others, as have been studied and researched by various eminent scholars resulting into theories of motivation. At the same time motivation, rather the source of motivation, directs a person towards performance and satisfaction. The current paper makes an attempt to understand the source of motivation, demotivation, satisfaction, relationship of work culture with the performance and other related aspect for employees and managers taking the Herzberg’s two factor Theory as a base.

**Key Words:** Motivation, demotivation, work culture, intrinsic and extrinsic motivation factors.

### **1. Introduction**

Motivation is a very important aspect of human drive, whether personal or professional. Organizations have always been curious in finding out the various motivational factors that influence the employees in performing their job and deriving job satisfaction. There have been several studies and researches that have come up with theories of motivation highlighting various factors that influence the employees’ job performance and satisfaction. Herzberg (1959)<sup>6</sup> constructed a two dimensional paradigm of factors affecting people's attitudes about work. These two factors are motivators and hygiene factors and this theory is also called as ‘motivation hygiene theory’. Factors, such as advancement, recognition, responsibility, and achievement are intrinsic factors where the presence of these factors ensures job satisfaction. Extrinsic factors,

such as company policy, supervision, interpersonal relations, working conditions, and salary are hygiene factors. The absence of hygiene factors can create job dissatisfaction, but their presence does not motivate or create satisfaction.

Extrinsic motivation is concerned with external motivators like pay, promotion, status, benefits, retirement plans, health insurance schemes, holiday and vacations etc. By and large, these motivations are associated with financial rewards. Intrinsic motivation, on the other hand, is concerned with the “feeling of having accomplished something worthwhile, i.e. the satisfaction one gets after doing one’s work well. Praise, responsibility, recognition, esteem, power, status, competition and participation are a few examples of such motivation factors.

Taking Herzberg’s theory as base, the current paper tries to examine the impact of various aspects that satisfy, demotivate, motivate, and maintain a specific level of motivation along with other important areas to be looked upon by the organization to make the people continue in work and provisions that need improvement. Through this paper, the researcher is also trying to find out whether these aspects differ for employees and managers

## **2. Conceptual Framework & Review of Literature**

Motivation has been recognized as a clue source of general behaviour, information technology behaviour (Davie *et al.*, 1992<sup>1</sup>; Moon & Kim, 2001<sup>10</sup>; Teo, Lim & Lai, 1999<sup>15</sup>) and work related behaviour (George & Brief, 1996<sup>5</sup>; Venktash & Speier, 1999<sup>16</sup>). There are two main types of motivation-extrinsic and intrinsic. “Extrinsic motivation focuses on the goal-driven reason,” for example, benefits and rewards obtained by employees while performing the job. Intrinsic motivation means involving in activities for their own interest or for the satisfaction earned from the experience (Deci, 1975)<sup>3</sup>. Herzberg suggested that employees are more satisfied and more

result-producing when their job is motivating, when task is interesting, jobs can be made motivating by job enrichment. Fred Luthans (1997)<sup>9</sup> explains that motivation is probably more closely associated with micro perspective of organization behavior than in any other topic. A comprehensive understanding of motivation includes the need-drive – incentive sequence, or cycle. The basic process involves needs, which set drives in motion to accomplish incentives. The drives or motives may be classified into primary, general, and secondary categories. The primary motives are unlearned and psychologically based. The general motives are also learned but are not psychologically based. Secondary motives are learned and are most relevant to the study of organization behavior.

Stephen P. Robbins (2001)<sup>14</sup> explains that motivation is a general inspirational process which gets the members of the team to pull their weight effectively, to give their loyalty to the group, to carryout properly the tasks that they accepted and generally to play an effective part in the job that group has undertaken. Motivation means a process of stimulating people to action to accomplish desired goals. Paul Mersey defines motivation as the driving force within the individual that propels him or her towards a behavior or action. Motivation is a psychological concept that generates within an individual. It is an inner feeling which energises a person to work more. Management tries to utilize all the sources of production in the best possible manner. This can be achieved only when employees cooperate in this task. Efforts should be made to motivate employees for contributing their maximum.

