

**SATISFACTION AT WORK: PERCEPTIONS AND EXPECTATIONS WITH THE
MOTIVATIONAL FACTORS**

**SATISFAÇÃO NO TRABALHO: PERCEPÇÕES E EXPECTATIVAS COM OS
FATORES MOTIVACIONAIS**

**SATISFACCIÓN EN EL TRABAJO: PERCEPCIONES Y EXPECTATIVAS CON LOS
FACTORES MOTIVACIONALES**

Cláudia Aparecida Avelar Ferreira

Doutora em Administração pela Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais (PUC-Minas)

Mário Teixeira Reis Neto

Doutor em Administração pela Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Professor Adjunto I da Universidade Fumec

Simone Costa Nunes

Doutora em Administração pela Universidade Federal de Minas Gerais

Professora adjunta IV da Pontifícia Universidade Católica de Minas Gerais

Artigo recebido em 08/08/2020. Revisado por pares em 18/10/2020. Reformulado em 20/10/2020. Recomendado para publicação em 22/08/2021, por Ademair Dutra (Editor Científico). Publicado em 31/08/2021. Avaliado pelo Sistema *double blind review*.

©Copyright 2021 UNISUL-PPGA/Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios. Todos os direitos reservados.

Permitida citação parcial, desde que identificada a fonte. Proibida a reprodução total.

Revisão gramatical, ortográfica e ABNT de responsabilidade dos autores.

ABSTRACT

The aim of this study was to identify the perceived motivational factors and expectations of different professionals in the public and private sectors, based on the theories of Herzberg and Vroom. The study used a quantitative and descriptive research survey, which showed that administration/marketing professionals had a significant perception regarding motivational factors ($p = 0.001$), being the most satisfied. Professionals working in the private sector were the most satisfied ($p = 0.003$). Therefore, the study showed how satisfaction is differentiated by career, education, employment bond, and gender.

Keywords: Satisfaction; Motivation; Dissatisfaction; Public sector; Private sector.

RESUMO

O objetivo do estudo foi identificar os fatores motivacionais percebidos e as expectativas de diferentes profissionais do setor público e privado. Foi utilizado a Teoria Herzberg e Vroom. O estudo foi delineado em uma pesquisa quantitativa, descritiva, um survey. O estudo mostrou que os profissionais de administração/marketing apresentaram percepção significativa em relação aos fatores motivacionais ($p = 0,001$), sendo os mais satisfeitos. Os profissionais que atuam no setor privado são os mais satisfeitos ($p = 0,003$). Por isso, o estudo mostrou como a satisfação é diferenciada pela carreira, educação, vínculo empregatício e gênero.

Palavras chave: Satisfação; Motivação; Insatisfação; Setor Público; Setor Privado.

RESUMEN

El objetivo del estudio fue identificar los factores motivacionales percibidos y las expectativas de los diferentes profesionales del sector público y privado. Se utilizó Teorías Herzberg y Vroom. El estudio fue una investigación cuantitativa y descriptiva, una encuesta. El estudio mostró que los profesionales de la administración/marketing tenían una percepción significativa con respecto a los factores motivacionales ($p = 0,001$), siendo los más satisfechos. Los profesionales que trabajan en el sector privado son los más satisfechos ($p = 0,003$). Por lo tanto, el estudio mostró cómo la satisfacción se diferencia por la carrera, la educación, el vínculo laboral y el género.

Palabras clave: Satisfacción; Motivación; Insatisfacción; Sector Público; Sector Privado.

1 INTRODUCTION

The satisfaction of professionals in contemporary organizations can be identified both by the importance that human capital has acquired as a competitive advantage for organizations, as well as from the process of humanization in labor relations.

Satisfaction is an important aspect of the organization, and complete employee satisfaction is a challenge for management. This situation rarely occurs due to unsatisfied needs perceived by employees who require new forms of motivation (PANG; LU, 2018; REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2018). There is a positive association between employee mood and job satisfaction (RUEDA *et al.*, 2010); therefore, emotions are an important factor of employee satisfaction (LOCKE, 1969, 1976; PEDRAZA, 2020).

Because satisfaction is important for workers and managers, identifying the perceptions and expectations of professionals, whether in the public or private sector, promotes the continuous support of work teams and reduces turnover. In the work context, perceived individual differences and labor characteristics can lead to differences in employee motivation, performance, and job satisfaction, in both the public and private sectors (REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2003; MANOLOPOULOS, 2008; PANG; LU, 2018).

In the public service sector, investigating motivation and satisfaction in the specific context is important because of their relationship with performance. The results of motivation studies help managers recognize the interrelationship between motivation in the public service and job satisfaction (DUARTE; TEIXEIRA; SOUSA, 2019), implement improvements in certain areas (VENTORINI; PAES; MARCHIORI, 2019), and remove barriers in people management practices and organizational behavior (OLIVEIRA; ESTIVALETE, 2019). In the private sector, Pang and Lu (2018) have demonstrated positive relationships between motivation, job satisfaction, financial and non-financial performance, high employee production, and quality of task performance.

Job satisfaction is related to motivational factors, whether in the public or private sector. Numerous studies have considered the public sector (BORZAGA; TORTIA, 2006; DECI; RYAN 2000; HONDEGHEM; WISE, 2010; JURKIEWICZ, MASSEY JR.; BROWN, 1998; MANOLOPOULOS, 2008; PERRY; WISE, 1990; RASHID; RASHID, 2012; RYAN; DECI, 2000; Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021).

VROOM, 1964; WESTOVER; TAYLOR, 2010). Studies in the private sector have included Vroom (1964), Jurkiewicz, Massey Jr. and Brown (1998), Rainey and Bozeman (2000), Rashid and Rashid (2012) and Pang and Lu (2018).

