

Examining the Relationship between Motivational Factors and Job Satisfaction: An Empirical Study

***SMD.Azash**

****Dr.N.Thirupalu**

*Research scholar, Register Number: PP.MAN.137, Department of Business Administration
Rayalaseema University, Kurnool - 518 007 (A.P)

**Professor, Department of Business Administration, Aurora's P.G College, Ramanthapur,
Hyderabad, Telangana - 500 013

Abstract

In this paper, an attempt is made to investigate the influence of Motivational Factors on job satisfaction by self-administration of questionnaire to 443 respondents working in selected public and private sector banks in Kadap District (AP). The present study is based on Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory from the study it is concluded that Motivational Factors has the strongest positive association with the dependent variable (Job Satisfaction), Work itself Factor which is $r = 0.860$. Then, it is followed by the positive correlation between Autonomy Factor ($r=0.839$, Significant at 0.01 level), Advancement Factor ($r=0.847$, Significant at 0.01 level), Achievement Factor ($r=0.805$, Significant at 0.01 level), Recognition Factor ($r=0.861$, Significant at 0.01 level), Responsibility Factor ($r=0.906$, Significant at 0.01 level) and Job Satisfaction.

Keywords

Achievement Advancement, Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene theory and Job Satisfaction.

Introduction

Employees play vital role in shaping the customer perception. Organisations spend to create customer loyalty but often ignore the critical aspect of enhancing employee motivation. In today's banking sector, employees play very important role in winning customers' hearts and minds (Almad, 2012)). Therefore, the motivation of employees is increasingly seen as key, given that motivated employees are willing to exert a particular level of effort for a certain amount of time toward the achievement of organisational goals (Allen & Wright, 2007). In addition, special attribute is paid on the role of employee motivation in enhancing employee satisfaction. Employees who are highly motivated have been identified to undertake duties diligently (Idowu & Salami, 2010). By so doing, the level of job satisfaction is enhanced thus leading to better positioning of the organization.

Khan *et al.* (2010) argued that job satisfaction depends on the quality of services and how they are provided. Therefore, employees in banks and particularly those who have frequent contacts with customers usually serve as representatives of both the organisation and services provided for (Nguyen, Ngugen, & Harry, 2013). As a result, motivated employees can either portray a positive or negative image to the customers. Thus, the employee motivation plays a major role in achieving high level of job satisfaction (Petcharak, 2004). The real challenge to HR managers therefore lies in devising ways of ensuring job satisfaction in order to reduce the rate of turnover. Thus, Dess *et al.* (2008) concurs that hiring and developing the best employee will be unproductive if organisations cannot provide the working environment, intrinsic and extrinsic rewards.

Review of Literature

Job satisfaction is the way an employee feels about his or her job. It is a generalised attitude towards the job based on evaluation of different aspects of the job. Job satisfaction indicates the satisfaction derived from the being engaged in a piece of work. It is essentially related to human needs and their fulfilment through work. Job satisfaction is the resulting feeling of

satisfaction which the employee gains from the job following the fulfilment of his needs and desires. By working on a job, most men gratify many of their needs. Work in this regard, is a potent source of need gratification of all types such as physical, security, social and ego needs.

The term Job satisfaction has been given different connotation by different authorities on the subject. Job satisfaction referees to an individual's subjective experience, on one's work situation –one's responses and feelings towards different facets of his work role. Hoppock (1935) was the first industrial psychologist to provide the concept "job satisfaction ", a logical definition. He defined job satisfaction as any combination of psychological, physiological and environmental circumstances, which cause a person to truthfully say "I am satisfied with my job".

According to Cranny, Smith and Stone (1992) define job satisfaction as employees" emotional state regarding the job, considering what they expected and what they actually got out of it. In fact, an employee with low expectations can be more satisfied with a certain job than someone who has high expectations. If one's expectations are met or exceeded by the job, then one is happy and satisfied with the job.

