



MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION IN THE NATIONAL SECURITY ENVIRONMENT

Irina IOANA*
Constantin-Edmond CRACSNER**

This research has studied the relation between motivation and job satisfaction in a national security organization. Two questionnaires for motivation and professional satisfaction were used as assessment tools. The research group consisted of 80 militaries, respectively 80 civilian subjects representing the control group. Several types of relations were studied, considered relevant for the study objectives, such as: the relation between work motivation and management satisfaction and interpersonal relationships within the team, with respect to work organization and functional communication; the relation between the motivation for accomplishment through work and the degree of salary satisfaction, rewards and career advancement opportunities; the relation between the levels of general satisfaction and the motivation for accomplishment through work; the relation between the higher levels of satisfaction with work organization and functional communication, respectively with management and interpersonal relationships of the military group, compared to the control group of civilian employees. The results of this research have some practical value, advancing the possibility that some conclusions can be assimilated in the human resources policies of national security institutions, in order to optimize staff motivation and maximize performance.

Keywords: motivational dominants; professional satisfaction; human resources; national security.

The global theoretical study of the relationship between motivation and professional satisfaction is not, at this stage of knowledge, a matter of novelty. What are endeavouring, through this study, is to highlight the way in which the motivation-satisfaction relation works concretely in one of the of the national security structures, in order to streamline the professional training and preparation process.

Clear understanding of all research presented in this study involves, first of all, a general problem of conceptual delimitation on motivation and satisfaction in the military profession and, secondly, a problem of methodology, highlighting the specifics and particularities between motivation and satisfaction in the national security system.

Classical theories of motivation are based on personal needs analysis^{1,2,3,4}, equity theory⁵, expectation theory⁶, interactionist theories, respectively the force field theory⁷ and the individual-environment relational theory^{8,9}.

In a very general definition, motivation is

*, „Mihai Viteazul” National Intelligence Academy

e-mail: ioana.irina@animv.eu

** Ecological University of Bucharest

e-mail: edmond.cracsner@gmail.com

a "great category of internal determinations of behaviours, psychological activities, and subjective states, which explains and justifies a person's action" (larousse.fr/dictionnaire/).

From the perspective of the human needs' theory pyramidally hierarchic (physiological, security, social, self-esteem and self-realization), these needs are in themselves motivation sources, due to the fact that they require to be satisfied, and when a need has been met, the need for higher level will become a new source of motivation^{10,11,12}. Criticized^{13,14,15} or revised^{16,17,18,19} the human needs' theory remains a benchmark in explaining the relation between work motivation, satisfaction, and performance. In the same sense, it is estimated that there is a constellation of factors determinants of satisfaction, some of which are largely related to professional activity (career, promotion, job content; responsibility; performance; feeling of power, etc.) and are considered motor factors or intrinsic, and others related to the work environment (personnel policy, working conditions, job security, interpersonal relationships, salary and rewards, social benefits, etc.), are considered hygiene factors²⁰. Over time, studies have been conducted that have either refuted²¹, or confirmed^{22,23} Herzberg's assertions. In another approach it is



considered that the main agents of motivation are represented by: the need for self-fulfilment through success and self-surpassing; the need for power through the realisation of the desire to influence and to lead others; the need for affiliation or association by establishing, maintaining and strengthening a positive emotional relationship with others²⁴. A later study demonstrated the importance of motivation, incentive value and probability of success for predicting the achievement of performance and of the frequency the affiliation acts are performed. Both theory and research lead to the following conclusions: the force of motivation, especially in relation to the force of other personal factors, is the most important determinant of the frequency of the operative act; the value of the incentive is the most important determinant of cognition-based choices; driving force and the probability of success is combined multiplicatively to predict the strength or the probability of the response; all determinants and the highlighted interaction represent collectively over 75% of the variation of operators, such as frequency of the affiliated acts. The rest of the variation is easily attributable to environmental opportunities²⁵. Survival needs²⁶ are identified (material and physiological needs), relational needs (needs of esteem and belonging) and needs development or growth (self-fulfillment, self-realization, taking responsibility) expressed synthetically by the acronym ERG. An applied study of this theory highlighted the causal relationship between meeting human needs, performance at work and individual personality differences (self-esteem) both for managers, and for employees²⁷. Another study, conducted in the military, proposed three new concepts to be included in the relation category (respect from the organization, respect for the supervisor, the need for personal freedom). For this purpose, a questionnaire, on the concepts of existing and proposed needs, was created and administered on a number of 630 soldiers of 11 types of organizational structures in the US naval forces. The results were subjected to factor analysis and regression analysis which confirmed both empirical validity, as well as the predictive power of the concept of organizational respect. At the same time, the statistical analysis of the results rejected the other two proposed concepts but provided unexpected support for the discussion of two new relation concepts²⁸. The literature offers numerous

other studies regarding the relation between the components reflected by the ERG theory^{29,30,31}.