Ferreira *et al.* (2016) argued that the motivation of professionals is influenced by complex managerial and organizational factors, thereby necessitating the investigation of which factors add greater value and contribute to job satisfaction and organizational efficiency. Castro *et al.* (2016) and Ferreira *et al.* (2016) emphasized that identifying the motivation of professionals is a main objective of people management in organizations.

For both the public and private sectors, there is an open field in the academic research with respect to expectations regarding motivational factors and their relation to the perception of several professional categories in terms of satisfaction. This situation justifies the research.

The aim of this study was to identify the perceived motivational factors and expectations of different professionals in the public and private sectors. Identifying motivational factors can equip managers with various strategies with which to motivate their team of professionals. This study was conducted using the variables of the authors' research (REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2003; MANOLOPOULOS, 2008). The authors (REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2003; MANOLOPOULOS, 2008) applied in their study the theory of Herzberg (1968; 2003) and Vroom (1964). This study is important because it constitutes a timeless theme that can be contextualized for several labor markets.

2 THEORETICAL REFERENCES

2.1. JOB SATISFACTION

Work satisfaction is an emotional state that depends on the values of the individual and is composed of two phenomena: joy (satisfaction) and suffering (dissatisfaction) (Locke, 1969, 1976). Locke (1969) corroborated the findings of Weiss *et al.* (1967) that the job satisfaction and positive sense of well-being of professionals is derived from their own assessment of their work or the realization of their values through their activities. However, there is a dichotomy between values and needs: values differ from person to person because

they vary according to individual wants or perceptions of what is favorable, while needs, which are innate and common to all, refer to the individual's survival and well-being (LOCKE, 1969, 1976).

Satisfaction involves the emotions and attitudes of employees with respect to the goals and performance of organizations and can be defined in the following six ways, according to Pedraza (2020): a) a positive emotional state that is the product of employees' subjective evaluation of situations they experience during the performance of their work; b) employee perceptions concerning their functions and work context, based on their own evaluation of their performance during their stay in an organization; c) positive and negative feelings of employees concerning their work production and the gradual development of self-appreciation; d) an assessment by employees of rewards that fulfil their expectations and wishes, such as their position, remuneration, opportunities for promotion, and autonomy; e) an understanding of employees' emotions with respect to the actual benefits arising from their work and expectations, driven by their contributions to the organization; and f) various positive and negative emotions experienced by employees that contrast with the evaluation criteria of work experiences.

For Weiss *et al.* (1967), job satisfaction is a multidimensional concept with intrinsic and extrinsic qualities. It has been widely studied in academia (DECI; RYAN, 2000; HERZBERG; MAUSNER; SNYDERMAN, 1959; HERZBERG, 1971; HOPPOCK, 1935; LOCKE, 1969; ROSE, 2001; WEISS *et al.*, 1967), especially in relation to differences between the public and private sectors (BORGES, 2013; BRADLEY; DAVIS, 2013; WESTOVER; TAYLOR, 2010; TAYLOR; WESTOVER, 2011; WESTOVER, 2012).

Work satisfaction comprises both intrinsic and extrinsic dimensions (ROSE, 2001). The intrinsic dimension is qualitative and symbolic. It is of a personal nature and is represented by individual initiatives and relationships with superiors. The extrinsic dimension refers to the work environment, such as salary, promotions, job security, and other material or financial rewards (EUROPEAN FOUNDATION FOR THE IMPORTANCE OF LIVING AND WORKING CONDITIONS, 2007). The association of these dimensions is a goal for global satisfaction (DECI; RYAN, 2000). Westover and Taylor (2010) corroborated Deci and Ryan (2000) by emphasizing

that job satisfaction is a process that is constantly evolving owing to the fluidity of response to personal and environmental demands.

However, Herzberg's theory (1971) pointed out that satisfaction and dissatisfaction are related to the determinants of work, such as the environment, reward systems, and leadership. Vroom (1964, p.15) "stated that satisfaction is conditional on motivation, because motivation is the willingness to do act based on the ability to satisfy certain individual needs".

Work satisfaction is related to people's participatory and organizational behavior (OLIVEIRA; ESTIVALETE, 2019). Although satisfaction is not causally related to performance at work, it can be linked to organizational performance through low turnover and absenteeism (PINDER, 1998). Motivation and satisfaction in the workplace are influenced by the age of employees (MANOLOPOULOS, 2008), and managers and employers require appropriate strategies to keep their employees satisfied through improved interpersonal relationships, better task distribution, promotion of respect among employees, high productivity, and employee creativity (ROŽMAN; TREVEN; ČANČER, 2017).

Reis Neto and Marques (2018) agreed with Lawler III (2000, p. 79) in warning about the administrative myth that work satisfaction is a condition for motivation and performance. Satisfaction results from rewards that individuals receive, value, and feel good about. Therefore, satisfaction is best understood as a quality that is determined by the level of reward for the individual. Consequently, performance can lead indirectly to satisfaction if a reward is received. Remuneration is the main source of dissatisfaction in organizations (Lawler III, 2000; REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2003).

Several studies conducted as by (LAWLER III, 2000; MANOLOPOULOS, 2008; REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2003) showed that remuneration was the source of the greatest dissatisfaction in organizations, especially in the best practices of remuneration adopted in which the value of gain by employees is high. Individuals perceive satisfaction differently from other individuals, and over time, people adjust the working conditions that meet their needs. As a result, satisfaction can increase or decrease.

According to Harrison, Newman, and Roth (2006); Pang and Lu (2018); and Duarte, Teixeira, and Sousa (2019), satisfaction in the work context is aligned with other factors, such

Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

as colleagues, stress, supervision, and work–life balance. Raziqa and Maulabakhsha (2015) demonstrated a positive relationship between the work environment and the satisfaction of employees with work tasks; therefore, it is important that managers encourage growth and personal development. Chan and Mak (2016) identified a relationship between job satisfaction, trust, and enjoyment, indicating that having fun in the workplace led to confidence in middle management and satisfaction.

