

Empirical Analysis of the Relationship between Motivation and Job Satisfaction: A Study of Ifesinachi Industries Nigeria Limited

Mamah, Augustine Aik, PhD¹

Department of Management, Marketing and Entrepreneurial Studies

Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria

E-mail: mamah_aik@yahoo.com

Ogbu, Cyril Gabriel, PhD²

Department of Business Administration

Caritas University, Amorji, Nike, Enugu, Nigeria

E-mail: ogbu12004@yahoo.com

DOI: 10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i12/1944 URL: <http://dx.doi.org/10.6007/IJARBSS/v5-i12/1944>

ABSTRACT

Job motivation and satisfaction, since their discovery as critical elements in organization management had remained authors' study delight. A mere mention of them invokes different reactions from different persons. It has been observed that the controversy and ambiguity surrounding them as management constructs are persisting, especially, among the Nigerian organization managers. Many of such managers would wish to avoid their deployment in the management of their organizations in order not to be roped in such controversy, despite their critical importance. It has also been observed that most of the studies on the identified constructs were concluded based on different opinions (literature), instead of empirical generalization. This study is set out to empirically investigate the extent of the relationship between motivation and job satisfaction in order to establish their interchangeable or otherwise distinct management constructs. A descriptive survey research was adopted for this study, and correlation design as its method was used for the analysis of the data, which was collected through self designed questionnaire. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient was used to determine the internal data consistency. The study population is made up of 68 numbers of broad ranged managers in the study organisation. All the population constitutes the sample size. The study is highly significant, more especially, to the organization managers in Nigeria, who through this rational clarification shall form positive opinion about them, and deploy such appropriately in managing their organizations. The study shows strong correlate between job satisfaction and motivation. The study further shows that the two can be used interchangeably as management constructs. Based on the findings, this study recommends for their use as interchangeable management constructs.

1.1 Background of the Study

Motivation and satisfaction are job related management constructs, which have so far more than any other management issue, observed to have created uncertainties with regards to their meanings and usages in managing people in work places. Stretching this further, it could be observed that with regards to conceptualization and application-whether the two constructs can be used interchangeably or distinctively in organization and management have so far generated, as well as, created platforms for debates and controversies. It has also been observed that the definitions and descriptions given to them, most especially by some popular industrial psychologists and other writers in management, do not on a face value, help in resolving the issues. For instance, many of these authors describe both management (job satisfaction and motivation) constructs as containing elements such as emotions, sentiments, attitudes, and perceptions of individuals and groups in workplaces, and yet, do not say categorically whether they are the same or distinct management phenomena.

In what seems a corollary to the above observation, the notable authors and practitioners in the likes of Herzberg, F.; Maslow, A.; McClelland, D; and Adams, J., among others, tagged their studies motivation, yet, described them along the lines of job satisfaction. More precisely, Herzberg, as cited in Stello (2012), frames his study questionnaire solely on job satisfaction, which he described as 'feeling good'. As earlier observed in this study, this term was used to collect data on his job motivation studies.

The ambiguity to the meaning and usage of these management constructs has created a big wedge to essential knowledge about them in organisation management, especially, among the Nigerian organisation managers. Instances abound about the usefulness of these constructs in employee resources and management. On this, many organisation and management opinion leaders and writers such Getahum, Sims and Hummer (2006); Samuel (2008); Samuel and Chipunza (2009); Bahera, Sahoo and Sundaray (2012); Curran (2012), among others, have found out that job satisfaction and motivation have strong influence on employee decision on organisation commitment, citizenship behaviour, turnover intention, organisational related stress and burn-out syndromes, quarrelsomeness, disloyalty and disobedience, absenteeism, wilful damage to equipments and machineries, and increased quality defects. All these, if not checked, would invariably become very serious human resource related problems to organisations and their managers. It then becomes necessary to clarify their status as management constructs with a view to mitigating the ambiguity surrounding them either as similes, and therefore, interchangeable or distinct and then separable. When this is successfully done, it is expected that the users would be more equipped with more assurances on their deployments in organisation management.

1.2 Population / Profile of the Study Organisation

The population of this study consists of all-broad-ranged management staff in Ifesinachi Industries Nigeria Limited from various branches across the country and the Headquarters at Onitsha, Anambra State. These include all the managers from various units known as branch managers, ticket administrators, maintenance managers, fleet administrators, and routing managers. The common determinant of the choice elements for this study is management

position. The population is 68, as at the time of this study (**Source: Field study, 2015**). They are classified as Senior Staff, which were appointed, among others, based on academic qualification not below OND (Ordinary National Diploma, Nigeria), or its equivalent in training and other development activities. The study, however, excluded non-permanent staff of any category such as loaders, carriers or commission agents.