Jerald Greenberg Robert A. Baron (2002)<sup>7</sup>, defines that motivation is concerned with the set of processes that arouse, direct and maintain behavior toward a goal. It is not equivalent to job performance, but it is not of several determinants in job performance. Today's work ethic motivates people to seek interesting and challenging jobs instead of simply money. Moorhead

Griffin (2002)<sup>11</sup> explains that the equity theory of motivation assumes that people want to be treated fairly. It hypothesizes that people compare their own input-to-outcome ratio in the organization to the ratio of a comparison with other. If they feel that their treatment has been inequitable, they take steps to reduce the inequity. Expectancy theory is based on the assumption that people are motivated to work toward a goal if they want it and think that they have a reasonable chance of achieving it. Job characteristics like achievement, challenging task, awards and recognition are important for the satisfaction and dissatisfaction. These are the elements that affect employee motivation, Friedlander (1964)<sup>4</sup>. In general good working condition affect the employee motivation and good interpersonal relationship with supervisors and subordinates is also a motivational factor for the employees. Intrinsic motivation reduces the turnover, absenteeism and motivates employees to retain with the organization (Spuck, 1974)<sup>13</sup>. Intrinsic motivation arises when employees have a sense of self-determination, and they are capable and competent in their field (Deci, 1971<sup>2</sup>; Deci & Ryan, 1985<sup>3</sup>).

There exists diverse view relating to motivation. Theories of motivation are classified as ‘contents’ and ‘process’ oriented. The content theory tells what motivates people but indicates people very little about how motivation is expressed. The process theories interpret the underlying process of motivation and indicate how to motivate people. Managers who hold human relation theory of participation believe simply in involvement for the sake of involvement, arguing that as long as subordinates feel that they are participating and are consulted, their ego needs will be satisfied and they will be more cooperative (Richie and Miles, 1970)<sup>14</sup>. Job satisfaction and employee commitment receive considerable attention from industrial and organizational psychologists, management scientists, and sociologists. Three

thousand studies had been done on job satisfaction alone by the time Locke prepared his study nearly 20 years ago (Locke, 1976<sup>8</sup>).

The aforementioned review of literature throws light of deductive approach. However, the researcher wants to focus on empirical experience in this context and for this purpose, as an exploration has taken up this micro-level study for inductive experience.

### **3. Research Methodology**

The title of the problem under study is, 'Employee Satisfaction and Demotivation: An Empirical Study.' The study has been carried out by following the research methodology as briefly outlined below.

The population of the study covers the lower and middle level (Managers), employees working in corporate in the city of Jaipur. Though the population is finite but very large in number, a sample of 100 employees, 50 each have been randomly selected for the purpose of the study. The research is in general exploratory in nature. Still efforts are made to infer results subjected to testing by future researchers. It is 'Ex-Post Facto', work.

#### **3.1 Overall Hypothesis**

- The researcher hypothesizes that the difference in the average score values of different parameters of managers and employees are different.
- The average score values of all the different parameters are the same for managers and employees.
- There is a positive co-relation between the relative importance of internal factors under different parameters of managers and employees.

### **3.2 Objectives**

1. To know the average score values of the various parameters and to study the difference between the scores of managers and employees.
2. To study the relationship between the average scores of the individual statements covered under the parameters of managers and employees.
3. To find out the motivators, de-motivators and hygiene factors for managers and employees.

### **3.3 Research Design**

For the study, a sample of 100 employees from Jaipur city have been undertaken randomly and the total sample cover 50 managers and 50 employees. A well-structured and fully tested questionnaire has been administered to the sampled respondents. The questionnaire contained 10 parameters having 3-4 statements on a 4-point scale, except parameters 8 and 9, having 3-point scale. In order to test the hypothesis, the average score values were calculated for all the factors and for all the statements. Non-parametric tests namely Median Test and Sign Test were used to test the hypothesis at 5% level of significance. The researcher's limitation is that it's not a very large size sample because the purpose of the study is to focus it as a case to explore inductive response in the real life setting.