Satisfying professionals in organizations is a complex and dynamic process. Therefore, in our analysis, we sought to understand and measure the level of satisfaction and the expectations of professionals in relation to the motivational factors of work.

According to Vroom (1964), work motivation occurs when there is dissatisfaction; that is, the individual recognizes that a need is not being met. The model used in the current study provides an indication of propensity for action, considering that the greater the dissatisfaction (unmet need), the greater the propensity for action (REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2003).

Biodun, Din, and Abdulateef (2013) and Del Bosque and San Martin (2008) found a link between the concept of expectations and satisfaction, stating that “expectations have a positive and significant influence on satisfaction” (DELBOSQUE; SAN MARTIN, 2008, p. 566).

2.2 MOTIVATION IN THE PUBLIC AND PRIVATE SECTORS

Motivation is the desire to act, and motivation to work is composed of psychological processes that direct, energize, and maintain action to fulfil a task, function, or project (GRANT; SHIN, 2013).

This construct presents several definitions of motivation, such as that of Frohman (1996, p. 13), stating that motivation is induced by some external behavior. Individuals who are motivated make a greater effort to perform tasks than those who are not. Vroom (1964, p. 15), “states that the choices made by a person among alternative courses of action are lawfully related to psychological events occurring contemporaneously with the behavior.”

Lawler III (2000, p. 79) expanded Vroom’s definition that motivation for work stems from the importance of rewards and the degree to which rewards are related to specific performance or behavior. Motivation generates benefits for organizations, fosters human
Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

resources actions, increases staff efficiency, guides organizational achievement, builds friendly relationships, and ultimately leads to the stability of the workforce (AWOREMI; ABDUL-AZEEZ; DUROWOJU, 2011).

According to Vallerand and Ratell (2002), motivation is a multidimensional construct; therefore, a single concept is not sufficient to explain the behavior of the individual in various situations. It presents several global, contextual, and situational types and levels corresponding to a hierarchical model (DECI; RYAN, 2000).

According to Nohria, Groyberg, and Lee (2008), individuals present four motivational needs: conquest (reward system), values (culture), understanding (work project), and defense (performance management processes and resource allocation). Employee motivation is influenced by the complexity of the managerial and organizational factors.

For managers, one of the most challenging tasks is to motivate the team efficiently and successfully by increasing productivity. Therefore, to understand the work behavior of professionals, it is indispensable to know their needs and the factors that motivate them (KUMAR, 2012).

Given these theoretical perspectives on motivation, managers should be alert to motivational factors related to the intrinsic aspects of individuals that direct their behavior in different intensities and directions (REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2003). Between 1993 and 2003, Pinder and Latam (2005) evaluated which psychological theories since 1977 had predominated and showed that goal definition theories, social cognitive theories, and organizational justice theories were the most relevant in the motivation literature over the past 30 years.

Herzberg's (2003) two-factor theory analyzed motivation based on the individual's satisfaction with work. This theory complements Maslow's theory (1971) by reasoning that the external environment and work of the individual, not just the fulfilment of physiological needs, interfere with motivation and influence performance. Motivational factors (intrinsic) are those that effectively motivate the individual when they are present and within their control to perform and generate satisfaction. However, if they are absent, there will be great dissatisfaction (the work in Si, realization, recognition, progress, responsibility, growth). The Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

hygienic factors (extrinsic) are linked to the content of the job, the nature of the task, and the duties related to the position itself (working conditions, policy and administration of the company, salary, relationship with the supervisor, benefits, status, security, interpersonal relations, and social incentives) and are considered preventive: when they are appropriate, they generate satisfaction, and if they are not adjusted to the individual, they generate dissatisfaction (FERREIRA *et al.*, 2016; REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2018).

Pérez-Ramos (1990) pointed out that Herzberg (2003) has been greatly criticized; however, his theory is widespread due to its practicality and simplicity. It proposes practical solutions to improve satisfaction and performance levels but has been criticized as a limited, questionable method that applies a general measure of satisfaction. Herzberg proposed the technique of work enrichment, based on increasing the motivational factors in a position or group of positions, whereby professionals are given the responsibility of a task, but tasks are expanded to generate several tasks and avoid the inherent routine of the position (REIS NETO; MARQUES, 2018).

In expectancy theory (VROOM, 1964), motivation is a function of three beliefs: expectations (effort will lead to performance), instrumentality (performance leads to results), and Valence (the results are important or valuable). These three beliefs interact. The theory focuses on identifying the main psychological forces that guide decisions concerning the effort and the understanding of its consequences, rather than specifying its causes and fluctuations. In this way, much-desired rewards generate the likelihood of producing high levels of performance that require great effort. Remuneration is a factor that stimulates workers to engage in alternative, conscious behaviors. In general, the chosen behavior translates to added value for each individual (FERREIRA *et al.*, 2016).

The limitation of the expectancy theory is that it cannot justify the unexplained motivational variation that is fundamental to understanding other forces influencing motivation; it is seen as calculation because it is moderately effective for predicting motivation and behavior. It creates a caricature of how employees actually make decisions and experience motivation; it fails to specify the nature and sources of variation in employees' beliefs and judgments as well as how employees update and modify their beliefs over time. However, this theory was designed to diagnose and solve motivational problems in *Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios*, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

organizations despite its limitations and continues to be a popular and widely used theory (GRANT; SHIN, 2013).