Factors Affecting Job Satisfaction

Identifying determinants of job satisfaction has been a focus of attention for both the professional and academic worlds. Since the job satisfaction of employees is an important part of any strategy aimed at improving the effectiveness of employees (Brunetto & Farr-Wharton, 2003) any organizational commitment to quality improvement implies, therefore, that possible key influences on the level of employee job satisfaction should be investigated. In this section, an attempt has been made to identifying the factor which influences the job satisfaction.

A large number of investigations are found that two major groups of factors as important determinants of satisfaction (Zeffane, 1994; Spector, 1997; Ellickson & Logsdon, 2001; DReiner & Zhao, 1999).These groups are the personal factors of the employees and the factors of the work environment. According to Oshagbemi(2003), components of job satisfaction should be understood in order to improve the well-being of people as well as to achieve successful management in general.

The search for an understanding of factors contributing to job satisfaction or dissatisfaction has been an ongoing area of interest for social scientists and managers around the world for a considerable time. These interests stem from the researchers' belief that job satisfaction represents an important theme in understanding organizations and the individuals within Spector (2008).

Researchers have examined several factors that correlate with job satisfaction, whether in a positive or a negative way. However, the importance of the various factors appears to change from one situation to another. That is, individuals who perform the same job in the same environment and at the same time do not all derive the same degree of satisfaction.

The multi-aspect feature of job satisfaction becomes obvious when trying to determine the relevant dimensions of job satisfaction. Although the main concern for researchers in this field is to identify the factors that affect the level of satisfaction of employees in work organizations, there is no uniform agreement among researchers about the factors that determine job satisfaction (Gruneberg, 1979; Mullins, Essentials of Organisational Behaviour, 2006; Spector, Industrial and organizational psychology : Research and practice, 2008). While several studies in this field are limited to just a few dimensions or factors, a larger number of dimensions have been identified (Seashore & Taber, 1975; Watson, 2002).

Many researchers assume that job satisfaction is a general attitude determined by three factors, namely, the individual, the nature of the job and situational variables (Purohit, Job satisfaction and work motivation, 2004; Baron, 1986). Similarly, Glisson and Durick(1988) classify variables affecting job satisfaction into three categories: (1) variables that describe the

characteristics of the job tasks performed by the workers, (2) variables that describe the characteristics of the organizations in which the tasks are performed, and (3) variables that describe the characteristics of the workers who perform the task. Mullins (2006) indicates that job satisfaction is affected by a wide range of variables including individual, social, cultural, organizational and environmental factors. Spector (2008) categories the antecedents of job satisfaction into three models based on research studies. These models illustrate (1) the impact of the job environment, (2) the impact of personality, and (3) the joint influence of the environment and personality on job satisfaction. However, Spector (2008) states that although personality has been shown to have a connection with job satisfaction, the reasons are not well delineated. Therefore, investigation is clearly needed to determine why personality relates to job satisfaction (Spector, 2008).

Although researchers have found many factors that relate to job satisfaction, the majority of these factors can be grouped into two broad categories: (a) personal or demographic factors, which focus on individual attributes and characteristics; and (b) environmental factors, which pertain to factors associated with the work itself or the work environment

Statement of the Problem

Banks are the most significant players in the Indian financial market because they are the biggest purveyors of credit and attract most of the savings from the population. Banking plays very important role in the economic development of all the nations of the world because a developed banking system holds the key as well as serves as a barometer of economic health of a country. The banking sector is core competency of the world economy which influences the strength of every nation's economy in the world economy. The overall development and growth of any economy depends more on the sound services sector. The role of service sector in Indian economic development has increased by several notches from the fact that service sector which was contributing only 20 percent during the independence time, now it is contributing over 50 pc of GDP India. Hence, Indian banking industry is also growing at the cost of new competitive changes after liberalization, privatization and globalization. Now, banking sector is performing well to make every citizen free from poverty, ignorance, finance problems which had plagued millions of our people for centuries.