From the perspective of the equity theory, it is stated that, always, people compare the efforts made and the rewards obtained at work with the efforts and results of another relevant person or group. This comparison emphasizes the quality of the exchange, starting from the premise that the proof of fairness contributes to job satisfaction, while unfairness is perceived as inequity that generates job dissatisfaction^{32,33,34,35}.

From the expectations' theory perspective, it is considered that any motivated behaviour is the product of certain key variables, such as: expectation or anticipation, a foreseeable outcome as a result of an action; instrumentality or the ability to resolve; valence or attractiveness and the individual importance of work³⁶. Subsequent studies have revealed the importance of motivated behaviour and of its determining factors^{37,38,39,40,41,42}.

The described perspectives (needs theory, expectations theory, equity theory) have one thing in common, that they mainly focus on the individual.

The literature shows that there are other perspectives centered on the idea that motivation is born when the individual meets their environment. A perspective is provided by field theory, which considers the motivation of the individual to be generated by the attractions or barriers present in the environment where their activity takes place⁴³. The fundamental idea is that this theory can be a tool for the integration of various divergent physiological, psychological, and sociological aspects on an interdependent basis, explaining social behavior as the result of the interaction between a structure of a total situation and the distribution of all the forces present in its field⁴⁴. The force field theory has found a wide applicability in various research areas, such as organizational, economic, educational, sociological, psychological, etc.^{45,46,47,48} Another perspective considers that the basic unit to be studied is neither the individual nor the environment, but the interaction between the individual and the environment, which generates the real motivations⁴⁹. The conceptual model of human motivation is presented in terms of behavioral, interactional and relational, where motivation is the result of cognitive processing in behavioral action plans of dynamics or individual needs⁵⁰. This model of dynamic behavior achieved

in three interactional phases (motivation, planning, action) aroused great interest for disciplines such as sociology, education, law, economics, psychiatry, clinical psychology, medicine, philosophy, sports and others^{51,52,53}.

Given these theories of the interaction between motivation, satisfaction and performance, with their inherent advantages and limitations, we aim to study how they can be applied, in their essence, to the specifics of the military organization environment.

Objectives

The purpose of this research is to investigate the relation between motivation and professional satisfaction dimensions in the specific military structures of the national security system⁵⁴.

The research objectives are constrained by three obvious areas of professional and scientific concern, respectively theoretical, methodological, and practical-applicative⁵⁵.

The theoretical objective was to test some hypotheses resulting from the postulates on the relation between motivation and satisfaction advanced by some of the field specific theories.

The methodological objective aimed at the concrete approach assumed by any empirical investigation in the field of organizational psychology, including randomization groups of subjects, the choice and application of the research tools consecrated from the specialized literature, the explanation of the instructions and experimenting in direct contact with subjects on the field, creating thus, an adequate research design and statistical processing.

The practical-applicative objective advanced the possibility that some of the conclusions of the research can be transmitted and used in human resources policies of the national security system organizations, in order to increase the level of motivation and professional satisfaction of the staff and, implicitly, their performance.

Method

Hypotheses

The research aimed at testing in two groups – a research group (military) and a control group (civilians) – following the basic assumptions of the literature on the relations between motivation

and satisfaction, the following hypotheses being formulated:

- H_1 – The more satisfied they are with the management and the interpersonal relationships in group, respectively by the manner of work organization and the functional communication, the military have a higher motivation of accomplishment through work.

- H_2 – Militaries with a high level of salary satisfaction, rewards and career advancement opportunities show a high, directly proportional level for motivation of accomplishment through work.

- H_3 – The military personnel with a high level of general satisfaction have a high, directly proportional level for motivation of accomplishment through work.

- H_4 – The military personnel have higher levels of satisfaction with work organization and functional communication, respectively towards the management and interpersonal relationships in the team, compared to employees in civil organizations.

Participants

The investigated group included 160 subjects, grouped in two numerically equal sublots, the first representing the research group formed by the military (G 1), and the second being the control group consisting of civilians (G 2). To establish the subjects, we used a random selection (convenience sample), so the two groups, on which we have applied the research tools, cannot be considered representative, and the results cannot be generalized for the entire personnel in national security environment, nor for the civilian population.

For G 1, consisting of $N = 80$ subjects belonging to a military structure, the statistical analysis of the central trend indicators highlighted the following results: mean age 38.07 years (min. = 25, max. = 50, standard deviation = 6.26); 75 men (93.8%) and 5 women (6.2%); 53 (66.3%) of the subjects are high school graduates, one (1.3%) graduated post-secondary courses, and 26 (32.5%) hold university degrees, but do not hold positions or ranks corresponding to the obtained undergraduate level, forming a significant socio-professional layer of the military overqualified in relation to the work they currently carry out. From G1, 54 subjects (67.5%) occupy positions and ranks at the level



corresponding to their graduated studies.