The loss of reliability in public institutions has been happening gradually owing to a bureaucratic model that does not show efficiency and effectiveness for the population. Studies of motivation in the public sector have addressed the reasons for it, norms, and cognitive motives (MANOLOPOULOS, 2008; PERRY; HONDEGHEM; WISE, 2010; PERRY; WISE, 1990); public service missions (PERRY; WISE, 1990; WESTOVER; TAYLOR, 2010); goals and rewards (BORZAGA; TORTIA, 2006; DECI ; RYAN, 2000; RYAN; DECI, 2000; GIAUQUE; ANDERFUHREN-BIGET; VARONE, 2013; RODRIGUES; REIS NETO; GONÇALVES FILHO, 2014); work and content (MANOLOPOULOS, 2008; RASHID; RASHID, 2012); ethics (JURKIEWICZ; MASSEY JR.; BROWN, 1998); values and autonomy (VROOM, 1964); remuneration, interesting work, organizational justice, and good interpersonal relationships with colleagues and supervisors (CHATZOPOULOU; VLACHVEI; MONOVASILIS, 2015).

Private sector studies have also addressed motivation, linking goals, rewards, and motivation (RODRIGUES; REIS NETO; GONÇALVES FILHO, 2014); financial rewards (JURKIEWICZ; MASSEY JR.; BROWN, 1998; RAINEY; BOZEMAN, 2000; RASHID; RASHID, 2012); career development opportunities and supportive environments (RASHID; RASHID, 2012); and volunteering (JURKIEWICZ; MASSEY JR.; BROWN, 1998).

3 METHODOLOGY

This study comprised quantitative and descriptive research (BABBIE, 1999; COLLIS; HUSSEY, 2005). The factors were selected based on the 12 variables proposed by Manolopoulos (2008) and six variables proposed by Reis Neto and Marques (2003). In this survey, motivating factors were mainly identified based on the classic study conducted by Herzberg (1968), which was revalidated in 2003 (Harvard Business Review and work Jurgensen, 1978 (cit. Manopoulos, 2008) and Vroom (1965), which was revalidated in 1990 for Bass and Stogdill's (1974); Handbook of leadership: Theory, research, and managerial applications, 3rd, 1990). Validation of a revision to the Vroom/Yetton Model: First Evidence A. G. Jago, J. T. Ettlting, and V. H. 1965.

The variables proposed by Manolopoulos (2008) include provision of fair wages, provision of pay incentives, communication and cooperation in the working environment, opportunities for hierarchical advancement, security in the workplace, working conditions, opportunities to advance the field of the employee's expertise, the need for creative work, the need for esteem and reputation, recognition for work performed, the need for competence, and opportunities to take on responsibilities. The variables proposed by Reis Neto and Marques (2003) include remuneration, professional challenges, job content and tasks, benefits offered, growth prospects in the company, job security, power needs, possibilities of acquiring knowledge, the organizational environment, work facilities and equipment, work safety, the performance evaluation system, and the ways managers and employers manage employees. The variables proposed by these two sets of authors were combined, and 18 motivational factors were studied.

The demographic variables were: type of company - public/private; profession; gender - female, male, other; age - 18 to 25 years, 26 to 35 years, 36 to 45 years, 46 to 60 years, and 60 years or more; marital status - married, single, separated, divorced; employment bond - effective, contract, outsourced; the employee works only in this company - yes, no; education - elementary school, middle school, higher education, *lato sensu* specialization (MBA), and *stricto sensu* specialization (MA, PhD, other).

Given this context, two hypotheses were proposed based on the studies of Manolopoulos (2008) in the public sector and Reis Neto and Marques (2003) in the private sector. Satisfaction was the dependent variable, and motivational factors (expectations) were independent variables.

H1: It is hypothesized that there will be significant differences between expectations and perceptions between professionals' specific groups.

H2: It is hypothesized that the demographic variables will influence expectations and perceptions between professionals' specific groups.

To measure expectations, an electronic questionnaire composed of 18 items that consisted of two questions per item was applied using a five-point Likert-type scale, ranging

from (1) “nothing important” to (5) “very important” and for perception from (1) “very unsatisfactory” to (5) “very satisfactory.”

Convenience sampling was used to collect the data of professionals working in public sector and private sector organizations. The inclusion criterion was as follows: active professional, independent of the time in the position/task and employment bond with organization. The exclusion criteria were those under the age of 18 and workers’ informal. The convenience sample covered the public and private sectors in Brazil, Argentina, Peru, Colombia, and Portugal.

The questionnaire was sent by email using a snowball sampling technique (VINUTO, 2014), which is a chain-referral system that requests recipients to pass on a questionnaire to other potential people in a network. It sought to know and understand the expectations (understood as a need or motivational element) and the corresponding perception of these factors by professionals in the public and private sectors. This study was approved by the Ethics Committee of Fumec University/Brazil CEP: 46315615.7.0000.5155.

The questionnaire was structured based on that of Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry (1990) aimed at researching the degree of customer satisfaction with the quality of services provided (perception); however, it can be used for the measurement of any type of employee reaction (HAYES, 2001: vii), such as tourism expectations (BIODUN; DIN; ABDULATEEF, 2013). To calculate satisfaction, the following expression was used:

Satisfaction is equal to perception minus expectation, that is, $[Satisfaction] = [Perception] - [Expectation]$ (HAYES, 2001).

According to Zeithaml, Parasuraman, and Berry (1990), when perception is smaller than expected, dissatisfaction occurs. Expectation refers to a motivational need or factor that is or is not important. Perception, according to Reis Neto and Marques (2003), is subjective, selective, simplifying, limited in time, and cumulative.

The SPSS 21 software, Minitab v.17, was used for the data interpretation. We calculated: 1. validation of the questionnaire (Cronbach’s alpha); 2. descriptive statistics, Student’s t-test, and Pearson’s linear correlation; 3. Tukey test, and 4. linear regression. The

Tukey test was performed for the study variables, with significance for the data in terms of both perceptions and expectations. The tests were corrected using the Bonferroni correction (1935, 1936). Linear regression with dichotomous variables shows the size of the effect of one category over another. The Cronbach's alpha for the 36 items of the study corresponded to 0.89, indicating an acceptable internal reliability (NUNNALLY, 1978). The Student's t-test was applied where there was a low representation of the professional categories. The variables were adjusted because the items were unwell distributed: Q22, Q32, Q42, Q52, Q62, Q71, Q72, Q82, Q92, Q102, Q112, Q122, Q132, Q142, Q152, Q161, Q162, Q172, Q181, and Q182.