Further, the performance of banks is completely linked with the growth of economy and response to the requirements of changing environment to make our economy more competitive. Because with the globalization trends world over, it is difficult for any nation, big or small, developed or developing, to remain isolated from what is happening around and such isolation is nearly impossible for India also. In response to these dynamic changes, India has also adopted liberalization, privatization and globalization (LPG) policy under banking sector reforms in 1991 and hence resulted in improved performance and continuous developments in every sphere of the banking business. Indian banking industry has undergone radical changes due to liberalization and globalization measures (Jain & Jain, 2006) and transformation is taking place amid broader changes in banking sector and the banks are benefiting from increasing globalization of financial services (Parry Robert , 2000). Banking organisations are expected to fulfil social as well as economic obligation to ensure all round development of the economy. Unfortunately, due to many reasons, most of the banking organisations are not able to fulfil the promises for which they have been established.

In many cases, decline in their performance in terms of productivity, profitability and social obligation has been widely noticed. Heavy over-dues, losses, huge expenditure on overheads, wastage, lack of motivation among employees, low employee morale, dissatisfaction, indiscipline and lack of commitment towards work are some of the reasons for poor performance of banking sector.

Significance of the Study

Work plays an important role in individuals' lives because they spend more of their time at work than doing any other single activity. According to Furnham (2005), there are many reasons why people work: work provides a source of income, a source of activity and stimulation, a source of social contacts, a means of structuring time, and a source of self-fulfillment and self-actualization. Employees' job satisfaction is also an important aspect of work. Positive feelings about a job can contribute to individuals experiencing greater satisfaction with their lives in general. They also lead individuals to be healthier psychologically and physically. Work could be a source of happiness for an individual, and therefore, psychologists and others who are concerned with individuals' happiness emphasize that high job satisfaction should be experienced (Spector; Arnold, Silvester, Patterson, & Robertso, 2005).

Historically, the concept of job satisfaction has been widely researched since the beginning of the twentieth century, when there was a move towards considering the psychological conditions of the employee associated with post-war industrial revaluation for the purpose of increasing the productivity of workers (Allen & Wilburn, 2002; Mullins, 2004). Since the Human Relations School was established, the multiple aspects of the linked concepts of job satisfaction and motivation have been demonstrated by the various job satisfaction and motivational theories, such as those by Maslow, Herzberg, Vroom and so on.

Employees are the main organizational resource; without them organizations would not exist or function (Worthington & Britton, 2006). In recent years, measuring employees' satisfaction has become a subject of growing interest among organizational managements. This organizational interest in measuring job satisfaction has been motivated by the following reasons:

1. Utilitarian reasons such as to increase and improve productivity, organizational commitment, organizational citizenship behaviors, and ultimately, to increase organisational effectiveness.
2. A decreased propensity for counterproductive behaviours such as withdrawal behaviour including absenteeism and turnover; burnout; and workplace aggression.
3. Humanitarian interests (i.e. the notion that employees deserve to be treated with respect and have their psychological and physical well-being maximized) (Ellickson & Logsdon; Organ & Ryan, 1995; Spector, Industrial and organizational psychology : Research and practice, 2008; Spector, Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences, 1997)

When employees are satisfied, they improve the performance and productivity of the company and contribute positively towards profitability. According to Wright and Davis (2003), the benefits that employees receive from their organisation influence the effort, skill, creativity and productivity that they are willing to give to their employer. Organisations with satisfied employees outperform other organisations (Ostroff, 1992). Therefore, job satisfaction has become a major organisational objective for competitive levels of quality and organisational success.

Objectives of the Study

- To measure the Job Satisfaction of the selected respondents.
- To identify the relationship if any between Motivational Factors (Intrinsic Motivation) and Job Satisfaction.

Hypothesis of the Study

H₀₁: *There are no statistically significant correlation between motivational factors and job satisfaction.*

Based on Null Hypothesis Two (H₀₂) the following sub-hypothesis were formulated.

