

The Relation Between Motivation and Personality Types

Andrea Bencsik, Renata Machova and Endre Hevesi
Budapest Business School, Univerzita J. Selyeho Komarno, Slovakia, Budapest, Hungary

Abstract: The study deals with motivation which has been there for thousands of years and has been researched for long. Yet, uniformly reassuring answers to the questions arising from its research still have not been found. There are even fewer cases where research findings have been successfully incorporated into everyday corporate practices. This study deals with the relation between motivation and personality types. It is aimed at the study of motivational behaviour among people working in different positions and people with different personality traits. The question is whether there is relation between the effects of motivation tools, personality types, the purpose of the known and accepted goal of work, recognition and satisfaction. We also aim to find out what kind of relationship there is between them. Our research is based on a questionnaire survey (quantitative technique) conducted among the employees of a given corporation and on interviews with them (qualitative method). Our hypotheses were elaborated on the basis of the questions that respondents had to answer in our research. This study deals with the evaluation of those ones which were used in our questionnaire survey. All three hypotheses were proven. This proves that different tasks at work and different personality types need the application of different motivation tools. It has been proven that there is relation between the known and accepted (attractive) goal of work, its value and employee satisfaction. These relations are factors that reinforce intrinsic motivation.

Key words: Motivation, employee satisfaction, behavior, personality type, goal

INTRODUCTION

The study of human behaviour and the peculiarities of motivation have been in the centre of people's interest for centuries. Since, there are countless aspects to the problem and research of motivation, it can be dealt with endlessly. What is more, as a result of continuously appearing new research findings the so called basic principles of motivation are also changing and developing. The age of people also influences the ways how they can be motivated. A marriage, the birth of a child, an illness and various personal difficulties can substantially change the attitudes of employees. It has been proven by research that one group of the factors triggering motivation come from inside us and other factors are external. The Greek philosopher Epicurus followed a hedonistic point of view and said that people are motivated by their search for pleasure and by their efforts to avoid pain. This approach prevailed more or less for thousands of years but lately the study of extrinsic and intrinsic motivators has appeared as a new field of research. Research projects aimed to find out about these motivators were primarily pedagogical-psychological studies, however, their results have also significantly influenced and changed the views on workplace motivation (Thomas, 2009):

- Extrinsic (instrumental) motivation: the achievement of a goal or an external factor plays a role in motivating someone to do something or behave in a certain way
- Intrinsic (self rewarding) motivation: we talk about this kind of motivation when the motivation to act lies in the pleasure of that particular action itself

While studying the relation between extrinsic and intrinsic motivation it has been found that if someone is motivated externally, e.g., by some reward, his or her intrinsic motivation will decrease (Kaplan, 2010).

On the basis of research into motivation and on the basis of the focus of attention of these studies we can distinguish between different groups. Motivation can be classified according to how it functions or according to its effects or on the basis of what motivation tools can be used in a given situations. In this spirit, the content theories of motivation (Maslow, 1943; Herzberg *et al.*, 1959; McClelland, 1965; McGreggo, 2006; Hunt, 1965; Alderfer, 1969) involve those individual factors which motivate people to do something. They are theoretical frameworks which suggest or presume actions that will be performed by our colleagues in order to meet their own needs (Vincze, 2012).

The process theories of motivation (expectancy theory, equity theory, goal setting theory, reinforcement

theory) (Skinner, 1953; Rooz and Heidrich, 2013; Meehl, 1992) discuss what influences the behaviour of individuals beyond their needs and what tools can be used to regulate people's behaviour. In this case, the focus is on the mechanism of action of factors that trigger motivation and influence behaviour (Fabian, 2008).

One of the most detailed motivation systems was elaborated by Murray who grouped 27 needs around six areas (Cherry, 2014a; Anderson, 1988; Roazen, 2003). According to him motives can appear overtly and covertly. Overt motives can be deduced from our behaviour and he elaborated a projection test to identify covert motives (Murray, 1938, 1940; Kluckhohn and Murray, 1953).

There has always been a dispute among those following the classic motivation theories, whether money is a motivation tool or not. This question has been widely dealt with theoretically and from a practical aspect as well but a uniform answer acceptable for all age groups and all employees in all position types has not been given yet.

What is more, personality traits just like cultural effects also have an influence on the working of the basic models of needs (Chapman and White, 2013). Thus, the validity of the basic models can be studied and evaluated only in a given social-economic context (Dobak and Antal, 2010; Cherry, 2014b).

The need for paradigm shift: Besides the traditional approach to motivation a paradigm shift based on new research results appeared, the need for which can be illustrated by Pink (2009)'s logical train of thought. According to Pink societies also have an operation system just like computers do which is mostly an invisible instruction and protocol system that operates everything. The first human operation system which we could call Motivation 1.0 was the first software in human history and was developed in order to survive. Its next version, Motivation 2.0, was built on external rewards and punishments and it was able to support and regulate cooperation between people. This was first used instinctively which was later replaced by its targeted and even scientific application following Taylor (1911). Motivation 2.0 worked well with the routine tasks of the 20th century. However, in the 21st century this software is not compatible with what we do and with how we do it any more. There is a need for an upgrade (Pink, 2009). On the basis of research findings about reward and punishment, it can be concluded that the time has come for the development and installation of Motivation 3.0. In order to motivate knowledge workers there is a need for the introduction of a new type of a motivation-operation

system. The basic principle of the new system is that the most efficient motivation tool is the inner motivation of people and the joy of creation.