A total of 167 professionals from different areas participated in the study because of missing data. The exploratory factor analysis detected a low number of people in the sample, causing poorly distributed items. The grouping of professionals by large areas was adopted consecutively as an example: pharmaceuticals, psychologists, physicians, nurses, biochemists, and health professionals. The effective employment bond category refers to the position of the public servant.

4 RESULTS

There was most of some professionals, as follows: female (51.2%), working in only one job (79.4%), belonging to the public sector (52.4%), aged between 26 and 35 years old (37.6%); married (51.8%); with effective employment bond (80%); with higher education (30.0%), and administration/marketing professionals (41.2%).

Table 1 shows the demographic variables for perception and expectations.

Table 1 – Demographic variables for perception and expectations.

Variables	Perception					Expectation				
	n	Average	SD ^a	t	p	n	Average	SD ^a	t	p
Gender										
Female	87	3,35	0,67	- 2,66	0,009***	87	4,47	0,41	0,57	0,568
Male	83	3,62	0,69			83	4,44	0,33		
WOC										
No	35	3,44	0,77	- 0,35	0,725	35	4,47	0,32	0,31	0,758
Yes	135	3,49	0,67			135	4,45	0,39		
Sector										
Private	80	3,64	0,63	3,00	0,003**	80	4,45	0,34	- 0,27	0,789
Public	89	3,33	0,71			89	4,46	0,40		
Age										

	Perception					Expectation				
18 to 25 years	14	3,56 _a	0,78	0,37	0,827	14	4,50 _a	0,30	0,22	0,925
26 to 35 years	64	3,44 _a	0,68			64	4,47 _a	0,39		
36 to 45 years	40	3,58 _a	0,68			40	4,46 _a	0,28		
46 to 60 years	46	3,42 _a	0,70			46	4,41 _a	0,44		
60 years or more	6	3,47 _a	0,61			6	4,41 _a	0,40		
Marital Status										
Single	50	3,44 _a	0,73	1,55	0,203	50	4,45 _a	0,38	0,75	0,523
Married	88	3,57 _a	0,70			88	4,43 _a	0,40		
Separated/Divorced	17	3,39 _a	0,43			17	4,45 _a	0,22		
Other	15	3,20 _a	0,61			15	4,59 _a	0,33		
Employment bond										
Effective	136	3,42 _a	0,68	2,69	0,071*	136	4,46 _a	0,37	3,84	0,024**
Contract	24	3,74 _a	0,72			24	4,51 _a	0,37		
Outsourced	10	3,68 _a	0,53			10	4,15 _b	0,26		
Education										
Elementary / Middle School	17	3,57 _a	0,58	2,53	0,042**	17	4,31 _a	0,66	0,97	0,426
Higher education	51	3,31 _a	0,72			51	4,46 _a	0,33		
Specialization	39	3,38 _a	0,72			39	4,46 _a	0,37		
MA	40	3,68 _a	0,70			40	4,52 _a	0,28		
PhD	21	3,70 _a	0,45			21	4,42 _a	0,34		
Career										
Administration / Marketing Prof.	70	3,74 _a	0,64	9,25	0,000***	70	4,47 _a	0,43	0,70	0,595
Social Communication Prof	14	3,14 _{b, c}	0,81			14	4,44 _a	0,30		
Education Prof.	26	3,73 _{a, b}	0,37			26	4,50 _a	0,25		
Health Prof.	52	3,16 _c	0,66			52	4,43 _a	0,36		
Other Prof.	8	3,04 _{b, c}	0,65			8	4,26 _a	0,34		

Note: * Significant at 0.10; **Significant at 0.05; ***Significant at 0.001; Tests made on MINITAB 17; ^a Group standard deviation

Source: Data by the Authors. Legend: WOC - Works Only in the Company. Prof. - Professional

The analysis of the data in Table 1 indicates the following results, discussed according to the questions and hypotheses proposed for the study.

Each professional category perceived motivational factors consensually. Therefore, in an organization, managers must seek to know what motivates their team. Given the heterogeneity of the professional categories, they should avoid standardizing certain attitudes, to enable them to be satisfied.

H1 - It is hypothesized that there will be significant differences between expectations and perceptions between professionals' specific groups. *Confirmed*. The study showed that there was a relationship between the perceptions of administration/marketing professionals, who presented a significant perception regarding motivational factors ($p < 0.001$) but that was not significant in relation to expectations ($p = 0.595$).

Participant's diversity in the study influenced the perception and expectations of motivational factors, highlighting the variables of gender, education, and employment bond, which were significant. Lower perception led to lower satisfaction, and as shown in Table 1, for all variables, professionals generally tended to have lower satisfaction.

H2 – It is hypothesized that the demographic variables will influence expectations and perceptions between professionals' specific groups. *Confirmed*, but only for the variables of gender, employment bond, and education. For the other variables, there was no correlation. The study showed that female professionals were more dissatisfied because they presented a significant perception ($p < 0.05$) of motivational factors. As the p-value was equal to 0.009, there was a difference between the two averages, with the male average being higher than the female average (3.62 versus 3.35). Therefore, because satisfaction is perceived as perception any less expectations, the lower the perception, the lower the satisfaction. There was no significant difference between the genders for expectations, as the averages were practically the same (female 4.47 vs. male 4.44).

As for the employment bond, effective professionals were more dissatisfied with the motivational factors for a significant perception ($p < 0.10$). With respect to education level, professionals with a PhD were more satisfied, followed by those with elementary or middle school education (more than seven years of schooling) with satisfaction for a significant perception ($p < 0.01$) and non-significant expectations ($p > 0.05$).