H_{01.1}: There is no statistically significant correlation between achievement and job satisfaction

H_{01.2}: There is no statistically significant correlation between recognition and job satisfaction

H_{01.3}: There is no statistically significant correlation between work itself and job satisfaction

H_{01.4}: There is no statistically significant correlation between responsibility and job satisfaction

H_{01.5}: There is no statistically significant correlation between advancement and job satisfaction

H_{01.6}: There is no statistically significant correlation between autonomy and job satisfaction

H₀₂: *Motivation Factors do not significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction of bank employees*

Based on Null Hypothesis Four (H₀₄) the following sub-hypotheses were formulated.

H_{02.1}: Achievement factor do not significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction

H_{02.2}: Recognition factor do not significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction

H_{02.3}: work itself factor do not significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction

H_{02.4}: Responsibility factor do not significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction

H_{02.5}: Advancement factor do not significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction

H_{02.6}: Autonomy factor do not significantly explain the variance in job satisfaction

Scope of the Study

The term, ‘job satisfaction’ in its broader sense covers various aspects of employment and non-employment conditions of employees. The present study aimed at studying motivational factors, which influence job satisfaction base on the Herzberg’s Motivation-Hygiene theory.

Research Design

The present study is a descriptive and explorative study.

Population

The target population in this study include bank employees working in both public and private sector banks in Kadapa District, Andhra Pradesh.

Sampling Method and Sample Size

The sampling method that was considered appropriate for the present study was disproportional stratified random sampling in this study the target population is divided into two strata that is public and private sector banks from each stratum sample respondents are disproportional selected from across various cadre such as officers, clerk and subordinate-staff. The total sample size of the respondents for the study is 443; comprising 146 officers, 209 clerks and 88 are sub-staff.

S.no	Sector of the Bank	Officers		Clerks		Sub-Staff	
		Population	Sample	Population	Sample	Population	Sample
1	Public Sector Bank	414	125	426	128	156	47
2	Private Sector Bank	67	21	268	81	134	41
Total		481	146	694	209	290	88

Table 1 **Sample of the Respondents**

Sources of Data

The study is mainly based on primary data. The secondary data is used to supplement the primary data. The main source of primary data is employees of public and private sector banks in Kadapa District of Andhra Pradesh and primary data is collected by self-administration of questionnaire.

Reliability of the Instrument

In this study, the coefficient alpha analysis is performed on each subscale and on the entire scale. The coefficient alpha values are shown in the table no 2. The coefficient alpha for Intrinsic Motivation/Motivational Factors is .865 and for its subscale are achievement .919, recognition .914, work itself .911, responsibility .899, advancement .789 and autonomy .678 and the coefficient alpha for job satisfaction is .792.

Table 2 Cronbach's Alpha Coefficient for Constructs

S.no	Constructs	No.of items	Cronbach Alpha (α)	Cronbach Alpha (α)
1	Intrinsic Motivation/Motivational Factors	28		.865
1.1	Achievement	4	.919	
1.2	Recognition	3	.914	
1.3	Work itself	6	.911	
1.4	Responsibility	5	.899	
1.5	Advancement	6	.789	
1.6	Autonomy	4	.678	
2	Job satisfaction	7	.792	

Variables in the Study

In this study, the following dependent and independent variables were included

Dependent variable: job satisfaction

Independent variables: Achievement, Recognition, Work itself, Responsibility, Advancement and Autonomy

Tools of Analysis

After collecting information from the sample respondents, the data were analyzed according to the objectives and hypothesis stated. In this study data analysis is carried out with the help of Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS 17 version). The statistical analysis used in this study can be categorized into two groups; descriptive and inferential statistics.

Results

Table 3 Descriptive Statistics for Job satisfaction

Descriptive Statistics			
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation
My work is challenging and pleasant	443	4.6185	1.02296
I am satisfied with the salary I receive	443	4.5734	1.02056
I am glad to work at this organisation	443	4.5666	1.02324
I can get along nicely with my supervisors	443	4.5666	1.02766
My colleagues are great to work with	443	4.5485	1.08643
The job security is high in this organisation	443	4.5327	1.05104
I am satisfied with my job	443	4.5305	1.22598
Overall Job satisfaction	443	4.6159	1.76630

Table 3 demonstrates seven statements for job satisfaction. “My work is challenging and pleasant” have the mean value and also scores the highest mean 4.61; while “The job security is high in this organisation” scores the lowest mean 4.53.