## **4. Survey Results, Findings and Discussion**

The survey relates to 100 employees in all which includes 50 managers and 50 employees (lower level). In the survey 10 different parameters as detailed in table-1 has been covered. For each parameter three to four statements were listed and the respondents were asked to rank them, the first ranking was given the highest score while the subsequent ranks were given lower scores.

The factors mostly contained 4-point scores except two parameters 8 and 9, which were given three point scores.

**Table 1**

**Average Scores of the factors and their statements on 4 or 3 Point Scale for Managers and Employees**

Parameter	Statements covered in the corresponding parameters	Average Scores		Rank Values Under the parameter		Overall Score Value for Each Factor		Symbols (Average Overall Ave.)	
		M	E	M	E	M	E	M	E
<b>Satisfying Factor</b>	When I do a job that others cannot do	2.80	3.06	2	1	2.485	2.500	-	-
	A simple job with sufficient income	1.80	2.52	4	2				
	I do a job only when my boss encourages me and is a part of our team	1.98	2.34	3	3				
	Challenging work with growth opportunities	3.36	2.08	1	4				



<b>Basis For Accepting and Extra Job</b>	A job in which I can use my own reasoning	2.58	3.06	3	1	2.555	2.595	-	-
	Involving greater responsibility and importance	3.24	2.74	1	2				
	A job which my boss believes that I can do	2.64	2.68	2	3				
	That which gives me more benefits	1.76	1.90	4	4				
<b>Demotivating Factor</b>	Unfair practices	2.88	2.30	1	4	2.500	2.500	-	-
	Lack of support from the co worker	2.72	2.72	2	1				
	Bad working conditions	2.22	2.64	3	2				
	Lack of salary increments	2.18	2.34	4	3				
<b>Necessary Factor to Continue at Work</b>	Recognition for good work	3.42	2.94	1	1	2.500	2.495	-	-
	The organization's reputation	2.58	2.54	2	2				
	Belongingness to a group	1.88	2.12	3	4				
	Good relationship between me and my boss	2.12	2.38	4	3				
<b>Most Motivating Factor</b>	Monetary benefits	2.82	2.86	1	2	2.250	2.505	-	-
	Promotion	2.02	3.08	3	1				
	Leave	1.38	1.96	4	4				
	Recognition	2.58	2.12	2	3				
<b>Provisions that Needs Improvement</b>	Career development programs	2.82	3.12	1	1	2.500	2.495	-	-
	Training	2.54	2.84	2	2				
	Motivational talks	2.52	2.02	3	3				

<b>for performance</b>	Autonomy (to take own decisions when required)	2.12	2.00	4	4				
<b>Influencing Factors to Perform</b>	When I see my team member performing better than I do	2.42	2.82	3	1	2.500	2.500	-	-
	Positive attitude of my supervisor towards me	2.92	2.80	1	2				
	The achievements of my past experiences	2.56	2.28	2	3				
	The result of the performance appraisal	2.10	2.10	4	4				
<b>Preference for Additional Facilities</b>	Housing	1.82	2.00	3	2	2.00	2.00	-	-
	Children's education	1.98	2.38	2	1				
	Medical/ Family medical insurance	2.20	1.62	1	3				
<b>Work Culture</b>	It is important for management to actively seek feedback from clients and customers also	4.42	4.58	1	1	4.313	4.353	+	+
	Supervisors are like co-workers always a part of our team	4.40	4.06	2	3				
	You have the opportunity to provide upward information or feedback	4.12	4.42	3	2				
<b>Work Culture Relationship with Job Performance</b>	My job performance is dependent on whether management shares business strategies and results with the employee team	3.76	4.20	2	2	3.700	4.085	+	+

	Employees perform better only if they engage in a host of socialization activities in and out of the workplace	3.58	4.08	4	3				
	Employees feel comfortable talking about personal issues with other employees and managers	3.66	3.68	3	4				
	To have a best friend in the organization is important for good job performance	3.80	4.38	1	1				
	<b>Aggregate of Average of all the Factors</b>					2.73	2.80		

Note: in the table M depicts Managers and E depicts Employees.