Ifesinachi Industries Nigeria Limited is a diverse business interest conglomerate. The company is a well known transport industry in Nigeria. The company began as a one man business (sole proprietorship), which specialized in road freight and passenger buses, especially, luxury bus services, within and outside Nigerian inland motor ways. Currently, the company has expanded its operations to include manufacturing, mail distribution services (nationally and internationally), general merchandizing, among others. The choice of this organization is because of its sustained business operations despite the volatility experienced by the industry operators, which have seen many of its contemporary closed shops.

1.3 Statement of the Problem

There are some issues that could be described as very critical in human resource management at workplaces and organizational relationships. Such issues have been observed to create some critical challenges for the managers and administrators of workforce in industrial setting, and the likes. Some of the issues worthy of note are job motivation and job satisfaction. Various literatures acknowledge that these two concepts are the most researched management phenomena in the history of organization and management, yet, the meanings attached to them in both theory and practices tend to confuse many individuals, especially, the organization managers and administrators, authors, and researchers, among others, to the extent that many would wish to avoid them in usage despite their pivotal importance in organisation and management. The observation is that they do this in order not to be roped in such controversies and confusion, thereby, depriving such the vitality of these management constructs.

It then becomes a necessity to empirically clarify their relationship, with regards to interchangeableness, or otherwise, distinctiveness of the constructs. This is an attempt to reduce the ambiguities surrounding them and to situate them more appropriately in organizational behaviour and general application. In other words, the establishment of their relationship is very important in order to elicit the understanding to the user, where he or she finds the two terms accommodating each other, or on the contrary in a given situation in organisation and management.

1.4 Objective of the Study

The objective that this study seeks to achieve is to investigate whether the two terms are similar, and therefore interchangeable, or otherwise distinct, and separable management constructs.

1.5 Significance of the Study

By this investigation and clarification, the controversy and ambiguity surrounding their usage and meaning shall be, to some extent, reduced for the benefit of the users, most particularly, the organization managers, administrators, industrial psychologists, students and researchers in human and organization behaviours, especially, among the Nigerian organisation managers. For instance, being an attitudinal study, the findings shall provide some predictions on how the identified constructs could influence the decisions about job behaviours such as retention, turnover, organizational commitment and citizenship, among others.

2.0 Review of Related Literature

Using extant literature, it is expected that the definitions, concepts, operational meaning and general usage of the two terms and their relationships, especially in the management of people in organization shall be exposed and critically evaluated. In addition, the literature review may reveal some new knowledge, as well as people's views and perceptions about the items under focus; from here, common ground can be drawn.

2.1 Concept and Definitions

Bearing in mind on the study's earlier assertion that the two terms –job satisfaction and motivation are made up of characters that are attached with emotions, sentiments, attitudes and perceptions of individuals at workplaces, their definitions would become daunting, so to say. Possibly based on this, many authors, individuals and groups define and describe then along their personal views, perceptions, sentiments including biases, and at times, as a reflection of particular circumstance and for a given purpose.

Conceptually, Shield as cited in Aigbionu (2013), describes the concept of employee job satisfaction to mean everything from making all aspects of a job easy to making the job more meaningful, significant, challenging and interesting. Job satisfaction based on this statement by Shield could indicate a ground which asserts employee focused phenomenon. This could be related to the views expressed by human behaviourist school of management thought, which maintains that employees are the greatest potential source of improvements in organizational efficiency/or effectiveness because such are capable of putting their talents to much better use (CIB Text, 1989).

Meanwhile, various studies invite us to know that the concept of science to management approach has much regard for job satisfaction as a tool in pursuance of efficiency or effectiveness, or both in the use of organizational resources aimed at achieving organization objectives, just like its counter part in human relations approach. The general belief here could then be that satisfying employees through their job environments would make them express their talents, which have been observed by many opinion leaders as keys to better organization performance.