For the standard deviation, “I am satisfied with my job” scores the highest standard deviation which is 1.22; a higher standard deviation means that the data will be spread much more and not too accurate. While “I am satisfied with the salary I receive” scores the lowest standard deviation with 1.02. A low standard deviation means the data is packed closer together which is more clustered, accurate and useful. The overall mean for job satisfaction is 4.61 and standard deviation is 1.76.

Table 4 Descriptive Statistics of Study Variables

Descriptive Statistics					
	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Cronbach's Alpha	Mean Ranking
Work itself Factor	443	4.5414	1.03077	.911	1
Autonomy Factor	443	4.5260	1.03557	.678	2
Advancement Factor	443	4.4960	1.01568	.789	3
Achievement Factor	443	4.4757	1.08043	.919	4
Recognition Factor	443	4.4679	1.07689	.914	5
Responsibility Factor	443	4.4328	1.11473	.899	6
Overall intrinsic Motivation		4.3378	1.09548	.865	

The means, standard deviations, and reliabilities of all variables from responses of 443 employees in the various public and private sector banks branches of Kadapa district in Andhra Pradesh reported in Table 4. The respondents rated the Motivational factors in a more positive manner as average (M=4.33, SD=1.09) for intrinsic Motivation within the organisation. A mean ranking of the various dimensions of intrinsic Motivation to determine their level of prevalence showed that employees were most satisfied with the Work Itself Factor (M=4.54,

SD= 1.03) Autonomy Factor (M=4.52, SD=1.03), Advancement Factor (m=4.49, SD=1.01), Achievement Factor (M=4.47, SD= 1.08), Recognition Factor (m=4.46, SD=1.07) and Responsibility Factor (m=4.43, SD=1.11).

Table 5 *The Relationship between Motivational Factors and Job Satisfaction*

Job Satisfaction	n	r	Sig.
Work itself Factor	443	.860**	.000
Autonomy Factor	443	.839**	.000
Advancement Factor	443	.847**	.000
Achievement Factor	443	.805**	.000
Recognition Factor	443	.861*	.000
Responsibility Factor	443	.906**	.000
**. Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).			
*. Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).			

The researcher used the Pearson Correlation Matrix to indicate whether there are positive or negative relationships between those variables. Positive value indicates positive relationship while negative value indicates negative relationship. When the correlation values are close to -1 or +1, then the variables will more near to the perfect linear relationship. 0.7 – 1.0 shows a strong relationship, 0.5 – 0.7 shows a moderate relationship, 0.3 – 0.5 shows weak relationship and below 0.3 means there is little or no relationship between the variables.

According to Table 5, Motivational Factors has the strongest positive association with the dependent variable (Job Satisfaction), Work itself Factor which is $r = 0.860$. Then, it is followed by the positive correlation between Autonomy Factor ($r=0.839$, Significant at 0.01 level), Advancement Factor ($r=0.847$, Significant at 0.01 level), Achievement Factor ($r=0.805$, Significant at 0.01 level), Recognition Factor ($r=0.861$, Significant at 0.01 level), ResponsibilityFactor ($r=0.906$, Significant at 0.01 level) and Job Satisfaction.

Table 6 multiple regression analysis between Job Satisfaction and Motivational factors

	Unstandardized coefficients		Standardized Coefficients	t	Sig.
	B	Std. Error	Beta		
(Constant)	.218	.045		4.812	.000
Achievement Factor	.111	.017	.204	6.493	.000
Recognition Factor	.094	.016	.173	5.893	.000
Work itself Factor	.043	.020	.075	2.111	.035
Responsibility Factor	.051	.015	.097	3.433	.001
Advancement Factor	.109	.019	.188	5.843	.000
Autonomy Factor	.166	.026	.292	6.469	.000
R=.943	R²=.889	Adjusted R²=.888			
ANOVA					
Model	Sum of Squares	df	Mean Square	F	Sig.
Regression	135.451	6	22.575	583.925	.000 ^b
Residual	16.856	436	.039		
Total	152.307	442			
a. Dependent Variable: Job Satisfaction					
b. Predictors: (Constant), Achievement Factor, Recognition Factor, Work itself Factor, Responsibility Factor, Advancement Factor and Autonomy Factor					