Group G 2 included 80 civilian subjects, and the statistical analysis of the central indicators trend showed that: the average age was 41.08 years (min. = 25, max. = 58, standard deviation = 7.74); 47 (58.8%) men and 33 (41.3%) women; 22 (27.5%) of the subjects are high school graduates, 12 (15%) graduated post-secondary courses, and 46 (57.5%) have university degrees. In group G 2, 43.8% of the subjects occupy positions and ranks below their training level, attested by the obtained diplomas, 1.2% declare the occupation well below the level of training, 52.5% occupy positions in accordance with the level of training, and 2.5% declare a socio-professional status superior to their training.

Instruments

To achieve the empirical undertaking of collecting the data necessary for testing the research hypotheses, we chose two standardized tools used at organizational evaluations in companies and institutions: the "Motivational Dominant" – DM questionnaire, and the "Professional Satisfaction" – SP questionnaire⁵⁶.

The DM questionnaire comprises of 32 items with direct scoring, representing statements about various emotions, feelings, attitudes and organizational behaviors, correlative to professional motivation, grouped from the perspective of four factors: leadership, expertise, relations and subsistence⁵⁷. Referring to the validity of the instrument, the author states that, on a sample of 320 subjects, the initial study obtained an internal consistency $\alpha = 0.941$ at the level of the questionnaire as a whole and the following internal consistencies by factors: $\alpha = 0.881$ (leadership), $\alpha = 0.902$ (expertise), $\alpha = 0.906$ (relationship) and $\alpha = 0.802$ (subsistence).

The SP questionnaire includes 32 items, out of which 18 with direct scoring and 14 with reverse scoring, representing statements about various emotions, feelings, organizational attitudes and behaviors related to professional satisfaction, grouped from the perspective of three specific and one cumulative factor, calculated based on their average, representing the overall satisfaction: remuneration and promotion, leadership and interpersonal relationships, organization and communication, respectively general satisfaction

(Constantin, 2004, p. 285). The author states that, after validation on a sample of 320 subjects, an internal consistency $\alpha = 0.872$ was obtained on the whole questionnaire and the following internal consistencies on factors: $\alpha = 0.820$ (remuneration and promotion), $\alpha = 0.760$ (management and interpersonal relationships) and $\alpha = 0.738$ (organization and communication).

Demographic data were collected for the two instruments, as well age, sex, education and profession or occupation. Because the two instruments had different measurement scales, the DM questionnaire being provided with a seven-step scale, and the SP questionnaire with a six-step scale, was chosen to unify the quantification of responses method, by adopting a common Lickert-type scale in five steps, with the following meanings: 1 – Never agree, 2 – Very rarely agree, 3 – Sometimes agree, 4 – Very often agree, 5 – Always agree.

Procedure

The research was designed as a quantitative, correlational, and differential study, aiming at testing the hypotheses stated above.

The research design defined three classes of variables, as follows: motivational variables, job satisfaction variables and socio-demographic factors. At the same time, they were grouped into two other categories: dependent variables (motivational and job satisfaction) and independent variables (socio-demographic). The research tools were selected so that the variables involved in the hypotheses to be identified in the factors provided by the questionnaires. Therefore, the motivational variables were assessed with the DM questionnaire, and the job satisfaction variables were assessed with the SP questionnaire.

In accordance with the instructions of the DM questionnaire, the motivational factors, respectively motivational factors variables were defined, as follows:

- need for power: the desire to influence others, the propensity for leadership functions and decision-making independence – the leadership factor (M_con);
- needs of accomplishment through work: the desire to excel in professional activities, to be considered a good professional – the expertise factor (M_exp);

- affiliation needs: the desire to establish and cultivate friendships within the group, to work with pleasure in a stenic and supportive environment, the propensity for harmonious relationships – the relational factor (M_rel);

- basic needs of existence: concern for the fundamental needs of existence, such as rest, stability, money, food, security - the subsistence factor (M_sub).

Similarly, the variables of job satisfaction, respectively the factors of professional satisfaction, were defined in accordance with the instructions of the SP questionnaire, as follows:

- satisfaction with salaries, rewards, and career advancement opportunities: the degree of satisfaction of the staff regarding work recognition provided through pay, bonuses or other financial incentives, possibilities of promotion or recognition of merit – the remuneration and promotion factor (Sat_rp);

- satisfaction with leadership and interpersonal relationships within the team: degree of staff satisfaction towards an optimal psychosocial climate as well as regarding a harmonious working relation with colleagues and superiors – the factor of communication and interpersonal relations (Sat_cr);

- satisfaction with work organization and functional communication: the degree of satisfaction on how work is organized and carried out through task definition, effort efficiency, effective communication, feedback – the organization and communication factor (Sat_oc);

- general satisfaction: the degree of satisfaction of the staff with work in general, in terms of organization, rewards existence and level, the quality of the psychosocial climate – the general satisfaction factor (Sat_ge).