In the work of Peretomode (2006) some definitions/descriptions of job satisfaction appear thus:

- The pleasurable or positive emotional state that results from the appraisal of ones' job experience;

- The feelings about various aspects of worker's experience;
-
- Any combination of psychological and physical environmental circumstances that cause a person to say "I am satisfied with my job";
- Clusters of evaluative feelings about a job;
- All the characteristics of the job, the job itself and the work environment in which employees found rewarding, fulfilling or satisfying/or frustrating and unsatisfying.

From the ongoing and in accordance with definitions as put forward by various authors, as shown above, one is tempted to observe that most of the definitions were taken from the motivational theories such as Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs, Herzberg's Two-Factor-Theory, Equity Theory of Adams, J.S. and V. Vroom's Expectancy Theory. For instance, the first of the definitions could be observed to have employed Herzberg's two-factor-theory of motivation-the intrinsic (psychological and physiological) and extrinsic (environmental circumstances). Motivation has also been described by many individuals and groups. For example, Mamah (2013) observes that despite the fact that a lot has already been written about motivation, and it is as old as social science discipline (a field of study where it could be easily located), it falls under the category of concepts that are yet to have general acceptable definitions. Peretomode (2006) adds a voice on this issue where he observed that in spite of the fact that motivation is at the heart of the study of management and its importance, it has been very difficult to define. It could be possibly based on this issue that Robbins and Judge (2007) assert that motivation is one of the most frequently researched topics in organization behaviour and management. Further on this issue, Mills, Bratton and Forshaw, as cited in Wyk (2011), observe that work place motivation is one of the most researched, and yet misunderstood management concept. However, some persons and groups made some attempts to define it. For instance, Mathis and Jackson, as cited in Peretomode (2006) say "it is an emotion or desire operating in a person's will and causing that person to act". Mamah (2013), on his own, describes motivation as complex forces, drives, needs, tension states or other mechanisms that start and maintain voluntary activity towards the achievement of personal or organisational goals. Conceptually, common sense would allow us to assume that motivation makes some proposals which state that there are factors within a person that could start, energize, direct, activate, move and stop behaviour. These factors could be seen as those that specify the needs, wishes and desires which satisfy such individuals to motivation, and to behave in a particular direction or circumstance.

2.2 The Relationship between Motivation and Satisfaction

In furtherance to their observation, Mills, et al., as contained in Wyk (2011), were of the view that job satisfaction/motivation is a subject many would say has been researched to death, and yet, has more questions than answers. Joined in this above description by Mills, et al, Mamah (2015) maintains that because motivation and satisfaction are terms that involve emotions,

perceptions, expectations and morale of workers in their various places of work, it then becomes clearer to understand the various views as observed, and expressed about the inconclusiveness of studies on them with regard to their meanings and descriptions.

To a common sense, this could suggest that at any time, studies on motivation/job satisfaction would be quite revealing. For instance, their common ground, as can be observed from the foregoing literature, shows that both could be described as constructs that involve human emotions, attitudes, perceptions, expectations, morale, which most times propel behaviours in workplaces. In furtherance to this, some critical observations have also shown that the majority of authors in this subject area employ the psychological and physiological elements in individuals which could induce such to act in certain direction toward a thing. Yet, another common ground is the classification of their individual properties by some of these authors. For instance, Robbins and Judge (2007) list job satisfaction elements to include the nature of a job, supervision, present pay, promotion, opportunities and co-worker relationship. In the same vein, Armstrong (2003) enumerates some of the properties of motivation to include incentives, rewards, leadership, and the work itself. Based on these expositions, it could be observed that these elements ascribable to satisfaction and motivation can be reasoned with assurance to fit-in individually, as well as collectively into each other.

As severally been observed in this study, both were seen to summon emotions (attitudes) that could be inductive to behaviour (actions). In this way, a common sense would suggest a relationship between the two, which could be seen as inseparable and intertwined, and therefore, can be used interchangeably. This view is in line with Peretomode (2006), who observed that they can be interchangeably employed. Based on this view, he maintained that a satisfied worker is a motivated one, and vice versa. Also, Mateus (2007) does not distinguish between job satisfaction and motivation. It has also been observed that Hicks and Gullet (1981), while describing job satisfaction use the concepts of motivation. In the same vein, Mamah (2015) reasons that motivating employees is a means of empowering them psychologically and physiologically, thereby, providing them with incentives to regard their jobs as satisfying to their needs and that of the organization they are serving.