Source (Self Developed)

As per the objective of the study, the researcher wanted to know whether the overall average scores of the managers and employees for the various factors differ or they are, by and large, the same. As per the calculations, the average score values for different factors are differing and hence the researcher tried to test the difference by applying Median Test at 5% level of significance as given below.

$H_0$  = No difference between the average scores of the parameters of managers and employees

$H_1$  = There is difference between average scores of the parameters of managers and employees

The combined Median Value is 2.50 and the positions of the score values of the factors are shown in Table-2.

**Table 2**

**Position of the Average Score Values of the number of factors in two samples (Managers and Employees)**

Category	At or Above Median Value	Below the Median Value
Managers	7 (A)	3 (B)
Employees	7 (C)	3 (D)

**To apply the test,  $x^2$**  has been calculated as follows

$$x^2 = n [AD-BC-n/2]^2 / (A+B) (C+D) (A+C) (B+D)$$

where n = total number of combined factors of managers and employees

$$= 20 [21-21-10]^2 / 10 \times 10 \times 10 \times 10 = 2/10 = 0.2$$

For one degree of freedom the table value of  $X^2$  at 5% level of significance is 3.841, while the calculated value is 0.2. Since, the calculated value is much less than the corresponding table value, the null hypothesis stands accepted at 5% level of significance. It means that there is no difference between the average scores of the parameters of managers and employees.

In order to analyze the relative importance of the factors for the employees and for the managers, the researcher has applied Sign Test at 5% level of significance. For this purpose the researcher has hypothesized that the overall average score value of all the factors for managers is 2.73,

while for employees 2.80 and by subtracting their score values from the score values of the factors for managers and employees as depicted in table-1, are shown either as '-' symbol, where a particular parameter score is lower than the overall average score of the parameters and '+' symbol where the individual score value of the factor is higher than the average score value.

By applying the Sing test for managers

$H_0$  = No difference between the parameter score values and the hypothesized value

$H_1$  = There is a difference between the parameter score value and the hypothesized value

For this purpose we have to calculate number of signs '+' and '-',  $n$  denotes the total of the two.

$n = 10$ , of the two the less frequent number is denoted by  $S$ , which is 2. Critical value ( $k$ ) is calculated by the following formula

$$K = (n-1)/2 - 0.98/\sqrt{n}$$

$$K = 4.191$$

Since,  $S$  (2) is much less than  $K$  (4.191), the null hypothesis stands rejected at 5% level of significance. Hence, the parameter values are not the same but they differ substantially and looking at the table the two parameters that contribute substantially toward maintaining a sufficient level of satisfaction are 'work culture' and 'work culture relationship with the job performance'. It means these two hygiene factors, as given by Herzberg (Company Policy, Supervision and interpersonal relation), if are absent will cause demotivation and are necessary for maintaining satisfaction among employees.

Similarly the results of the sign test for employees gives the same result as  $S$  value is 2

$N = (10)$  and  $K = (4.191)$ .

Hence, in this case also the same two parameters contribute the most.

Further the researcher tried to know the most prominent motivators, de-motivators and hygiene factors preferred among employees and managers and to also find whether they differ among the two categories of respondents.

1. The most satisfying factor among managers and employees belong to the category of 'Motivator'. But challenging job with growth opportunity is most preferred by the managers and least preferred by the employees. Employees derive maximum satisfaction when they are able to do a job that others cannot.
2. Employees prefer an additional assignment when they are able to use their own reasoning and managers where the job involves greater responsibility, both again belong to the category of 'Motivator'.
3. Most demotivating factor for managers is unfair practices and for employees it is lack of support from the co-workers. Both of these statements belong to the category of 'Hygiene', factor. It means the presence of fair practice and support from co-workers is very significant for maintaining satisfaction among employees. Their presence may not motivate the employees/managers but their absence will demotivate them.
4. For both, managers and employees, recognition for good work, is important to continue in work, which again is a 'Motivator.'
5. Career development programmes are most important for both the category of respondents for better performance, which is a 'Motivator.'