External incentives such as a reward may even have a negative impact on intrinsic motivation or performance. Researcher lists a series of examples for the most efficient motivation principles in the case of tasks with different complexity. He describes the most efficient principles on an imaginary scale where the complexity of the work is increasing (with fully algorithmic and mainly heuristic tasks at the two endpoints).

According to Amabile (1996) of the Harvard Business School rewards and punishment work extremely well in the case of algorithmic tasks but their impact is likely to be disastrous in the case of heuristic tasks. There are challenging tasks, where there is a need to find solutions to new problems or a need to create something completely new that is necessary but has not existed yet. These challenging tasks largely depend on a third motivation factor. Amabile (1996) calls this the "intrinsic motivation principle of creativity". While motivation strengthens and inspires creativity, motivation with instructions and directives has an opposite effect and hinders enthusiasm.

In the light of the above mentioned thoughts, it can be concluded that we can talk about motivation when there is a so called inner generator in a people which makes them do something or take actions at their own initiative. Real success will come when corporate interests and the individual ones are in line. The tools to build intrinsic motivation in people are the following: recognition, appraisal, giving of more authority, promotion and the assignment of more interesting tasks that must be carried out independently. These are tools that satisfy higher level needs (Plette, 2002). As an increasing number of corporations are becoming flatter and leaner, the need for employees who can motivate themselves is increasing. As Pink (2009) put it down: Motivation 2.0 needs to be upgraded and has to be replaced by Motivation 3.0. However, in order to be able to develop the new operation system, first we must examine the deficiencies of the old version.

There are numerous factors in the environment that affect motivation. Out of all conditions the peculiarities of the given task are the most important factors. These are such as the content, the difficulty, the timing and the clarity of the task (Drellings, 1999). The more specifically a goal is set and the more difficult and more complex it is, the better result it generates (Hackman and Oldham, 2005); of course only if the employee accepts the given goals and considers them as his or her own goals too (Bakacsi, 2000). It is very important to set corporate goals

clearly. They must be easy to achieve and precisely defined, due to which fact they will be feasible (Lencioni, 2009). According to Plaminek (2010), it is our individual characteristics, differences and the external factors in our lives that determine what motivates us in a given situation. There are external factors that influence our behaviour in the long run (e.g., to what extent our individual needs are satisfied in the environment where we permanently live and work) and there are those ones which only have a short-time effect (e.g., our state of mind in a particular moment or period).

Personality traits also have a significant impact on our motivation (Pierce *et al.*, 2009). In our research, we raised the question whether there is a correlation between motivation factors and personality traits. In order to be able to evaluate the connection between them at an appropriate level, we will provide a very brief overview of personality traits.

Personality traits and types: The first detailed typology was elaborated by Hippocrates two and a half thousand years ago. His terminology is still used. This was later developed further by Galen (Gyori, 2000). They distinguished four temperaments: sanguine, choleric, melancholic and phlegmatic.

In the 19th and 20th centuries, Jung approached human types in his typology from two aspects. According to Jung (1995) in spite of a large number of motivation factors there are two basic psychological attitudes, namely extroversion and introversion. The role of the conscious mind is to manage the adaptation of people to the outside world and their orientation in it. There are four psychological functions that help maintain this orientation in the world. By combining the two, Jung (1995) defined the following eight types: extraverted thinking, extraverted feeling, extraverted sensing, extraverted intuitive, introverted thinking, introverted feeling, introverted sensing and introverted intuitive (Roazen, 2003).

In 1947, Eysenck studied 700 neurotic soldiers and he carried out the statistical analysis of 39 personal traits with the help of factor analysis. He found two independent dimensions: extraversion-introversion, emotional stability-instability. Then, he used these two dimensions as two axes of a coordinate system and placed the personal traits into it while the four quadrants match the four basic temperaments defined by Hippocrates. The model is shown in Fig. 1.

The idea of being driven extrinsically and intrinsically is an interesting interpretation of personality traits. The two character types can be distinguished in line with




Fig. 1: Personality traits defined by Eysenck and Keane (1997)

motivation effects on the basis of what prevails in the setting of our goals, the development of our work and our view of life. The determination of people driven from inside (intrinsically motivated) comes from their childhood. They learn and get their goals from their parents and these objectives drive them throughout their life. These people develop a feeling that they can control their own life they know why they do certain things and what they can achieve by doing those things.

For those who can be motivated extrinsically a closer group of people or a wider social group are determining. These groups convey their expectations and behaviour patterns to these people via personal contact (communication with colleagues, superiors, etc.) and through the mass media. These people develop a trait at the very beginning of their life that they always have to come up to the expectations of the time. In order to do this their objectives might change continuously.