However, as it could be observed that the argument in favour of the two constructs and their use as interchangeable elements are strong, some views are on the contrary. Most of these views maintain that job satisfaction and job motivation are related but not synonymous. For instance, Lambrou, et al. (2010) used a study "Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Medical and Nursing Staff in a Cyprus Public General Hospital" to investigate their relationship. The study used cross-sectional survey method during the investigation. To measure the responses of motivation, the study adopted 4-item responses questionnaires. They include job attributes, remuneration, co-worker relationship, and achievement. A critical observation here shows that the 4-item-response questionnaires were based, chiefly, on intrinsic factors of Herzberg's Theory on motivation. Meanwhile, when the study measured job satisfaction with the same elements as in motivation, it revealed a moderate satisfaction scale. At this time, Pearson Correlation Coefficient method for investigation and analysis of its responses was employed. The response rate ranged between 0.303 and 0.308, according to the study. The study then concluded that job satisfaction and job motivation were often used together but wrongfully

interchangeable; implying a clear distinction between the two. However, the study admitted that small sample was used for the study. It further recommended that better and more correlated result could have been gotten if a larger sample size was used. In view of their findings, conclusions and re commendations, the study further suggested that job satisfaction and job motivation could work together to increase job performance and healthcare in the organizations studied; and that these organizations could do more things to increase job satisfaction primarily by focusing on the motivating interests of their existing future staff. This, to this study, shows obvious contradiction of opinions about the issue on their part.

Labrou et al. (2010) study is quite interesting to this present study. The first instance is where the study investigated the relationship between two related concepts-motivation and satisfaction, yet adopted two different measuring instruments-one is single dimensional for job satisfaction, while the other is multidimensional for motivation. The use of single (one-dimensional approach) to measure job satisfaction has been questioned by Hulin, as cited by Okaro, Eze and Ohagwu (2010). Okaro et al. (2010) intensively argue that to get an accurate measure of job satisfaction responses, such must be measured with multidimensional instrument. This position was buttressed by their argument, which maintains that one may be more or less satisfied with some aspects of his or her job, for instance, the supervisory methods, working conditions, pay packet, co-workers relationship, among others, at the same time, could be dissatisfied with others. Secondly, it could be observed that the variables (elements) used in the study as motivational factors can fit-in perfectly as those of job satisfaction, however, they are mostly extrinsic factors as described in Herzberg's motivational theory.

Towing the same line, Gibson et al., as found in Peretomode (2006) are of the view that the two terms are related but not perfectly the same. Rather, they maintain that job satisfaction is one variable that is part of motivational process. This could be seen to contradict Herzberg's theory on motivation, which this study believes formed their major source of reference. In Herzberg's theory, it is to the understanding of this study that Herzberg (1959) only distinguished between job satisfaction, which he called motivators and job dissatisfies, which he referred to hygiene or maintenance factors; suggesting that job satisfiers are job motivators. Herzberg's theory, in the eyes of this study is observed to make it clear that the two sets of factors satisfiers (motivators) and disatisfiers (maintenance/hygiene) factors are distinct and separable. This is because they are concerned with different sets of needs (variables). The theory, on itself, made assumptions, which states that most of the factors that contribute to job satisfaction are motivators while most of the other factors that contribute to job dissatisfaction are hygiene or maintenance factors.

More on this issue, it has been observed that some authors rely on conceptual definitions of motivation and job satisfaction for their analysis. For example, Peretomode (2006) is of the view that any definition about motivation should be the one that is concerned with individual's desires and how they can be fulfilled in workplaces. Meanwhile, he is of the opinion that job satisfaction should refer to individuals' desired-fulfilment acquired by same when experiencing various job activities and rewards. This view seems overwhelming to be fact. Meanwhile, this study has observed a gap in that argument. For instance, the author described motivation as a

process of how desires could be fulfilled in workplaces and satisfaction as any state resulting from the attainment of some desired goals. In that case, the understanding of this present study is that Peretomode’s study did not take into consideration the ongoing debates whether job satisfaction is an attitude or behaviour. Evidences such as Robbins and Judge (2006); Stello (2012) describe job satisfaction as an attitude rather than behaviour; a stance this present study is inclined to support.

3.0 Theoretical framework

The theoretical framework of this study is based on ‘Two-Factor-Motivational Theory’ which was first proposed by Fredrick Herzberg and Associates. The study was carried out in the United States of America, in the year 1959 (CIB, Study Text, 1989). This study shall align itself with the description given to the theory by Albers (1974); Koontz, O’dnell and Weihrich (1980); Hicks and Gullet (1981); Armstrong (2003); Noe, et al. (2004) Peretomode (2006); Robbins and Judge (2007); and Stello (2012). The above studies are of common view that Herzberg’s research that produced the theory centred on the responses obtained from a large number of interviews that sought to determine the attitudes that people have towards their jobs.