The table no 6 depicted the multiple regression results relating to influence of Achievement Factor, Recognition Factor, Work itself Factor, Responsibility Factor, Advancement Factor and Autonomy Factor on Job Satisfaction. From, the table it is can be seen that R the correlation coefficient is 0.943 which indicates a strong and positive relationship between Job Satisfaction (dependent variable) and Achievement Factor, Recognition Factor, Work itself Factor, Responsibility Factor, Advancement Factor and Autonomy Factor (independent variables). R square (R²=0.889) shows that by 88.8% the effect of Achievement Factor, Recognition Factor, work itself Factor, Responsibility Factor, Advancement Factor and Autonomy Factor on Job Satisfaction may be predicted by changes. To further explain this result, Job Satisfaction was influenced by some factors or constants out of which 88.8% was from Achievement Factor, Recognition Factor, Work itself Factor, Responsibility Factor, Advancement Factor and Autonomy Factor. This effect is respectable.

The Standardized Coefficients (table no 6) are .111, .094, .043, .051, .109, and .166 for Achievement Factor, Recognition Factor, Work itself Factor, Responsibility Factor, Advancement Factor and Autonomy Factor. This effect is respectable. Their p-values standing at .000, .000 .035, .001,000, 0.000 which are significant at 5% level.

Furthermore, the combined predictable power of the model or the adjusted coefficient of multiple determinations (adj. R²) indicates that about 88.8% of changes in Job Satisfaction are explained by the independent variables.

The result at the ANOVA table above shows that the calculated F-value (583.92) is significant at 5% level is greater than the table value. Thus, the overall test statistics is significant. The alternative hypotheses are accepted.

Discussion of Results

The purpose of the study was to establish the relationship between motivational factors and the various on job satisfaction as well as to find the extent to which motivational factors predict of job satisfaction of employees. The study revealed a significant positive relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction. Similarly, motivational factors were seen to have a significant influence of job satisfaction. This finding is consistent with that of (Mc, Ssekakubo, Lwanga, & Ndiwalana, 2014; Nguyen, Ngugen, & Harry, How to Motivate People, 2013) who also found a significant positive relationship between motivational factors and job satisfaction. Motivating employees through effective strategies such as providing fringe benefits, car loan facilities, housing loan, promotional and educational systems go a long way to boost their morale and make them satisfied with their work. Employees form the core of many organisations of which the banking sector is no exception. Therefore, in order to derive the best performance from them, it is important that their needs are provided so as to make them comfortable on the job to give out their best. Tiwari (2011) believes that most organizations gain immense progress by fully complying with their business strategy through a well-balanced reward and motivation programs for their employees. Especially in this current vibrant business environment, the extremely motivated employees provide their services as a synergy for achievement of organizational goals, business strategies, high proficiency, growth and performance. Hence, denying them their needs limits their potential and goes a long way to make them feel dissatisfied.

One major issue that arises in administering motivational strategies is fairness. According to Mc, Ssekakubo, Lwanga, & Ndiwalana, (2014), for employees to be satisfied with the motivational strategies used by the organisation, it is very important to ensure that these strategies are seen as equitable to all employees. If these strategies lack equity, it's bound to undermine even the best motivational system. Hence, the aftermaths must be equitable across the board. This means that consistency must be observed in guaranteeing that any motivational strategy employed always results in an outcome of equal value among the employees, irrespective of the type of work, actor involved and time. Also, this equity must be mutually felt, both on the part of the worker and employer (Mc, Ssekakubo, Lwanga, & Ndiwalana, 2014).