5 ANALYSIS

The study findings did not corroborate those of studies showing that women tended to show higher satisfaction with work, even in unfavorable conditions (KIFLE; DESTA, 2012). In relation to professionals with less education, second in level of satisfaction, the result can be explained by Abraham Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs Theory, which was based on the Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

understanding of the man inserted in the society and not only in the work environment. Regarding the results found for professionals with a PhD, the explanation may come from Vroom's theory (1964), as there may have been an interaction between the three beliefs: expectations (the effort will lead to performance), instrumentality (the performance will lead to results), and valence (the results are important or valuable).

Therefore, administration/marketing professionals were the most satisfied. Satisfaction can vary between professional categories by individual and country (TAYLOR; WESTOVER, 2011). Westover and Taylor (2010) corroborated Deci and Ryan's (2000) study by emphasizing that job satisfaction is a process that is constantly evolving due to the fluidity of response to personal and environmental demands. Bradley and Davis (2013) demonstrated that the meaning of tasks and support for career development was significantly positively related to job satisfaction.

There was a relationship between expectations and perceptions in the case of private sector professionals. They were more satisfied than professionals in the public sector in terms of perception ($p < 0.05$), but the result was not significant for expectations ($p > 0.05$). These data reinforce the empirical evidence that professionals in the public sector are generally less satisfied (BORGES, 2013). In this case, it is necessary to evaluate the context and content of work (MANOLOPOULOS, 2008).

Most of the professionals were dissatisfied, leading us to wonder what is happening in organizations and seeming to justify a change in strategy and a new model of human resource management practice that adds value to professionals, improves the internal and external equity and efficiency of organizations, especially public institutions, whose work stability is guaranteed by specific legislation. Satisfaction is favored by the combination of remuneration with loyalty and the work process (BORZAGA; TORTIA, 2006, CHATZOPOULOU; VLACHVEI; MONOVASILIS, 2015).

As expected, in the Tukey test, there was a difference between who has the employment bond by contract and who is effective. However, in the case of those with an outsourced relationship (contract with a legal entity), there was a difference both in contract (in Brazil, the organization makes a temporary contract with the individual to attend

emergency cases, especially in the public service) and effective. Regarding education, age, and marital status, there were no significant difference between level and perception and expectations. In terms of the career, the perception of social communication professionals showed a difference when compared to education professionals and other professionals. There were also differences between administration and education professionals and between social communication professionals, health professionals, and other professionals. However, there was no difference between the categories in terms of expectations. This demonstrated that there are different perceptions among professional categories.

The findings of Marques and Reis Neto (2003) showed that private sector intrinsic rewards are more critical points. Manolopoulos (2008) showed that extrinsic rewards are more liked than intrinsic rewards; however, they were intrinsically related to better organizational outcomes, as demonstrated by Herzberg (2003).

6 FINAL CONSIDERATIONS

The aim of this study was to identify the perceived motivational factors and expectations of different professionals in the public and private sectors. This study fills a gap in academic research on expectations regarding motivational factors and relates them to the perception of several professional categories in the public and private sectors in relation to satisfaction.

The study showed that administration/marketing professionals had a significant perception regarding motivational factors ($p = 0.001$) and were the most satisfied. Professionals working in the private sector were the most satisfied ($p = 0.003$). The relationship between perception and expectations was significantly confirmed for the variables of male gender, outsourced employment bond, and education equal to higher education and PhD, being those that are satisfied in general. For the other variables, there was no relation; therefore, they did not present satisfaction, and the motivational factors were not considered important.

Contributions: The results of the survey showed that the satisfaction of professionals should be investigated and the difficulties that managers and leaders have in motivating their teams. Motivational factors, which do not generate costs for the organization and can lead to Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

efficiency, must be retaken, such as the recognition of the professional, treatment in the subordinate/managerial relationship, and clear communication. In satisfaction studies, it is important to measure perceptions and expectations, which are not found in most studies.

Limitations: Some variables related to Q3 were not answered by all professionals. The number of participants may also be a limiting factor for a more robust analysis and greater significance among the variables. The study did not investigate mood, which may have influenced the research.

Suggestions: It is necessary, in future studies, to conduct further research in relation to the employment bond, which was the variable that showed significance in satisfaction (perception) and was considered important (expectations). It is necessary to investigate the influence of education on the perception and expectations of job satisfaction because there was disagreement between the statistical tests.

REFERENCES

- AWOREMI, J. R.; ABDUL-AZEEZ, I. A.; DUROWOJU, S. T. Empirical study of the motivational factors of employees in Nigeria. **International Journal of Economics & Finance**, v. 3, n. 5, p. 227-233, Oct. 2011.
- BABBIE, E. **Métodos de Pesquisas de Survey**. Belo Horizonte: Editora UFMG, 1999.
- BIODUN A. B.; DIN, A. K. H; ABDULATEEF, A. O. The relationship between tourist expectation, perceived quality and satisfaction with tourism products. **International Business Management**, v.7, n. 3, p. 158-164, 2013.
- BONFERRONI, C. E. **O cálculo das assistências no grupo de teste:** em Studi em Onore del Professore, Salvatore Ortu Carboni. Roma: Bardi, 1935.
- BONFERRONI, C. E. Teoria estatística das classes e cálculo das probabilidades. **Publicações do Instituto Superior de Ciências Econômicas e Comerciais de Florença**, v. 8, pp.3-62, 1936.
- BORGES, R. Are public officials really less satisfied than private sector workers? A comparative study in Brazil. **Public Administration Journal**, Rio de Janeiro, v. 47, n. 6, p. 1477-1496, nov./dez., 2013.
- BORZAGA, C.; TORTIA, E. Worker motivations, job satisfaction and nonprofit social services. **Nonprofit and Voluntary Sector Quarterly**, v. 35, n. 2, p. 225 – 248, Jun. 2006.
- BRADLEY E.W.; DAVIS, B.S. Job satisfaction in the public sector: The role of the work environment. **The American Review of Public Administration**, v. 33, n. 3, p.70-90, 2013.
- Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

CASTRO, M. L. M. *et al.* Values, motivation, commitment, performance and rewards: performance analysis model. **Business Process Management Journal**, v. 22, n. 6, p. 1139–1169, 2016.