The theory assumes that there are basically two factors within a person that start, energize, direct, activate, move, and stop behaviour. These have been observed to specify the needs, wishes, and desires which satisfy such individuals to motivation, and to behaviour. Herzberg’s theory proposes to find a ‘Two-Factor’ explanation-how motivation/ job satisfaction can take place in two ways-intrinsically and extrinsically.

This theory is very important in the realization of this study objective because it provides the theoretical foundation to gauge the arguments that the study provides.

3.1 METHODOLOGY

A survey research was adopted for this study, and correlation design as its method. Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient was used for analyzing the instrument; represented thus:

$$r = \frac{\sum xy - \frac{(\sum x)(\sum y)}{N}}{\sqrt{\left[\sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{N} \right] \left[\sum y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{N} \right]}}$$

Where: r, is a numerical measure of the linear relationship between the variables of X and Y. in this study, X represents raw scores of job satisfaction variables as contained in the questionnaire, and Y represents the motivation variables; \sum is the summation sign; $\sum XY$ is the sum of the cross products of X and Y; N is number of pairs of scores.

Meanwhile, the extent of dependability of the variables was determined through t-test distribution, given as $tr (t-cal) = \frac{r\sqrt{N-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}$, where tr is the unknown test of significance to be determined; r^2 is the coefficient of determination; N – 2 is the degree of freedom; N is the

number of paired observations; \sqrt{v} is the root of numbers involved, and 1 is Constant. The relationships of the variables were stated under null and alternate hypothesis with student t-test distribution, at 5% level of significance.

3.2 Research Question

Is there any significant evidence which shows that job satisfaction correlates with motivation, to confer their similarity, and therefore, to stand as interchangeable management constructs?

3.3 Hypothesis

H₀: The extent of the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation, as management constructs, is not significant to confer their similarity, and therefore, could not stand as interchangeable;

H_a: The extent of the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation, as management constructs, is significant to the extent of conferring their similarity, and therefore, could stand as interchangeable.

3.4 Decision rule

At 0.05 level of significance, and 2 degree of freedom, reject alternative hypothesis, if and only if t-cal calculated is greater (>) than t-tab (table).

3.4 Research Procedure/Data Source/Instrumentation

The study was a census one, which involved the investigation of all the population units from the sample frame. This is in line with Kothari (2004), who suggests that to avoid some sampling biases such as selection bias, census study is preferable. This is because in this type of study a complete enumeration of all the items in the population is known. Kothari was of the view that where all the items were covered, no element of chance was left and the highest accuracy would be obtained. The population under focus is 68 management staff of Ifesinachi Industries Limited with Headquarters in Onitsha, Anambra State Nigeria. In other words, the entire population, as aforementioned, served as the sample size for the study. To accomplish the study objective, questionnaire was used as data collection instrument. Four questions were asked which bordered on the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation, as management constructs. Likert-type of scale, which was calibrated from 5 to 1; each level showing the extent of agreement/disagreement by the respondents, served as the measurement instrument. However, two of the last two questions (3 and 4), which were constructed to deal with the objective, were used for hypothesis test. Question number 3, relating to job satisfaction, represents x variable, which is taken as independent variable, while question number 4, relating to motivation, represents Y variable, forms the dependent variable. Administration/collection of data was done through face to face contact. Their reliability and validity were determined appropriately. Statistical computation of the relationship between the variables under the study was done manually. This was followed by testing the hypothesis using inferential statistics of correlation technique. The decision rule as stipulated above applied.

4.0 Findings, Discussion and Conclusion

4. 0.1 Response Rate

The response rate indicates that the entire questionnaire distributed/administered, which numbered 68 (sixty eight), were returned as completed (filled). None was rejected. The responses rate was therefore, 100%.