6. Promotion, recognition and monetary benefits are all important as most important Motivators.

## **5. Conclusion**

To conclude it may be said that there is almost no difference among the managers and employees regarding the motivators, de-motivators and hygiene factors. The results reveal that for maintaining a specific level of satisfaction, hygiene factors are very important. Though their presence may not motivate them but their absence will surely demotivate them. As far as accepting any additional assignment, continuing in the job, feeling motivated. etc., are concerned, both employees and managers need 'Motivators.'

The study is conducted at a micro-level; however it can be taken as a base for future extensive research in this area.

## **References**

1. Davis, F. D., Bagozzi, R. P., & Warshaw, P. R. (1992). Extrinsic and intrinsic motivation to use computers in the workplace1. *Journal of applied social psychology*, 22(14), 1111-1132.
2. Deci, E. L. (1971). Effects of externally mediated rewards on intrinsic motivation. *Journal of personality and Social Psychology*, 18(1), 105.
3. Deci, E. L., & Ryan, R. M. (1985). The general causality orientations scale: Self-determination in personality. *Journal of research in personality*, 19(2), 109-134.
4. Friedlander, F. (1964). Job characteristics as satisfiers and dissatisfiers. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 48(6), 388.

5. George, J. M., & Brief, A. P. (1996). *Motivational agendas in the workplace: The effects of feelings on focus of attention and work motivation*. Elsevier Science/JAI Press, pp 75-109.
6. Herzberg, F., Mausner, B., & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The Motivation to Work* (2nd ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons, pg. 157.
7. Jerald Greenberg Robert A. Baron, (2002). *Behaviour in organizations understanding and managing the human side of work*, upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, Inc, pp591-616.
8. Locke, E.A. (1976). The nature and acuses of job satisfaction. In: Tiejn, M.A. and R.M. Myres (1998), *Motivation and job satisfaction management division*, Vol. 36(4), pp 226-230.
9. Luthans, "The Need for and Meaning of Positive Organizational Behavior," op. cit.; Luthans, "Positive Organizational Behavior: Developing and Managing Psychological Strengths," op. cit.; Fred Luthans and Carolyn Youssef, "Emerging Positive Organizational Behavior," *Journal of Management*, Vol. 33, 2007, pp. 321–349; and Fred Luthans and Bruce J. Avolio, "The 'Point' of Positive Organizational Behavior," *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 30, 2009, pp. 291–307.
10. Moon, J. W., & Kim, Y. G. (2001). Extending the TAM for a World-Wide-Web context. *Information & management*, 38(4), 217-230.
11. Moorhead and Griffin(2002), *Organisational Behavior*, Seyed Mehdy Alvani and Gholamreza Memarzade, Seventh Edition, Mervarid Publication, Tehran, Iran pg. 78.
12. Ritchie, J. B., & Miles, R. E. (1970). An analysis of quantity and quality of participation as mediating variables in the participative decision making process. *Personnel*



Psychology, 23 (3), 347-359. Retrieved from  
<http://www.wiley.com/bw/journal.asp?ref=0031-5826>

13. Spuck, D. W. (1974). Reward structures in the public high school. *Educational administration quarterly*, 10(1), 18-34.
14. Stephen P. Robbins, Organization Behavior, Twelfth Edition, Pg. 184.
15. Teo, T. S., Lim, V. K., & Lai, R. Y. (1999). Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation in Internet usage. *Omega*, 27(1), 25-37.
16. Venkatesh, V., & Speier, C. (1999). Computer technology training in the workplace: A longitudinal investigation of the effect of mood. *Organizational behavior and human decision processes*, 79(1), 1-28.