Regarding the demographic variables, we specify that the age was entered in the database as an absolute value, and the other variables were coded in numerical expressions, for statistical processing, as follows:

- sex/gender was transformed into a binary variable, having code 1 for men, respectively code 2 for women;

- the following codes have been assigned to the training level: 1 - elementary studies, 2 - middle school, 3 - high school, 4 - post-high school and 5 - University studies;

- the adequacy of the occupation at the level of

training was coded with – 2 - much below level of education, – 1 - below the level of education, 0 - at the level of education, 1 – above education level and 2 - well above education level.

The administration of the questionnaires was carried out with the assurance of anonymity and guarantee the confidentiality of both the answers and the demographic and socio-professional data.

Results

Descriptive analysis of motivational variables

Table no. 1 presents the descriptive statistics of the motivational variables, for the two research groups.

It is observed that the military in G 1 have higher averages and higher homogeneity of responses (smaller standard deviations) compared to civilians in G 2, except for the subsistence factor, respectively the motivation for subsistence (M_sub), where the situation is reversed.

In G1, the difference between the motivational factor and the highest average, that is, the expertise factor, represented by the needs of accomplishment through work (M_exp = 4.60) and the motivational factor with the lowest average, i.e., the subsistence factor, focused on the basic needs of existence (M_sub = 4.34) is $\Delta 1 = 0.26$.

In G2, the difference between the motivational factor and the average is the largest, represented by the affiliation needs (M_rel = 4.46) and the motivational factor with the lowest average, represented by the power needs (M_con = 3.93), is of $\Delta 2 = 0.53$.

In G1, the highest motivational homogeneity is recorded at the level of the expertise factor, of the needs for achievement through work, where the deviation SD standard = 0.50, and the highest heterogeneity is recorded at the level driving factor, deriving from the power needs, where the standard deviation is SD = 0.56.

At the same time, in G2, the highest homogeneity is recorded at the level of the subsistence factor, of the subsistence needs, where the standard deviation is SD = 0.51, and the highest heterogeneity is identified by the driving factor, deriving from the power needs, where the standard deviation is SD = 0.69.

Comparing the results of the driving factor, a higher homogeneity can be seen for group G1 (military) in relation to group G2 (civilians).



Table no. 1
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE MOTIVATIONAL VARIABLES,
FOR THE TWO RESEARCH GROUPS

Group			M_con	M_exp	M_rel	M_sub
G ₁	N	Valid	80	80	80	80
		Missing	0	0	0	0
	Mean	4.3526	4.6022	4.5080	4.3419	
	Std. Deviation	.56400	.50524	.54868	.55221	
G ₂	N	Valid	80	80	80	80
		Missing	0	0	0	0
	Mean	3.9306	4.4319	4.4613	4.4098	
	Std. Deviation	.69876	.52004	.57205	.51496	

(Author's conception)

Descriptive analysis of job satisfaction variables

Table no. 2 presents the descriptive statistics of the satisfaction variables for the two groups under study.

It is observed that the subjects in group G 1 have higher averages than the subjects in group G2, both at the general satisfaction level factor, Sat_ge_G 1 (M = 3.72) compared to Sat_ge_G 2 (M = 3.46), as well as at the level of each source of satisfaction in slice, as follows: the average remuneration and promotion factor of G 1 is higher than the average remuneration and promotion factor

1 (M = 4.04) > Sat_cr_G 2 (M = 3.78); the mean of the organization and communication factor of G 1 is higher than the average of the organization and communication factor of G 2 , where Sat_oc_G 1 (M = 3.95) > Sat_oc_G 2 (M = 3.69).

At the same time, it is evident that at the level of the G 1 group there is a higher heterogeneity, objectified by higher standard deviations, at the level of all job satisfaction variables.

In G1, the source of satisfaction with the highest average for the military it is given by the communication and interpersonal relations factor, i.e., by the satisfaction regarding the

Table no. 2
DESCRIPTIVE STATISTICS OF THE SATISFACTION VARIABLES
FOR THE TWO GROUPS

Group			Sat_rp	Sat_cr	Sat_oc	Sat_ge
G ₁	N	Valid	80	80	80	80
		Missing	0	0	0	0
	Mean	3.1895	4.0406	3.9538	3.7258	
	Std. Deviation	.51036	.66761	.70799	.55214	
G ₂	N	Valid	80	80	80	80
		Missing	0	0	0	0
	Mean	2.9387	3.7870	3.6988	3.4680	
	Std. Deviation	.48791	.63231	.62955	.49709	

(Author's conception)

of G 2 , where Sat_rp_G 1 (M = 3.18) > Sat_rp_G 2 (M = 2.93); the average of the communication and interpersonal relations factor of G 1 is higher than the average factor of communication and interpersonal relationships of G 2 , where Sat_cr_G

management and interpersonal relationships in the team (Sat_cr = 4.04), and the source of satisfaction with the lowest average is given by the remuneration and promotion factor, that is, satisfaction with pay, rewards, and opportunities

for advancement in career (Sat_rp = 3.18). The difference between the averages of the two factors is $\Delta 3 = 0.86$.