Table 1: Responses that examined the extent of the correlation between job satisfaction and motivation, as management constructs

S/N	QUESTIONNAIRE	SA	A	N	D	SD	TOTAL
1	You are satisfied with your job	16 (23.53)	22 (32.36)	22 (32.36)	6 (08.82)	2 (02.94)	68 (100%)
2	You are motivated to carry-out this job.	30 (44.12)	30 (44.12)	6 (08.82)	2 (02.94)	0 (00)	68 (100%)
3	To what extent do you agree that you are motivated when you are satisfied in a job	42 (61.76)	20 (29.42)	2 (02.94)	2 (02.94)	2 (02.94)	68 (100%)
4	To what extent do you agree to a statement that 'a satisfied person is a motivated one'	34 (50)	18 (26.47)	12 (17.65)	2 (02.94)	2 (02.94)	68 (100%)

Source: Field survey, 2015

Responses: Table 1 shows that greater number of respondents agreed that they were satisfied, and motivated. Also, responses for question 3 and 4, which were used to test the hypothesis shows greater agreements on the questions, Nonetheless, reliability of the responses were further tested to either accept or reject the hypothesis.

Table 2: Hypothesis Test Result, Interpretation and decision

Level of significance	df	t-cal	t-tab	Decision
0.05	66	6.5905	2.01	Ho was Rejected

Source: Author's extraction of Pearson's Moment Correlation Coefficient computed r, tr, df and decision for hypothesis test (see, Appendixes A and B).

Table 2 shows the computed tr (calculated t-test), which represents value of the correlation coefficient; df (degree of freedom) and t-table (table value of the results). The decision shows rejection of null hypothesis, which states that the extent of the relationship between job satisfaction and motivation, as management constructs, is not significant to confer their

similarity, and therefore, could not stand as interchangeable. This validates the views of Peretomode (2006); Mateus (2007); Hicks and Gullet (1981); and Mamah (2015), who maintain that the two concepts cannot be described as distinct, separable, and not interchangeable. This result could also be aligned with Herzberg's Theory, which is used as the main theoretical framework for this study; earlier in the study was noted to have used job satisfaction elements to study motivation in work places. Herzberg (2003), in his study identified and referred to job satisfaction elements as motivators, making them non-distinct management constructs.

4.2 Conclusion

A common observation among the organization behaviourists, authors, and practitioners is that job satisfaction/motivation always provides fresh, as well as, elastic study indices. That is to say, there is no end to its study. This is because not only that the studies could be described as controversial, and therefore ignite debates, but at any time, the findings are quite revealing.

The current debate, which this study looked into, is whether the two management constructs- job satisfaction and motivation are by their nomenclature-meaning or usage mere semblance, therefore, distinct or otherwise similar, and interchangeable. In other words it looked at the dichotomy of the two most important management constructs-motivation and satisfaction. As usual, in a discussion of this nature, the two sides of the opinion were given fair hearing, which seemed convincing almost on equal basis. Most importantly, the findings of the empirical investigation were observed to have accepted the views of those who argue in favour that the two terms can be interchanged, and therefore, not distinct. That is to say, they are not mere semblance, not distinct, not separable but could be interchanged in management context and usage as a particular situation demands. This confirms and supports various authors and organization theorists, as noted in the literature, who argue for their common usage. Two studies can be restated here. Agbionu (2013), who made reference to Shields, describes the concept of employee job satisfaction to mean everything from making all aspects of a job easy to making the job more meaningful, significant, challenging and interesting. Actually, she involved motivation in that description. Also, Mamah (2015) asserts that motivating employees is a means of empowering them psychologically and physiologically in order to provide them incentives to regard their jobs as satisfying to their needs and that of the organization they are serving. In this case, any of the two terms- job satisfaction and motivation can take up the above description without a mistake being made.

This study recommends the usage of job satisfaction and motivation as inseparable, indistinct management constructs. This study has shown, among other things that a satisfied person is a motivated mind; and a motivated person is a satisfied mind. This shall reduce the ambiguity, uncertainty and fright the users normally face when applying such in managing their workforce.

List of References

- Agbionu, C. U. (2013), "Reward Management and Employees' Job Satisfaction and Performance in Nigeria: A Study of Anambra State Civil Service", A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management Services, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Unpublished, 345 Ps.

Albers, H. A. (1974), *Principles of Management: A Modern Approach*, 4th ed., Canada, John-Willey and Sons Inco, 679 Ps

Armstrong, M. (2003), *A Handbook of Human Resource Management Practices*, 8th ed., London, Kogan Page Ltd., 981 Ps

Bahera, N., Sahoo, C. K. and Sundaray (2012), "Retaining High Performing Employees Through Job Satisfaction: A Theoretical Construct", *European Foundation for the Involvement of Living and Working Conditions*, Online:<http://www.europa.eu>

Chattered Institute of Bankers (CIB) Study Text (1989), *The Nature of Management: Stage One* 7th ed., London, BPP Publishers Ltd., 389 Ps

Curran (2012), "Assessing Employee Turnover in Language Services Section of Parliament of the Republic of South Africa": A Thesis Submitted to the Department of Public Administration, Faculty of Economic and Management Sciences, School of Public Leadership, Stellenbosh University, Online: <http://scholar.sun.ac.za>.