CHAN, S.C.H.; MAK, W-M. Have you experienced fun in the workplace? An empirical study of workplace fun, trust-in-management, and job satisfaction. **Journal of Chinese Human Resource Management**, v. 7, n. 1, p. 27-38, 2016.

CHATZOPOULOU, M.; VLACHVEI, A.; MONOVASILIS, TH. Employee's motivation and satisfaction considering economic recession; evidence of Grevena Prefecture Greece. **Procedia Economics and Finance**, v. 24, p. 136-145, Jul. 2015.

COLLIS, J.; HUSSEY, R. **Pesquisa em administração: um guia prático para alunos de graduação e Pós-graduação**. 2 ed. Porto Alegre: Bookman, 2005.

DECI, E.L.; RYAN, R.M. The “what” and “why” of goal pursuits: human needs and the self-determination of behavior. **Psychological Inquiry**, v.11, n. 4, p. 227-268, 2000.

DEL BOSQUE, I.R.; SAN MARTÍN, H. Tourist satisfaction a cognitive-affective model. **Annals of Tourism Research**, v. 35, n.2, p. 551-573, Apr. 2008.

DUARTE, R.L.; TEIXEIRA, A.; SOUSA, L.G. A relação entre a motivação e a satisfação no trabalho dos servidores públicos. **Recap- Revista de Carreiras e Pessoas**, v. 9, n. 3, p. 393-413, set. /dez. 2019.

EUROPEAN FOUNDATION FOR THE IMPROVEMENT OF LIVING AND WORKING CONDITIONS. **Measuring Job Satisfaction in Surveys-comparative analytical report**, Dublin, 2007. Available in: <http://www.eurofound.eu.int>. Access in: 19 Nov. 2013.

FERREIRA, C.A.A. *et al.* Motivation and rewards to health professional. **Revista Gestão & Planejamento**, Salvador, v. 17, n.1, p. 41-58, 2016.

FROHMAN, M.A. Unleash urgency and action. **Industry Week**, Cleveland, v. 245, n. 20, p. 13-23, 1996.

GIAUQUE, D.; ANDERFUHREN-BIGET, S.; VARONE, F. HRM practices, intrinsic motivators, and organizational performance in the public sector. **Public Personnel Management**, v. 42, n. 2, p. 123-150, 2013.

GRANT, A.M.; SHIN, J. Work motivation: directing, energizing, and maintaining effort (and research). *In*: RYAN, R. M. (ed.). **Oxford Handbook of Motivation**. Oxford: Oxford University Press, 2013.

HACKMAN, J.R.; OLDFHAM, G. R. Motivation through the design of work: test of a theory. **Organizational Behavior and Human Performance**, v. 16, p. 250-279, Aug. 1976.

HARRISON, D. A.; NEWMAN, D. A.; ROTH, P. L. How important are job attitudes? Meta-analytic comparisons of integrative behavioral outcomes and time sequences. **Academy of Management Journal**, v. 49, n. 2, p. 305-325, 2006.

Revista Eletrônica de Estratégia & Negócios, Florianópolis, v.14, n. 2, mai./ago. 2021.

HAYES, B. E. **Measuring customer satisfaction**: development and use of questionnaires. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 2001.

HERZBERG, F. One more time: how to motivate employees? (Classic). **Harvard Business Review**, v. 81, n.1, p. 87-96, 2003.

HERZBERG, F. **Work and the nature of man**. 4th ed. Cleveland: World Publish in, 1971.

HERZBERG, F. Una vez más, cómo se hace para motivar a los empleados. **Harvard Business Review**, v. 1, n.13, p. 1-13, 1968.

HERZBERG, F.; MAUSNER, B.; SNYDERMAN, B.B. **The motivation to work**. 2th ed. New York: John Wiley & Sons, 1959.

HOPPOCK, R. **Job satisfaction**. New York: Harper Brothers, 1935.

JURKIEWICZ, C.L.; MASSEY JR, T.K.; BROWN, R.G. Motivation in Public and Private Organizations: A Comparative Study. **Public Productivity & Management Review**, v.21, n. .3, p. 230-250, Mar. 1998.

KIFLE, T.; DESTA, I. H. Gender differences in domains of job satisfaction: evidence from doctoral graduates from Australian Universities. **Economic Analysis & Policy**, v. 42, n. 3, p. 319-338, Dec. 2012.

KUMAR, S.S. Motivation as a strategy to enhance organizational productivity. **Advances in Management**, v. 5, n. 7, p. 24-27, 2012.

LATAM, G.P.; PINDER, C.C. Work motivation theory and research at the dawn of the twenty-first century. **Annu. Rev. Psychol.**, v. 56, p. 485-516, 2005.

LAWLER III, E.E. **Rewarding excellence**: paying strategies for the new economy. San Francisco: Jossey-Bass, 2000.

LOCKE, E. A. What is job satisfaction? **Organizational Behavior Human Performance**, v. 4, n. 4, p. 309-336, 1969.

LOCKE, E. A. The nature and causes of job satisfaction. *In*: DUNNETTE, M.D (ed.). **Handbook of industrial and organizational psychology**, Chicago: Rand McNally, 1976. p. 1297-1349

MANOLOPOULOS, D. *Work motivation in the Hellenic extended public sector: an empirical investigation*. **The International Journal of Human Resource Management**, v. 9, n. 9, p.1738-1762, 2008.