In group G2, the satisfaction factor with the highest average is represented by satisfaction with leadership and interpersonal relationships within the team (Sat_cr = 3.78), and the satisfaction factor with the lowest average, is given by the satisfaction regarding salary, rewards and career advancement opportunities (Sat_rp = 2.93), the difference between them being $\Delta 4 = 0.85$.

In group G1, the highest homogeneity is recorded at the level satisfaction regarding payments, rewards, and opportunities for career advancement, where the standard deviation is $SD = 0.51$, and the highest heterogeneity is at the level of satisfaction with work organization and functional communication, where the standard deviation is $SD = 0.70$.

In G2 group, the highest homogeneity is recorded at the level satisfaction regarding payments, rewards, and opportunities for career advancement, where the standard deviation is $SD = 0.48$, and the highest heterogeneity is found at the level of management satisfaction and interpersonal relationships in the team, where the standard deviation is $SD = 0.63$.

Motivational and job satisfaction variable correlational analysis

Table no. 3 shows the matrix of correlations between the job satisfaction and motivational

variables, for the two groups, where noteworthy are the following results:

a. For G₁ (military)

- salary, rewards and career advancement opportunities satisfaction Sat_rp correlates significantly ($r = 0.238$; $p < .03$) only with power requirements M_con;

- satisfaction with management and interpersonal relationships Sat_cr correlates significantly with all motivational variables, thus with the needs of power M_con ($r = 0.327$; $p < .003$), work requirements M_exp ($r = 0.460$; $p < .001$), M_rel affiliation needs ($r = 0.318$; $p < .004$) and basal existence M_sub ($r = 0.316$; $p < .004$);

- satisfaction with work organization and functional communication Sat_oc correlates significantly with all motivational variables, thus with the needs of power M_con ($r = 0.364$; $p < .001$), work requirements M_exp ($r = 0.472$; $p < .001$), M_rel affiliation needs ($r = 0.329$; $p < .003$) and basal existence M_Sub ($r = 0.313$; $p < .005$);

- overall satisfaction correlates significantly with all motivational variables, thus with power needs M_cond ($r = 0.364$; $p < .001$), power needs achievement through work M_exp ($r = 0.437$; $p < .001$), affiliation needs M_rel ($r = 0.324$; $p < .003$) and the basic needs for existence M_sub ($r = 0.319$; $p < .004$);

- all variables of job satisfaction correlate significantly with each other and, each in section, with general satisfaction.

Table no. 3
THE CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND MOTIVATIONAL VARIABLES

Group		M_con	M_exp	M_rel	M_sub
G ₁	Sat_rp	.238*			
	Sat_cr	.327**	.460**	.318**	.316**
	Sat_oc	.373**	.472**	.329**	.313**
	Sat_ge	.364**	.437**	.324**	.319**
	Sat_rp	.258*			
G ₂	Sat_cr	.301**	.412**	.362**	
	Sat_oc	.410**	.548**	.501**	.232*
	Sat_ge	.378**	.459**	.413**	

** Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

(Author's conception)



b. for G₂ (civilians)

- salary satisfaction, rewards, and career advancement opportunities Sat_{rp} correlates significantly (r = 0.258; p < .021) only with power requirements M_{con};

- satisfaction with management and interpersonal relationships Sat_{cr} significantly correlates with M_{con} power requirements (r = 0.301; p < .007), work needs M_{exp} (r = 0.412; p < .001), work needs M_{rel} affiliation (r = 0.362; p < .001), but not with the basic necessities of existence M_{sub};

- satisfaction with work organization and functional communication Sat_{oc} correlates significantly with all motivational variables, thus with the needs of power M_{con} (r = 0.410; p < .001), the work requirements M_{exp} (r = 0.548; p < .001), M_{rel} affiliation needs (r = 0.501; p < .001) and with the basic necessities of existence M_{sub} (r = 0.232; p < .038);

- overall satisfaction Sat_{ge} correlates significantly with power needs M_{con} (r = 0.388; p < .001), work requirements M_{exp} (r = 0.459; p < .001), M_{rel} affiliation needs (r = 0.413;

variables for the two groups, respectively group G 1 (military) and group G 2 (civilians), where the following are notable results:

- while in G1 there are no statistically significant correlations between job satisfaction and any of the demographic variables, in G 2 we found that occupation adequacy and training level - Adequacy correlates significantly with salary satisfaction, rewards and career advancement opportunities Sat_{rp} (r = 0.255; p < .022) and overall satisfaction Sat_{ge} (r = 0.239; p < .032), the gender variable has a statistically significant correlation with satisfaction in leadership and interpersonal relationships in the Sat_{cr} collective (r = 0.238; p < .033), with satisfaction with work organization and functional communication Sat_{oc} (r = 0.396; p < .001) and with the general satisfaction Sat_{ge} (r = 0.285; p < .010);