Getahun, S., Sims, B. and Hummer D. (2006), "Job Satisfaction and Organizational Commitment among Probation and Parole Officers: A Case Study", *International Journal of Business Environment*, Vol.1, 1-6.

Herzberg (1965), *The New Industrial Psychology*, *Industrial and Labour Relations Review*, Online: www.wikkipedaencyclopedia.

Herzberg and Associates (1959) An Internet Search Via EBSCO Megafire Database with the Key Word Search "Herzberg".

Herzberg, F. (2003), "One More Time: How do you Motivate Your Employees?" *Harvard Business Review*, (3-11). Original Work Published in 1987.

Hicks, H. G. and Gullet, R. C. (1981), *Management*, International Students Edition, Global, McGraw Hills, 668 Ps

Koontz, H., O'donell, C. and Weirich H. (1980), *Management*, 7th ed. Global, McGraw Hills International Book Company, 832 Ps

Kothari, C. R. (2004), *Research Methodology: Methods and Techniques*, Second Revised Edition, New-Delhi, New-Age International Publishers, 401 Ps

- Lambrou, P., Kontodimopoulos, N. and Naikas, D. (2010), "Motivation and Job Satisfaction among Medical and Nursing Staff in a Cyprus Public General Hospital", *Human Resources for Health*, 8:26 Online: <http://www.humanresourceshealth.com/content/8/1/26>.
- Mamah, A. I. (2013), "Contemporary Management Approaches as Motivation Strategies against Labour Turnover in Nigerian Organizations", *GOU Journal of Management and Social Sciences*, Vol.1(1), Dec. (38-54).
- Mamah, A.I. (2015), "Job Satisfaction and Tenure Variables of Medical Practitioners: A Study of Selected Specialist Public Hospitals in Enugu Metropolis, Enugu State" Thesis Submitted to the Department of Business Management, Faculty of Management Sciences, Ebonyi State University, Abakaliki, Nigeria
- Mateus, G. (2007), "Reasons for High Turnover of Nursing Professionals at Public Hospitals in Angola", Dissertation Submitted to the Department of Health Studies, University of South Africa.
- Noe, R. A. Hollenbeck, J. R, Gehart, B. and Wright, P. M. (2004), *Fundamentals of Human Resources Management*, New York, the McGraw Hills Companies Inco. 570 Ps
- Okaro, A. O., Eze, C. U. and Ohagwu, C. C. (2010), "Impact of Motivation on Productivity of Radiographers in two Tertiary Healthcare Institutions in Enugu Metropolis, South Eastern Nigeria", *American Journal of Science Research*, ISSN 1450-223 Issue 8, 26-32, Online: <http://www.eurojournals.com/ajsr.htm>.
- Okaro, A. O., Eze, C. U. and Ohagwu, C. C. (2010), "Survey of Job Satisfaction among Nigerian Radiographers in South-Eastern Nigeria", *European Journal of Scientific Research*, Vol.39 (3), 448-456. Online: <http://www.eurojournals.com/ejstr.htm>.
- Peretomede, V. F. (2006), *Educational Administration: Applied Concepts and Theoretical Perspectives*, Reprint 1st ed., Lagos, Toja Educational Research and Publishers Ltd, 298 Ps
- Robbins, S. P. and Judge, A. T. (2007), *Organizational Behaviour*, 12th ed. New Delhi, Prentice Hall of India, Pvt. Ltd., 759 Ps
- Samuel, M. O. and Chipunza, C. (2009), "Employee Retention and Turnover: Using Motivational Variables as Panacea", *Africa Journal of Business Management*, Sept. Vol.3 (8), (410-415).
- Samuel, M.O. (2008), 'Using Motivational Strategy as Panacea for Employee Retention and

Turnover in Some Selected Public and Private Sector Organizations in the Eastern Cape Province of South Africa', Dissertation Submitted to the Faculty of Management and Commerce, University of Fort Hare, South Africa, in partial fulfilment for the Degree of Master of Commerce in Industrial Psychology

Stello, C. M. (2012), "Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory Job Satisfaction: An Integrative Literature Review, A Seminar Paper Submitted to the Department of Organizational Leadership, Policy, and Development, College of Education and Human Development, University of Minnesota, U.S.A.