NOHRIA, N.; GROYSBERG, B; LEE, L.E. *Employee motivation: a powerful new model*. **Harvard Business Review**, v. 86, n.10, p.133-134, 2008.

NUNNALLY, J. **Psychometric Theory**. New York, NY: McGraw-Hill, 1978.

OLIVEIRA, M.J.; ESTIVALETE, V.F.B. Consequentes de motivação do serviço público: proposição de um framework de análise em organizações públicas brasileiras. **Administração Pública e Gestão Social**, v.11, n. 4, p.1-17, set. /dez. 2019.

PANG, K.; LU, C-S. Organizational motivation, employee job satisfaction and organizational performance: An empirical study of container shipping companies in Taiwan. **Maritime Business Review**, v. 3, n.1, p. 36-52, 2018.

PEDRAZA, N. A. El clima y la satisfacción laboral del capital humano: factores diferenciados en organizaciones públicas y privadas. **Innovar**, v. 30, n. 76, p. 9-24, abr. 2020.

PÉREZ-RAMOS, J. *Motivação no trabalho: abordagens teóricas*. **Psicologia da Universidade de São Paulo**, v.1, n. 2, p.127-140, dez. 1990.

PERRY, J. L.; WISE, L. R. The motivational bases of public service. **Public Administration Review**, v. 50, n. 3, p. 367–373,1990.

PERRY, J.; HONDEGHEM, L.; WISE, L. R. Revisiting the motivational bases of public service: Twenty years of research and an agenda for the future. **Public Administration Review**, v. 70, n. 5, p. 681-690, Sep./Oct. 2010.

PINDER, C.C. **Work motivation in organizational behavior**. Upper Saddle River, NJ: Prentice Hall, 1998.

RAINEY, H.G.; BOZEMAN, B. Comparing public and private organizations: empirical research and the power of a priori. **Journal of Public Administration Research and Theory**, v. 10, n. 2, p. 447-470, Apr. 2000.

RASHID, S.; RASHID, U. Work motivation differences between public and private sector. **American International Journal of Social Science**, v.1, n. 2, p. 24-33, Dec. 2012.

RAZIQA, A.; MAULABAKHSHA, R. Impact of Working Environment on Job Satisfaction. **Procedia Economics and Finance**, v. 23, p. 717-725, 2015.

REIS NETO, M.T.; MARQUES, A.L. The satisfaction of computer professionals with motivational factors: a study about expectations and perceptions. **Revista de Negócios**, v. 8, n. 4, p. 1-16, 2003.

REIS NETO, M.T.; MARQUES, A.L. A motivação no trabalho: conceitos e teorias clássicas. In: REIS NETO, M.T (org.), **Motivação: teoria e pesquisa aplicada à gestão de pessoas**. Rio de Janeiro: Qualitymark, 2018. p. 3-33

RODRIGUES, W. A.; REIS NETO, M.T.; GONÇALVES FILHO, C. Influences on motivation to work in environments with goals and rewards: a study in the public sector. **Public Administration Journal**, v. 48, n. 1, p. 253-273, 2014.

ROSE, M. **Disparate measures in the workplace. Quantifying overall job satisfaction**. 2001. Paper presented at the 2001 British Household Panel Survey Research Conference,

Colchester. Available in: <http://citeseerx.ist.psu.edu/viewdoc/download?> Access in: 15 Aug. 2013.

ROŽMAN, M., TREVEN, S.; ČANČER, V. Motivation and Satisfaction of Employees in the Workplace. **Business Systems Research**, v. 8, n. 2, p. 14-25, 2017.

RUEDA, F. J. M. *et al.* Escala de suporte laboral (ESUL) e Escala de satisfação no trabalho: evidências de validade. **Avaliação Psicológica**, Porto Alegre, v. 9, n. 3, p. 479-488, dez. 2010.

RYAN, R.M.; DECI, E.L. The darker and brighter sides of human existence: basic psychological needs as a unifying concept. **Psychological Inquiry**, v.11, n. 4, p. 319-338, 2000.

TAYLOR, J.; WESTOVER, J. H. Job Satisfaction in the public service: The effects of public service motivation, workplace attributes and work relations. **Public Management Review**, v. 13, n. 5, p. 731-753, 2011.

VALLERAND, R. J.; RATELL, C.F. Motivação intrínseca e extrínseca: uma hierarquia do modelo. *In*: DECI, E.L.; RYAN, R. M. **Handbook of Self – Determination Research**. Rochester: The University of Rochester Press, 2002.

VENTORINI, C.C.; PAES, C.O.; MARCHIORI, D.M. O impacto da participação e da motivação na satisfação com o trabalho: evidências do setor público. **Pretexto**, Belo Horizonte, v. 20, n. 3, p. 68-82, jul. /set. 2019.

VINUTO, J. A amostragem em bola de neve na pesquisa qualitativa: um debate em aberto. **Temáticas**, v. 22, n. 44, p. 203-220, 2014.

VROOM, V.H. **Work and motivation**. New York: Wiley, 1964.

WEISS, D.J. *et al.* **Manual for the Minnesota satisfaction questionnaire**. Minneapolis: University of Minnesota, 1967.

WESTOVER, J.H.; TAYLOR, J. International differences in job satisfaction: the effects of public service motivation, rewards, and work relations. **International Journal of Productivity & Performance Management**, v. 59, n. 8, p. 811-828, 2010.

WESTOVER, J.H. Comparative international differences in intrinsic and extrinsic job quality characteristics and worker satisfaction, 1989-2005. **International Journal of Business and Social Science**, v. 3, n.7, p.1-15, 2012.

ZEITHAML, V.A.; PARASURAMAN, A.; BERRY, L.L. **Delivering Quality Service: balancing customer perceptions and expectations**. New York: The Free Press, 1990.