Implications for Management

It is ironical that employees' cry about motivational strategies are not fully acknowledged and addressed to improve on their level of job satisfaction within the organisation though much is expected of them. A satisfied employee performs satisfactorily to improve on the image of the organisation. Now, managers are expected to direct financial resources towards implementing motivational strategies such as providing car and housing loan systems, fringe benefits, promotional, payment/salary and study leave systems.

Management should take note of the various dimensional satisfaction levels of employees and pay more attention to improving the satisfaction of employees on benefits, promotion and payments where they seem to be relatively low. It is sometimes difficult to know what specifically motivates an employee without knowing his or her needs.

It is therefore necessary that both the employer and the employee come together to establish a mutual relationship by working together to agree on the best way to motivate the employee. Such a relationship has a spiral effect because the relationship between an employee and his/her employer is dependent on the length of time and the productivity of the employee in the institution. Inequities in implementing motivational strategies should be avoided among employees of the same rank. Workers will always show dissatisfaction and agitation as long as

inequities exist in the dispensation of motivational packages. When this happens, their actions can negatively affect the productivity of the organisation and the success of the business as a whole.

In as much as inequity exists, some workers would always be aggressive. Their actions can mutilate the attitudes of other workers in the organisation causing them to show attitudes such as absenteeism and tardiness or low level of cooperation with the authorities which can cause far reaching problems. Additionally, they can behave in a condescending critical manner towards their colleagues, who eventually are likely to be spiteful. The new era manager is an embodiment of initiating and implementing HRM practices by ensuring that organisations and employees come to a common understanding. Employees with the required level of satisfaction can play a meaningful and leading role in providing banking services. Effective motivational strategies add value and can make employees truly useful and customer friendly in service delivery. A motivated employee will remain important and relevant to the organisation. It is hoped that banks would stay focused in this fast-changing environment which demands that employees are well motivated to perform towards achieving organisational goals.

Implications for Future Research

The study showed that motivational strategies have proven to be a strong predictor of job satisfaction. It is therefore imperative on future researchers to consider other possible outcomes of employee motivation such as employee commitment, organisational citizenship, turnover etc. so as to get the holistic importance of motivation in the organisation. Other sectors of the business environment such as the telecommunication industry, the mining and the manufacturing sectors should also be explored to establish the influence on motivation on some employee attitude to give more credence to the concept of employee motivation.

References

1. Allen, D., & Wilburn, M. (2002). *Linking Customer and Employee Satisfaction to the Bottom Line*. Milwaukee, WI: ASQ Quality Press,.
2. Allen, O., & Wright, E. (2007). *Customer Satisfaction in Business Organizations*. Central Ostrobothnia.
3. Almad, R. (2012). *Management* (10 ed.). Houghton Mifflin, USA: Cengage Learning.
4. Arnold, J., Silvester, J., Patterson, F., & Robertso. (2005). *Work Psychology: Understanding human behaviour in the workplace* (4 ed.). FT Prentice Hall.
5. Baron, R. (1986). *Behavior in organizations*. Newton, MA: Allyn and Bacon.
6. Brunetto, Y., & Farr-Wharton, R. (2003). The commitment and satisfaction of lower-ranked police officers: Lessons for management, Policing. *An International Journal of Police Strategies and Management*, 26(1), 43-63.
7. Dess, G., Lumpkin, G., & Eisner, A. (2008). *Strategic Management: Creating Competitive Advantages*. New-York:: McGraw-Hill/Irwin.
8. Dreiner, M., & Zhao, J. (1999). The determinants of job satisfaction among United States Air Force's security police. *Review of Public Personnel Administration*, 19(3), 5-18.
9. Ellickson, M., & Logsdon, K. (2001). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *State Local Government Review*, 33(3), 173-84.
10. Ellickson, M., & Logsdon, K. (2001). Determinants of job satisfaction of municipal government employees. *State Local Government Review*, 33(3), 173-84.
11. Furnham, A. (2005). *The Psychology of behaviour at work: The individual in the organisation* (2 ed.). Hove & New York: Psychology Press.