Motivation types: Plaminek (2010) describes the differences between personalities from a very interesting aspect. In his argumentation, he seamlessly combines the effects of motivation factors and the characteristics of personality traits which prevail at their presence. According to him people can be put into four groups from the aspect of motivation which are the following:

Exploring people (objevovatele) are mostly motivated by new challenges. They look at the world as a mass of problems which are waiting to be solved. They perceive the overcoming of challenges as a competition with themselves or as an opportunity to reach new limits. Exploring people have excellent pre-conditions for doing

scientific or creative work, mainly for those tasks which do not require teamwork. A vast number of new ideas come from them. Employees belonging to this group like freedom they do not like working in teams and do not like it if their personal freedom is limited.

The objective of directive people (*usmiroovatele*) is to influence others. They can convince others and set paths to be followed. Their world is a vertically arranged system of human relations. They observe the hierarchical social arrangement of the environment with great attention and they also feel a need to put people around them into similar structures. In general, they look at the vast majority of the society as a group of people not in their interest and as a group of people who can be lead. However, there are also a few people they appreciate and respect and perceive them as interesting partners. They show a very fair and loyal attitude towards these people.

Harmonizing people (*sladovatele*) always try to create favourable living conditions for themselves. It is important for them to have peaceful and balanced relations with other people. People usually have pleasant conversations with them. It is not a problem for them to ask questions, they listen carefully and respond to others views. It is not difficult for them to accept that others might have different opinions. They understand others' feelings very easily; they are highly empathic. In this respect, they are the opposites of exploring people who excel in IQ while harmonizing people excel in EQ. People of this type build networks, not hierarchies. They aim to build a perfect living and working environment around them.

The objective of specifying people (*zpresnovatele*) is to develop themselves. They attribute great importance to detail and they always accomplish the tasks they started. They are reliable, thorough and demanding of themselves and their environment. They like systematic work and keep order in their things at work. They want goals to be set clearly and following that they accomplish their tasks precisely. Norms and rules are important for them. Their behaviour tends to be standard, predictable and fair. They like to analyse data, to develop systems and to put objects in those systems. They are interested in numerical information, e.g., in the exact time of arrival, the consumption of a vehicle or the degree of success. Their communication skills are not well-developed. They mainly communicate to clarify different situations, to acquire data and to check things. They may appear cold to others as if they did not have feelings. Of course they do; they only do not show them. Since they express their feelings rarely they tend not to be able to accomplish tasks if they are under great pressure and can become emotionally unstable. On occasions they might have emotional

outbursts which appear periodically. It is important for their superiors and colleagues to be able to tolerate these outbursts. These people are loyal to their company and their superiors even in those cases when others turn away from their bosses.

People can be put into the above described four groups on the basis of their behaviour in different situations such as when they are given appraisal or they are being criticised when they are put under great pressure or when they have to face an unfair situation.

The identification of the personality profile of employees is important for employers in order to be able to assign appropriate tasks to each member of their staff. The dynamic types of people like challenge (heuristic tasks) and the stable types like algorithmic tasks (Plaminek, 2010).

The corporate practices of today: The development of a corporate motivation system is always a challenge for HR departments, thus, they are usually interested in new solutions (Pinder, 2008). In most corporations, there are always tasks which are not clearly heuristic or algorithmic. Therefore, if someone is considering the introduction of the above described new motivation-operation system as a new way of improvement, it is important to think it over how the new system can be used in the case of tasks that are not clearly heuristic or algorithmic. The new research results on extrinsic/intrinsic motivation can contribute to the development of corporate motivation systems.

The state of the economy and society in Central and Eastern Europe is different from that in developed western countries. Employees are primarily motivated through financial incentives. Since, the privatisation of businesses after the change of regime and the appearance of multinational corporations in the region the employees of most companies have been doing algorithmic work and their wages are usually low. In a country where the unemployment rate is approximately 14% the fact that one has a job is supposedly enough to motivate people to work well. In the fear of losing their job people tend to be willing to do algorithmic work with higher probability and they are willing to work even for lower wages in order to satisfy their own basic needs. It can be observed in general that there are very few cases when employee motivation is personalised. What is more, it also often happens that managers do not make efforts to motivate their staff at all.

In our research, we wanted to find out whether managers consider at all that they should use a variety of motivation tools in the case of different duties and positions which require different behaviour and soft

skills. We also examined how much the concrete tools to motivate employees are in harmony with those employees' personality traits.

MATERIALS AND METHODS

In our research, we used qualitative (interview) and quantitative (questionnaire survey) research methods alike. In this study, we introduce the findings of our quantitative research. The hypotheses relating to our questionnaire survey were the following:

- Hypothesis 1: employees belonging to different personality types are motivated by different motivation factors and different tasks
- Hypothesis 2: those individuals who are aware of the objective and goal of their work and find them attractive can identify with that goal and consider it valuable
- Hypothesis 3: an attractive goal which is motivating on its own and satisfaction are related to each other (An employee who has attractive goals is more satisfied)

We used questionnaires to conduct our quantitative research. The questionnaire comprised of 28 questions divided into three major parts. The first part was aimed to find out about the personality types of the employees and the second one was designed to evaluate and rank motivation factors. While bearing in mind the previously elaborated hypotheses in the second part we surveyed the importance of feedback as a motivation factor. We also wanted to find out how important the goal of work itself is for employees and to what extent it is important for them how easily goals can be reached, how clearly they are set and how difficult they are. In the third part, the respondents could come up with suggestions how to develop positive atmosphere at the workplace and how to improve job performance. Thus, in the first two parts we used closed questions (with 5-degree Likert scales) and in the third one open ones.