- in group G 1 it is observed that age correlates statistically negatively with education - Educ (r = -0.410, p < .001) and positively with the occupation adequacy and training level - Adequate (r = 0.411, p < .001), and education correlates significantly statistically, negatively with the

Table no. 4
THE CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN JOB SATISFACTION AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Group	Var	Age	Gen	Educ	Adecv
G ₁	Educ	-.410**			
	Adecv	.411**		-.993**	
G ₂	Educ	-.298**	-.236*		
	Adecv	.321**		-.493**	
	Sat _{rp}				.255*
	Sat _{cr}		.238*		
	Sat _{oc}		.396**		
	Sat _{ge}		.285*		.239*

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).
* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

(Author's conception)

p < .001), but not with the basic necessities of existence M_{sub};

- as in the experimental group G 1 (military), in group G 2 (civilians) all job satisfaction variables correlate significantly with each other and, individually, with general satisfaction.

Table no. 4 shows the matrix of correlations between the job satisfaction and demographic

occupation adequacy and training level - Adequacy (r = - 0.993, p < .001);

- in group G 2 statistically significant correlations are observed between the various variables demographic, thus: age has an inverse correlation with the level of education - Educ (r = -0,298; p < .007) and a direct correlation with the occupation adequacy and training level - Adequate

($r = 0.321$; $p < .004$), and the level of training - Educ presents an inverse correlation with the occupation adequacy and training level - Adequacy ($r = -0.493$; $p < .001$).

Table no. 5 shows the matrix of correlations between the motivational and demographic variables in the two groups, respectively the group G 1 (military) and group G 2 (civilians), where the following results are emphasised:

between the analyzed groups.

By applying the *t* test to determine the significance of the differences between averages by gender and level of training no differences were identified as significant. Also, no significant differences were observed between the two groups neither for affiliation needs or relational factor (M_rel) nor for the basic needs of subsistence or the subsistence factor (M_sub).

Table no. 5
THE CORRELATION MATRIX BETWEEN THE
MOTIVATIONAL AND DEMOGRAPHIC VARIABLES

Group	Variabile	Age	Adecv
G1	M_con	-.352**	
	M_exp	-.315**	
G2	M_con		.369**
	M_rel		.230*

** . Correlation is significant at the 0.01 level (2-tailed).

* . Correlation is significant at the 0.05 level (2-tailed).

(Author's conception)

- for the G 1 group there are significant negative correlations between age and power needs M_con ($r = -0.352$; $p < .001$), as well as between age and work needs M_exp ($r = -0.315$; $p < .004$);

- for group G 2 there are significant positive correlations between occupation adequacy and training level - Adequacy and power needs M_con ($r = 0.369$; $p < .001$), as well as between occupation adequacy and training level - Adequacy and relational needs M_rel ($r = 0.230$; $p < .040$).

Analysis of the difference between the averages of the two groups

Table no. 6 presents the averages of the variables for the two groups, which were the basis for calculating the significance of the difference in averages.

The significance of the difference between the subjects' averages from those two groups was analyzed, for the variables of motivation and satisfaction, in accordance with gender, training level and belonging to group G 1 (military) or group G 2 (civilians).

Table no. 7 presents the statistical results specific to the significant differences establishment

Instead, as presented in Table no. 7, significant differences were found between group G 1 (military) and group G 2 (civilians), for other variables of motivation and satisfaction, as follows:

- power requirements or driving factor (M_cond): $F = 11,913$, sig. = .001, $t = 4.13$, $p < .001$, CI 95% (.21450, .60080);

- performance requirements or expertise factor (M_exp): $F = 1,542$, sig. = .216, $t = 2.101$, $p < .037$, CI 95% (.01024, .33046);

- satisfaction with salaries, rewards, and opportunities for career advancement or remuneration and promotion factor (Sat_rp): $F = .012$, sig. = .914, $t = 3.176$, $p < .002$, CI 95% (.09884, .4666);

- satisfaction with leadership and interpersonal relationships or communication factor and interpersonal relationships (Sat_cr): $F = .308$, sig. = .580, $t = 2.467$, $p < .017$, CI 95% (.04579, .46421);

- satisfaction with work organization and communication or the organizing factor, and communication (Sat_oc): $F = .308$, sig. = .397, $t = 2.407$, $p < .017$, CI 95% (.05057, .45668);

- general satisfaction (Sat_ge): $F = 1,393$, sig. = .240, $t = 3,103$, $p < .002$, CI 95% (.09369, .42181).