12. Glisson, C., & Durick, M. (1988). Predictors of job satisfaction and organisational commitment in human service organisation. *Administrative Science Quarterly*, 33 (1), 61-81.
13. Gruneberg, M. M. (1979). *Understanding job satisfaction*. New York: The Macmillan Press, Ltd.
14. Hoppock, R. (1935). *job satisfaction*. New York: Harper & Row.
15. Idowu, A., & Salami, A. (2010). A Paradigmatic Approach to Means of Achieving Competitive. *International Journal of Business and Management*, 5(12).
16. J, C. C., Smith, P. C., & Stone, E. F. (1992). *Job satisfaction: How people feel about their jobs and how it affects their performance*. New York: Lexington Books.
17. Jain , A., & Jain, P. (2006, July- December). Customer Satisfaction in Retail Banking Services. *NICE Journal of Business*, 1(2), 95-102.
18. Khan, J., Loubste, M., & Van Wyk, H. (2010). *Marketing Research: A South African Approach* . Pretoria: Unisa Press.
19. Mc, J., Ssekakubo, J., Lwanga, F., & Ndiwalana, G. (2014). Employee Motivation , Job Satisfaction and Organizational Performance in Uganda ' s Oil Sub-sector. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 3(7), 315-324.
20. Mullins, L. (2004). *Management and Organisational Behaviour*. Pearson Higher Education FT Prentice Hall.
21. Mullins, L. (2006). *Essentials of Organisational Behaviour*. Harlow: Pearson Education .
22. Nguyen, F., Ngugen, P., & Harry, E. (2013). *How to Motivate People* (2 ed.). United Kingdom:: Kogan Page.
23. Nguyen, F., Ngugen, P., & Harry, E. (2013). *How to Motivate People* (2 ed.). United Kingdom: Kogan Page.
24. Organ, D., & Ryan, K. (1995). A meta-analytic review of attitudinal an dispositional predictors of organizational citizenship behaviour. *Personnel Psychology*, 48(4), 775-803.
25. Oshagbemi, T. (2003). Personal correlates of job satisfaction: empirical evidence from UK universities. *International Journal of Social economics*, 30 ((11/12)), 1210-32.
26. Ostroff, C. (1992). The relationship between satisfaction, attitudes and performance: An organizational level analysis. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 77(6), 963-974.
27. Parry Robert , T. (2000, April 14). Global Financial Change and the Transformation of Banking in Post Communist Countries: Principles and Parallels. *Economic Research and Data Publications FRBSF Economic Letter*, 200-12.
28. Petcharak, P. (2004). A Comparative Analysis of factors determining motivational level of employees working in commercial banks in Kohat. *International Journal of Business and Managing Service Quality*, 21(5), 535-551.
29. Purohit, P. (2004). *Job satisfaction and work motivation*. Delhi, India: Sharada Publishing House.
30. Seashore, S. E., & Taber, T. (1975). Job satisfaction indicators and their correlates. *American Behavioural Scientist*, 18(3), 333-368.
31. Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.
32. Spector, P. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes and consequences*. Thousand Oaks, Calif: Sage.

33. Spector, P. (2008). *Industrial and organizational psychology : Research and practice* (Fifth Edition ed.). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
34. Spector, P. (2008). *Industrial and organizational psychology : Research and practice* (Vol. 5). New York: John Wiley & Sons.
35. Tiwari, V. (2011). Relationship Between Motivation and Job Satisfaction Of The White Collar Employees. 7(2), 31–39.
36. Watson, C. A. (2002). Understanding the factors that influence nurses' job satisfaction. *Journal of Nursing Administration*, 32(5), 229-231.
37. Worthington, I., & Britton, C. (2006). The business environment. *Financial Times*.
38. Wright, B., & Davis, B. (2003). Job satisfaction in the public sector: The role of the work environment. *American Review of Public Administration*, 33(1), 70-90.
39. Zeffane, R. (1994). Correlates of job satisfaction and their implications for work redesign. *Public Personnel Management* , 23 (1), 61–75.