Research sample: Research was carried out among the whole staff of a hotel in Slovakia. All 50 members of the hotel staff took part in the survey. This way, the sample can be considered representative for the researched business. Two questionnaires were not filled in correctly, so the final size of the research sample was 48.

RESULTS

Evaluation of the research and hypotheses: The data from the questionnaires were analysed by using basic and complex methods in Excel and in SPSS.

Testing of the 1st hypothesis: Employees belonging to different personality types are motivated by different motivation factors and different tasks.

Identification of personality types: In order for us to identify respondents' personality types they had to specify what their reaction would be in four given situation. On the basis of Plaminek's book *Tajemství motivace*, we elaborated questions to identify what personality type as defined by Plaminek, each respondent is. We identified the following personality types on the basis of the responses. The most important traits and motivation factors were also included in the Table 1.

Motivation factors, goals-feedback: The second part of the questionnaire was designed to evaluate and rank those motivation factors which are dealt with in the theoretical part of the study. The motivation factors that were evaluated most important by respondents belonging to the four different personality types are listed in Table 2. Table 3 shows those factors which were considered to be of the highest importance by respondents on a 5-degree Likert scale. The values show how many times respondents indicated the individual factors to be of the highest importance.

In order to prove or hypothesis we also examined which factors do not motivate certain personality types. Table 3 shows those cases when different respondents

Table 1: Identified personality types

Personality type	Persons	Job/Position	Most important traits	Can be motivated through
Exploring	2	Higher-level manager	Independent, overcoming of challenges, they exceed their own limits	Freedom, interesting and creative work, challenges
Directive	1	Higher-level manager	Able to lead people, convincing, good talker	Position, opportunities to influence others, recognition
Harmonizing	25	Regular staff	High EQ, empathy, loyalty, thrive for perfection	Perfect environment, relations, job security, fairness
Specifying	20	Regular staff	Respecting of norms and rules, good analytical skills, loyalty, respecting of superiors	Presence of order, existence of systems, punctual communication, stability, job security

Own research

Table 2: Evaluation of motivation factors

Motivation factors	Personality types				Total
	Exploring	Directive	Harmonizing	Specifying	
Wage	-	-	23	20	43
Other allowances	-	-	20	12	32
Recognition, status	-	1	2	-	3
Interesting job and tasks	1	1	3	-	5
Fair treatment	-	-	10	-	10
New challenges	2	-	2	-	4
Creative tasks	1	-	-	-	1
Freedom of independent decisions	1	-	1	-	2
Leading/Managing of others	-	1	-	-	1
Competition	-	1	-	-	1
Job security	-	-	21	18	39
Well-balanced relations with colleagues	-	-	24	10	34
Rules that are set well	-	-	12	19	31
Total	5	4	118	79	-

Table 3: Evaluation of non-motivating factors

Motivation factors	Personality types				Total
	Exploring	Directive	Harmonizing	Specifying	
Wage	-	-	-	-	-
Other allowances	-	1	-	-	1
Recognition, status	-	-	5	8	13
Interesting job and tasks	-	-	10	9	19
Fair treatment	-	-	2	-	2
New challenges	-	-	10	-	10
Creative tasks	-	-	10	9	19
Freedom of independent decisions	-	-	8	10	18
Leading/Managing of others	1	-	8	-	9
Competition	-	-	9	-	9
Job security	-	-	-	-	-
Well-balanced relations with colleagues	1	1	-	-	2
Rules that are set well	-	-	6	-	6
Total	2	2	62	36	-

Own research

considered certain motivation factors to be of the lowest importance (When respondents circled 1 as the degree of importance of a certain factor on the Likert scale).

In order to evaluate the first hypothesis, it was necessary to identify personal profiles on the basis of the situations drawn up in the first part of the questionnaire. The data presented in Table 1 prove that employees who are in a management position in the corporate structure truly possess personal traits which enable them to fill such positions and the ways how they are motivated correspond to their personality type. The fact that our hypothesis is correct is also supported by the results presented in Table 2 and 3.

Table 2 shows that exploring people attributed the highest score of 5 to new challenges, to interesting and creative tasks and to the freedom of independent decisions. Recognition, status, interesting tasks, the leading/managing of others and competition scored the highest value of 5 among directive people. Most harmonizing people consider well-balanced relations with their colleagues most important. Only a single respondent did not give them a score of 5. Wages are also important

for them (23 of them marked it important) just like job security, other allowances and clearly set rules and norms.