Table no. 6
AVERAGES OF MOTIVATION AND SATISFACTION VARIABLES
FOR EXPERIMENTAL AND CONTROL GROUPS

Variabile	Group	N	Mean	Std. Deviation	Std. Error Mean
M_con	G ₁	80	4.3526	.56400	.06306
	G ₂	80	3.9306	.69876	.07812
M_exp	G ₁	80	4.6022	.50524	.05649
	G ₂	80	4.4319	.52004	.05814
M_rel	G ₁	80	4.5080	.54868	.06134
	G ₂	80	4.4612	.57205	.06396
M_sub	G ₁	80	4.3419	.55221	.06174
	G ₂	80	4.4097	.51496	.05757
Sat_rp	G ₁	80	3.1895	.51036	.05706
	G ₂	80	2.9388	.48791	.05455
Sat_cr	G ₁	80	4.0406	.66761	.07464
	G ₂	80	3.7870	.63231	.07069
Sat_oc	G ₁	80	3.9537	.70799	.07916
	G ₂	80	3.6988	.62955	.07039
Gat_ge	G ₁	80	3.7258	.55214	.06173
	G ₂	80	3.4680	.49709	.05558

(Author's conception)

Table no. 7
t TEST FOR SIGNIFICANT DIFFERENCES ESTABLISHMENT
BETWEEN G₁ (MILITARY) AND G₂ (CIVILIANS)

	Levene's Test for Equality of Variances		t-test for Equality of Means							
	F	Sig.	t	df	Sig. (2-tailed)	Mean Difference	Std. Error Difference	95% Confidence Interval of the Difference		
								Lower	Upper	
M_con	Equal variances assumed	11.913	.001	4.130	158	.000	.41125	.09957	.21458	.60792
	Equal variances not assumed			4.130	149.988	.000	.41125	.09957	.21450	.60800
M_exp	Equal variances assumed	1.542	.216	2.101	158	.037	.17035	.08106	.01024	.33046
	Equal variances not assumed			2.101	157.868	.037	.17035	.08106	.01024	.33046
Sat_rp	Equal variances assumed	.012	.914	3.176	158	.002	.25075	.07894	.09484	.40666
	Equal variances not assumed			3.176	157.681	.002	.25075	.07894	.09483	.40667
Sat_cr	Equal variances assumed	.308	.580	2.467	158	.015	.25363	.10281	.05057	.45668
	Equal variances not assumed			2.467	157.536	.015	.25363	.10281	.05057	.45668
Sat_oc	Equal variances assumed	.723	.397	2.407	158	.017	.25500	.10592	.04579	.46421
	Equal variances not assumed			2.407	155.870	.017	.25500	.10592	.04577	.46423
Sat_ge	Equal variances assumed	1.393	.240	3.103	158	.002	.25775	.08306	.09369	.42181
	Equal variances not assumed			3.103	156.289	.002	.25775	.08306	.09368	.42182

(Author's conception)

Discussions

The interpretation of the results went through two stages: the first stage, aimed at reporting the data obtained from research hypotheses regarding the relations between motivation and professional satisfaction among the military in group G1, and the second stage consisted in analyzing all statistically valid results and extracting all inferences relevant to the research topic.

For the first stage of analysis the following information was retained:

- In group G 1 (military) the conditions under which satisfaction with leadership and interpersonal relationships of the military Sat_{cr} significantly correlates with the needs of work M_{exp} ($r = 0.460$; $p < .001$), and satisfaction with work organization and functional communication S_{oc} significantly correlates with the needs of accomplishment through work M_{exp} ($r = 0.472$; $p < .001$). Therefore, H 1 hypothesis according to which the more satisfied they are with the management and the interpersonal relationships within the team, respectively of work organization and functional communication, the more the military have a higher motivation to accomplish themselves through work is supported.

- In group G 1 (military) no significant correlation was found ($r = 0.163$) between salary satisfaction, rewards and career advancement opportunities S_{rp} and the needs of accomplishment through work M_{exp} . Consequently, the H 2 hypothesis that the military with a high level of satisfaction regarding salaries, rewards and career advancement opportunities presents a high level, directly proportional, of their motivation to accomplish themselves through work M_{exp} , is not supported.

- In group G 1 (military) a significant correlation was found ($r = 0.437$; $p < .001$) between the general satisfaction S_{ge} and the needs of accomplishment through work M_{exp} . As a result, the H 3 hypothesis according to which the military with a level high level of overall satisfaction show a high level, directly proportional, in the motivation of accomplishment through work variable, is supported.

- At the same time, the conditions under which, on the one hand, satisfaction with the work organization and communication $S_{oc_G 1}$ ($m = 3.9537$) of the military is higher than that of civilians $S_{oc_G 2}$ ($m = 3.6988$), and the

difference between the averages of the two groups is statistically significant ($t(158) = 2,407$, $p < .017$) and, on the other hand, satisfaction with leadership and interpersonal relations of the military $S_{rp_G 1}$ ($m = 4.0406$) is superior to that of the civilians $S_{rp_G 2}$ ($m = 3.7870$), and the difference between the averages of the two groups is statistically significant ($t(158) = 2,467$, $p < .015$). Thus, H 4 hypothesis, according to which the military have higher levels of job satisfaction and functional communication, respectively towards leadership and interpersonal relationships, compared to employees in civil organizations, is supported.