Wyk, C. V. (2011), "Evaluating Motivational Level of Employees in Contemporary South African Organizations" A Dissertation Submitted for the Degree, Masters in Business Administration, Faculty of Business and Economic Sciences, Nelson Mandela Metropolitan University, South Africa, January.

Appendix A: Responses (Data) Computation with regards to Questionnaire Items 3 and 4

S/No.	X	Y	XY	X ²	Y ²
1	5	5	25	25	25
2	5	5	25	25	25
3	4	5	20	16	25
4	5	5	25	25	25
5	5	4	20	25	16
6	5	5	25	25	25
7	5	5	25	25	25
8	5	5	25	25	25
9	5	5	25	25	25
10	4	5	20	16	25
11	5	4	20	25	16
12	2	4	8	4	16
13	4	3	12	16	9
14	5	5	25	25	25
15	5	5	25	25	25
16	5	5	25	25	25
17	4	3	12	16	9
18	4	5	20	16	25
19	4	3	12	16	9
20	5	5	25	25	25
21	5	4	20	25	16
22	4	4	16	16	16

23	5	5	25	25	25
24	4	2	8	16	4
25	5	3	15	25	9
26	5	4	20	25	16
27	5	4	20	25	16
28	4	4	16	16	16
29	5	5	25	25	25
30	5	5	25	25	25
31	5	4	20	25	16
32	4	3	12	16	9
33	1	1	1	1	1
34	4	3	12	16	9
35	5	5	25	25	25
36	4	2	8	16	4
37	5	5	25	25	25
38	5	4	20	25	16
39	4	4	16	16	16
40	5	5	25	25	25
41	5	4	20	25	16
42	5	5	25	25	25
43	5	5	25	25	25
44	5	5	25	25	25
45	1	1	1	1	1
46	4	3	12	16	9
47	4	5	20	16	25
48	5	4	20	25	16
49	2	4	8	4	16
50	4	3	12	16	9
51	4	5	20	16	25
52	5	5	25	25	25
53	4	5	20	16	25
54	4	3	12	16	9
55	5	4	20	25	16
56	4	4	16	16	16
57	5	5	25	25	25
58	5	4	20	25	16
59	4	3	12	16	9
60	5	5	25	25	25
61	5	3	15	25	9

62	5	4	20	25	16
63	5	5	25	25	25
64	5	5	25	25	25
65	5	5	25	25	25
66	5	5	25	25	25
67	4	3	12	16	9
68	5	5	25	25	25
n = 68	Σx = 304	Σy = 284	Σxy = 1308	Σx ² = 1412	Σy ² = 1256

Appendix B: Manually Computed r; t_r; and df. Based on the Responses Obtained from Appendix A Using Pearson Moment Correlation Coefficient formula

$$r = \frac{\sum xy - \frac{(\sum x)(\sum y)}{N}}{\sqrt{\left[\sum x^2 - \frac{(\sum x)^2}{N}\right] \left[\sum y^2 - \frac{(\sum y)^2}{N}\right]}}$$

$$t_r = \frac{r\sqrt{N-2}}{\sqrt{1-r^2}}$$

$$\begin{aligned}
 r &= \frac{1308 - \frac{304 \times 284}{68}}{\sqrt{\left[1412 - \frac{(304)^2}{68}\right] \left[1256 - \frac{(284)^2}{68}\right]}} \\
 &= \frac{1308 - 86336}{68} \\
 &= \frac{1308 - 1269.647059}{\sqrt{\left[1412 - \frac{92416}{68}\right] \left[1256 - \frac{80656}{68}\right]}} \\
 &= \frac{38.352941}{\sqrt{\left[52.941 \right] \left[69.8824\right]}} = \frac{38.352941}{\sqrt{3699.644138}} \\
 &= \frac{38.352941}{60.82470007} \\
 r &= 0.63055
 \end{aligned}$$

$$\begin{aligned} \text{tr} &= \frac{0.63 \times 8.124}{\sqrt{1 - 0.3969}} = \frac{5.11812}{\sqrt{0.776595}} \\ \text{tr} &= \underline{\underline{6.5905}} \end{aligned}$$