As it can be seen from Table 3, the leading/managing of others and well-balanced relations with colleagues are not important for exploring people. This supports the fact described in the theoretical part of this study that exploring people are independent and do not like teamwork. Directive people do not think other allowances are important motivation factors and similarly to exploring people they do not think good relations with colleagues are important either. It is advisable to assign these people with tasks that can be done alone since they will probably like to work on them and reach higher work efficiency. Harmonizing respondents did not consider the following motivation factors of high importance: interesting and creative job and tasks, new challenges, freedom of independent decisions, leading/managing of others, competition, recognition, status, rules and norms. It is interesting that none of the harmonizing respondents marked well-balanced relations with colleagues, job security, wage and other allowances to be of the lowest importance. This indicates that financial security, the

atmosphere and the relations at their workplace are important for them. Responses also show that specifying people do not think that the freedom of independent decisions, creative and interesting tasks and recognition and status are important motivation factors. The responses we got are in line with the description of different motivation factors in the theoretical part of this study. The data presented in Table 1-3 above prove or first hypothesis that employees belonging to different personality types are motivated by different motivation factors and different tasks.

Testing of the 2nd hypothesis: Those individuals who are aware of the objective and goal of their work and can identify with that goal, consider their work valuable.

We asked respondents to what extent they consider their own work valuable. We used a 5-degree Likert scale where 1 indicated the least valuable and 5 the most valuable work. The 10% of respondents circled 1 as an answer which meant that they do not consider their work valuable at all. The 17% of respondents circled 2 as an answer and 20 and 13% chose 3 and 4, respectively. The 19 respondents which is 40% of all, consider their own work completely valuable and circled 5 on the scale. It is important for everyone to have a feeling that what they do is valuable. If people are aware of the value of their own work, they will make big efforts to do their tasks well and bring the best out of themselves.

We also aimed to find out to what extent respondents were aware of the goal of their work. Only 4% of respondents indicated that they did not have any idea about what the goal of their work was. The 8% of respondents circled 2, 10% marked 3 and 15% of all indicated 4 as an answer. The 63% which is the biggest group of respondents, namely 30 employees are fully aware of the goal of their work.

In order to find out whether there is relation between the value and the goal of respondents' work and to find out how strong the link is we conducted Chi-square tests and calculated Cramer-Chuprov coefficients of association. The value of the calculated indicators can range from 0-1, where 0 indicates that the factors are completely independent from each other and 1 indicates a functional relation between them (Table 4-8).

- $\chi^2 = 25.984$

Cramer's coefficient of association:

- $C^2 = 0.541345$
- $C = 0.735762$

Table 4: Absolute frequency (Goal of work)

Value of work	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	1	1	-	-	-	2
2	-	-	2	2	-	4
3	-	-	3	1	1	5
4	1	-	2	1	3	7
5	3	7	3	2	15	30
Total	5	8	10	6	19	48

Table 5: Relative frequency (Goal of work)

Value of work	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	Total (%)
1	50.00	50.00	-	-	-	100
2	-	-	50.00	50.00	-	100
3	-	-	60.00	20.00	20.00	100
4	14.29	-	28.57	14.29	42.86	100
5	10.00	23.33	10.00	6.67	50.00	100
Total	10.42	16.67	20.83	12.50	39.58	100

Table 6: Assumed absolute frequency (Goal of work)

Value of work	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	0.20833	0.33333	0.41667	0.250	0.79167	2
2	0.41667	0.66667	0.83333	0.500	1.58333	4
3	0.52083	0.83333	1.04167	0.625	1.97917	5
4	0.72917	1.16667	1.45833	0.875	2.77083	7
5	3.12500	5.00000	6.25000	3.750	11.87500	30
Total	5.00000	8.00000	10.00000	6.000	19.00000	48

Own research

Table 7: Assumed relative frequency (Goal of work)

Value of work	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	Total (%)
1	10.42	16.67	20.83	12.50	39.58	100
2	10.42	16.67	20.83	12.50	39.58	100
3	10.42	16.67	20.83	12.50	39.58	100
4	10.42	16.67	20.83	12.50	39.58	100
5	10.42	16.67	20.83	12.50	39.58	100
Total	10.42	16.67	20.83	12.50	39.58	100

Own table

Table 8: Chi-square

Value of work	Chi-square	1	2	3	4	5
3.008333333	1.333333333	0.41667	0.25	0.79167		
0.416666667	0.666666667	1.63333	4.5	1.58333		
0.520833333	0.833333333	3.68167	0.225	0.484430		
0.100595238	1.166666667	0.201190	0.017857	0.018954		
0.005	0.8	1.69	0.816667	0.822368		

Own research

Chuprov's coefficient of association:

- $T^2 = 0.135336$
- $T = 0.36881$

In order to prove our second hypothesis the conditional and unconditional distributions were compared as well as the existence of association links was also examined. We obtained a chi-square value of 25.98. We could claim that the examined factors were completely independent from each other if the Chi-square value was 0. This is not the case thus it can be concluded that there is relation between the goal and the value of respondents'

work. The strength of this relation can be expressed with Cramer's and Chuprov's coefficients. The coefficients indicate a medium-strength relation since their values fall between 0.3 and 0.8.

Our statistical analysis has proved that there is relation between the two factors referred to in our second hypothesis and the relation between them is of medium-strength.

Testing of the 3rd hypothesis: An attractive goal which is motivating on its own and satisfaction are related to each other (an employee who has attractive goals is more satisfied).

There were 42 respondents who circled 3, 4 or 5 when they had to indicate how much they are aware of the goal of their work. They made up 87.5% of all respondents. The 21 persons out of the 42 think that the goal of their work is specific and clearly set. They amount to 50% of the above mentioned 42 respondents. The remaining 50% indicated the following: the 7% think that their goals are complicated and difficult to reach. The 5% claimed that their goals are not clearly set but they are challenging (bring the best out of yourself). The 24% say that their goals are not clearly set and they are not a challenge either. The 14% circled the "other" option as an answer.

On the basis of the results of our questionnaire survey, it can be claimed that 87.5% of the hotel staff know what the goal of their work is and 52% find those goals attractive. They also consider their goals important and want to reach them, even if they are a challenge for them.

We also used a 5-degree Likert scale to find out how satisfied respondents were with their job, where 1 indicated the lowest degree of employee satisfaction and 5 the highest one. The 42% of the employees are completely satisfied with their work; 25, 27 and 2% circled 4, 3 and 2, respectively and 4% were not satisfied with their job at all. We assumed that those individuals who are aware of the objective and goals of their work and find them attractive are more satisfied with their work and consider their own work valuable (Table 9-13).

- $\chi^2 = 68.71319$

Cramer's coefficient of association:

- $C^2 = 1.431525$
- $C = 1.196463$

Chuprov's coefficient of association:

- $T^2 = 0.357881$
- $T = 0.598232$

Table 9: Absolute frequency (Employee satisfaction)

Degree of attractiveness of goals	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	2	-	-	-	-	2
2	1	-	-	-	-	1
3	3	7	3	-	-	13
4	1	1	1	4	5	12
5	-	-	-	-	20	20
Total	7	8	4	4	25	48

Table 10: Relative frequency (Employee satisfaction)

Degree of attractiveness of goals	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	Total (%)
1	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
2	100.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100
3	23.08	53.85	23.08	0.00	0.00	100
4	8.33	8.33	8.33	33.33	41.67	100
5	0.00	0.00	0.00	0.00	100.00	100
Total	14.58	16.67	8.33	8.33	52.08	100

Table 11: Assumed absolute frequency (Employee satisfaction)

Degree of attractiveness of goals	1	2	3	4	5	Total
1	0.29167	0.33333	0.16667	0.16667	1.04167	2
2	0.14583	0.16667	0.08333	0.08333	0.52083	1
3	1.89583	2.16667	1.08333	1.08333	6.77083	13
4	1.75	2	1	1	6.25	12
5	2.91667	3.33333	1.66667	1.66667	10.4167	20
Total	7	8	4	4	25	48

Table 12: Assumed relative frequency (Employee satisfaction)

Degree of attractiveness of goals	1 (%)	2 (%)	3 (%)	4 (%)	5 (%)	Total (%)
1	14.58	16.67	8.33	8.33	52.08	100
2	14.58	16.67	8.33	8.33	52.08	100
3	14.58	16.67	8.33	8.33	52.08	100
4	14.58	16.67	8.33	8.33	52.08	100
5	14.58	16.67	8.33	8.33	52.08	100
Total	14.58	16.67	8.33	8.33	52.08	100

Table 13: Chi-square

Degree of attractiveness of goals	Chi-square
1	0.333333
2	0.166667
3	0.083333
4	0.083333
5	0.520833
10.00595238	0.333333
5.00297619	0.166667
0.643086081	10.78205
0.321428571	0.5
2.916666667	3.333333
1.666667	1.666667
1.666667	1.666667
8.816667	8.816667

Own research

Our third hypothesis was evaluated similarly to the second one. We obtained a Chi-square value of 68.71319, on the basis of which it can be claimed that there is relation between the degree of attractiveness of goals and employee satisfaction. The strength of this relation was examined with Cramer's and Chuprov's coefficients. Their values fell between 0.5 and 1.2 which proves that there is strong functional relation between the degree of attractiveness of goals and employee satisfaction.

On the basis of the above facts, it can be concluded that our third hypothesis proved to be true. Those

individuals who find the goal of their work attractive show a higher degree of employee satisfaction and consider their own work valuable.

DISCUSSION

Our research described above proved our hypotheses which had been elaborated on the basis of the theoretical background and assumptions. The questions that arose in our research could be answered. The correctness of our answers was proved statistically through our questionnaire survey.

Following the identification of the personality types of respondents we worked with a list of behavioural patterns and personality traits that could be expected from each of them and with a list of motivation factors that should motivate each of them theoretically. In order to prove our hypotheses, we then tested these traits and motivation factors through further questions. The fact that the first hypothesis was proved was not a surprise at all. Earlier researches in other parts of the world have also shown the same results irrespective of national and cultural background (Maccoby, 2010; Parsons and Broadbridge, 2006). Personality types can also be identified on the basis of other classifications than those described in the theoretical part of this study (DISC, Belbin, MBTI, etc.) and their testing should bring more or less the same results (Marston, 1928; Jung, 1995; Belbin, 2013; Myers, 1998). Thus, it does not matter which type of personality test companies use; the results will be similar. In accordance with our research results, it has been shown in all cases that there is a need to use a variety of motivation tools because various tasks, people attitudes, value judgements and the personalities of employees also differ from each other.

It is important but it is not enough only to know our goals. We need to consider them as our own goals. If a goal is attractive for employees, it motivates them to perform better. For companies an ideal case is when corporate goals and employee goals are identical. It has been proved that there is relation between employee motivation and the attractiveness and clearness of goals set by the management of a company. If employees can identify with the expectations towards them, they will do their job with pleasure and it will make them satisfied. In this case, intrinsic motivation has a significantly high importance (Portal, 2013; Sellei, 2014).

CONCLUSION

Employee satisfaction has recently been approached from a slightly different perspective than until now

and its relation to motivation has been reassessed. Intergenerational differences and the differentiated value judgement of multinational corporations have a significant role in this (Gursoy *et al.*, 2008). On the basis of theories related to employee satisfaction, it can be claimed that there are factors which employers need to consider and deal with constantly if they aim to increase employee satisfaction. On the one hand, these are partly objective workplace factors such as the physical working environment, an employee's position and tasks, training, the development and performance of an employee, remuneration, the behaviour of the management and company structure as well as the social environment and interpersonal relations. On the other hand, personal factors also have a considerable influence on employee satisfaction (Sellei, 2014; Judge *et al.*, 2001). Hungarian research results show that the following factors have a significant influence on employee satisfaction: working groups, work-life balance, working environment, remuneration and allowances, organizational culture and opportunities for personal development (Medgyesi and Robert, 2000; Barling *et al.*, 2003). The results of our research are also in line with international research results. In the framework of our research project we have also conducted a qualitative research study. Its results were similar to the ones of our quantitative research and will be published in our forthcoming paper.

REFERENCES

- Alderfer, C.P., 1969. An empirical test of a new theory of human needs. *Organiz. Behav. Hum. Perform.*, 4: 142-175.
- Amabile, T., 1996. *Creativity in Context*. West View Press, Boulder, CO., USA., ISBN-13: 9780813330341, Pages: 317.
- Anderson, J.W., 1988. Henry A. Murray's early career: A psychobiographical exploration. *J. Personality*, 56: 139-171.
- Barling, J., E.K. Kelloway and R.D. Iverson, 2003. High-quality work, job satisfaction and occupational injuries. *J. Applied Psychol.*, 88: 276-283.
- Belbin, M., 2013. Method, reliability and validity, statistics and research: A comprehensive review of Belbin team roles. Belbin Associates. <http://www.belbin.com/content/page/4432/BELBIN-MRVSRAComprehensiveReview-Mar2010.pdf>.
- Chapman, G. and O. White, 2013. *A munkahelyi elismeres 5 nyelve (Five ways of recognition in the workplace)*. Budapest, Harmat Kiado.
- Cherry, K., 2014a. Murray's theory of psychogenic needs. <http://psychology.about.com/od/theoriesofpersonality/a/psychogenic.htm>.

- Cherry, K., 2014b. Personality psychology study guide-overview of personality. <http://psychology.about.com/od/psychologystudyguides/a/personalitiesg.htm>.
- Dobak, M. and Z.S. Antal, 2010. *Vezetes es Szervezes [Management and Organization]*. Aula KiadoKft, Budapest.
- Drellings, O., 1999. *Motivacio Elmelet es Kutatas [Motivation Theory and Research]*. Vince KiadoKft, Budapest.
- Eysenck, M.W. and M.T. Keane, 1997. *Kognitiv Pszichologia [Cognitive Psychology]*. Nemzeti Tankonyvkiado, Budapest.
- Fabian, E., 2008. A motivacio es az osztonzesmenedzsment [Motivation and incentive management]. *Magyar Grafika*, 4: 77-79.
- Gursoy, D., T.A. Maier and C.G. Chi, 2008. Generational differences: An examination of work values and generational gaps in the hospitality workforce. *Int. J. Hosp. Manage.*, 27: 448-458.
- Gyori, M., 2000. A Tudomanyos Pszichologia Kialakulasa: Hagyományok, Hosok, Fordulopontok [The Development of Scientific Psychology: Traditions, Heores, Turning Points]. In: *Fejezetek a Pszichologia Alapteruleteibol [The Basic Fields of Psychology in Brief]*. Olah, A. and A. Bugan, (Eds.), ELTE Eotvos Kiado, Budapest, pp: 7-27.
- Hackman, J.R. and G.R. Oldham, 2005. *How Job Characteristics Theory Happened*. The Oxford Handbook of Management Theory: The Process of Theory Development. Oxford University Press, New York, pp: 151-170.
- Herzberg, F., B. Mausner and B.B. Synderman, 1959. *The Motivation to Work*. 1st Edn., Wiley, New York.
- Hunt, J.M., 1965. Intrinsic Motivation and Its Role in Psychological Development. In: *Nebraska Symposium on Motivation*, Volume 13, Levine, D. (Ed.), University of Nebraska Press, Lincoln, NE., pp: 189-282.
- Judge, T.A., C.J. Thoresen, J.E. Bono and G.K. Patton, 2001. The job satisfaction-job performance relationship: A qualitative and quantitative review. *Psychol. Bull.*, 127: 376-407.
- Jung, C.G., 1995. *Gesammelte Werke, Bd. 6: Psychologische Typen Taschenbuch-1995*. Walter-Verlag, Auflage, Dusseldorf.
- Kaplan, A., 2010. Intrinsic and extrinsic motivation. <http://www.education.com/reference/article/intrinsic-and-extrinsic-motivation/>.
- Kluckhohn, C. and H.A. Murray, 1953. *Personality in Nature, Society and Culture*. 2nd Edn., Knopf, New York, Pages: 701.
- Lencioni, P., 2009. *Kell egy csapat [The need for Teams]*. HVG Kiado Zrt, Budapest.
- Maccoby, M., 2010. *The human side: The 4rs of motivation*. Res. Technol. Manage.
- Marston, W.M., 1928. *Emotions of Normal People*. K. Paul, Trench, Trubner & Company Limited, London, Pages: 405.
- Maslow, A.H., 1943. A theory of human motivation. *Psychol. Rev.*, 50: 370-396.
- McClelland, D., 1965. Toward a theory of motive acquisition. *Am. Psychol.*, 20: 321-323.
- McGrego, D., 2006. *The Human Side of Enterprise*. 1st Edn., McGraw-Hill, New York, ISBN-13: 978-0071462228, Pages: 256.
- Medgyesi, M. and P. Robert, 2000. A Munkaval Valo Elegdettseg Nemzetkozi Osszehasonlitasban [Job Satisfaction-International Comparison]. In: *Tarsadalmi Riport 2000 [Social Report 2000]*, Kolosi, T., G.Y. Toth and G.Y. Vukovich (Eds.). TARKI., Budapest, pp: 591-616.
- Meehl, P.E., 1992. Needs (Murray, 1938) and state-variables (Skinner, 1938). *Psychol. Rep.*, 70: 407-450.
- Murray, H.A., 1938. *Explorations in Personality*. Oxford University Press, New York.
- Murray, H.A., 1940. What should psychologists do about psychoanalysis? *J. Abnormal Soc. Psychol.*, 35: 150-175.
- Myers, I.B., 1998. *Introduction to Type: A Guide to Understanding Your Results on the Myers-Briggs Type Indicator*. Center for Applications of Psychological Type, Gainesville, FL., ISBN-13: 978-9999650090.
- Parsons, E. and A. Broadbridge, 2006. Job motivation and satisfaction: Unpacking the key factors for charity shop managers. *J. Retailing Consum. Serv.*, 13: 121-131.
- Pierce, J.L., I. Jussila and A. Cummings, 2009. Psychological ownership within the job design context: Revision of the job characteristics model. *J. Organiz. Behav.*, 30: 477-496.
- Pinder, C.C., 2008. *Work Motivation in Organizational Behaviour*. 2nd Edn., Psychology Press, London, ISBN: 9780805856040, Pages: 587.
- Pink, D.H., 2009. *Drive: The Surprising Truth About What Motivates Us*. Penguin-Riverhead, New York.
- Plaminek, J., 2010. *Tajemstvi Motivace [The Secret of Motivation]*. GRADA Publishing, Praha.
- Portal, H.R., 2013. Az elegedettseg megeszi reggelire a motivaciot? [Does Satisfaction Kill Motivation?]. http://www.hrportal.hu/article_print.phtml?id=104093.

- Roazen, P., 2003. Interviews on Freud and Jung on Freud and Jung with Henry A. Murray in 1965. *J. Anal. Psychol.*, 48: 1-27.
- Roos, J. and B. Heidrich, 2013. *Vallalati gazdaságtan és menedzsment alapjai* [Introduction into business economics and management]. *Digitalis Könyvtár*, [Digital Library].
- Sellei, B., 2014. *Mitől lesz motivált egy munkavállaló?* [What makes an employee motivated?]. *HR/Munkajog* [HR/Labor Law] <http://www.munkajog.hu/rovatok/napi-hr/mitol-lesz-motivalt-egy-munkavallalo>.
- Skinner, B., 1953. *Science and Human Behavior*. Macmillan, New York.
- Taylor, F.W., 1911. *Shop Management*. Harper & Brothers, New York, London.
- Thomas, K.W., 2009. *Intrinsic Motivation at Work*. Berrett-Koehler Publishers Inc., San Francisco.
- Vincze, I., 2012. *A pénz nem motivál?-A motivációról Herzberg szemeivel* [Does money not motivate?-motivation according to Herzberg]. <http://www.magabiztos.hu/olvasnivalo/a-penz-nem-motival-a-motivacirol-herzberg-szemeivel/>.