For the second stage, all valid results were analyzed statistically, and the relevant inferences were extracted. This secondary approach of interpretation led to a number of observations, which are presented below.

As employees of a military organization, G 1 subjects (military) have a higher professional satisfaction than the subjects in the group G 2 (civilians), employed in civil organizations. The observation is noted both in that regarding the general level of satisfaction S_{ge} ($m = 3.7258$ vs. $m = 3.4680$; $t(158) = 3,103$, $p < .002$), as well as in relation to each component, such as satisfaction regarding salary, rewards and career advancement opportunities S_{rp} ($m = 3.1895$ vs. $m = 2.9388$; $t(158) = 3,176$, $p < .002$), satisfaction with driving and interpersonal relations S_{cr} ($m = 4.0406$ vs. $m = 3.7870$; $t(158) = 2.467$, $p < .015$), respectively satisfaction with work organization and communication S_{oc} ($m = 3.9537$ vs. $m = 3.6988$; $t(158) = 2.407$, $p < .017$). The differences between the two groups are statistically significant.

As members of a highly hierarchically structured organization, the military have a higher level of power / leadership needs M_{cond} ($m = 4.3526$ vs. $m = 3.9306$; $t(158) = 4.130$, $p < .001$) and the needs of accomplishment by work M_{exp} ($m = 4.6022$ vs. $m = 4.4319$; $t(158) = 2.101$, $p < .037$) compared to the level of the employees' in civil organizations. The differences between the two groups are statistically significant.

Regarding M_{rel} affiliation needs as well as basic needs of existence M_{under} the level of motivation of the two categories is similar in the two groups.

Although superior to civilians ($m = 3.1895$ vs. $m = 2.9388$), satisfaction regarding salaries,



rewards, and career advancement opportunities of the military S_{rp} , is however at a relatively low level, being statistically significantly lower than the satisfaction felt with other sources of satisfaction in their organization, respectively satisfaction with leadership and interpersonal relationships S_{cr} ($m = 4,0406$), satisfaction with work organization and functional communication S_{oc} ($m = 3.9538$), as well as to the general satisfaction S_{ge} ($m = 3.7258$).

The military personnel who are satisfied with salaries, rewards, and career advancements opportunities are motivated by the needs of power, manifesting trends towards hierarchical ascension and leadership functions. The observation is supported by the fact that in group G 1, satisfaction regarding payments, rewards and career advancement opportunities S_{rp} correlates significantly with power needs M_{cond} ($r = 0.238$; $p < .033$).

The military who are equally satisfied with the way they are led by their superiors and the interpersonal relationships within the groups to which they belong develop a complex, strong motivation for work through activation of their needs for power / leadership, relationships, and subsistence. This one observation is supported by the fact that, in group G1, satisfaction with driving and interpersonal relationships S_{cr} within the group correlate significantly not only with the realization of needs through work M_{exp} , according to Hypothesis 1, which was confirmed, but also with the needs for power M_{cond} ($r = 0.327$; $p < .003$), M_{rel} affiliation needs ($r = 0.318$; $p < .004$) and basic living needs M_{sub} ($r = 0.316$; $p < .004$). Also, the same complex and strong motivation for work, is activated and supported in the military by satisfaction felt towards work organization and functional communication within the unit. And this observation too is supported by the fact that in group G1, satisfaction with work organization and functional communication S_{oc} correlates significantly not only with the needs of accomplishment through work M_{exp} , according to Hypothesis 1, but also with the needs for power M_{cond} ($r = 0,373$; $p < .001$), affiliation needs M_{rel} ($r = 0,329$; $p < .003$) and the basic needs of existence M_{sub} ($r = 0,313$; $p < .005$).

In the military, unlike civilian employees, job satisfaction is not influenced by age, gender, level

of education or adequacy of position / function at instructional level because, in group G 1, none of demographic variables correlate with any of the satisfaction variables work. In comparison, for example, it is observed that civilians in group G 2 are better satisfied by salary, rewards and career advancement opportunities S_{rp} as they occupy positions in accordance or higher than their level of instruction M_{cond} ($r = 0.255$; $p < .022$), and women are satisfied, to some extent significantly higher than men, in terms of work organization and functional communication S_{oc} ($r = -0.271$; $p < .05$).

As members of a relatively closed organization with a homogeneous organizational culture, which sometimes levels out individual attitudes and opinions, the military show a greater homogeneity of motivation (standard deviations smaller) than civilian subjects, the only exception being the basic needs of existence, where the situation is reversed.

The military appear to be more ambitious, more motivated for performance, more eager to achieve from a younger age ($m = 38.07$; $SD = 6.26$), compared to civilians ($m = 41.08$; $SD = 7.74$). This observation is also supported by the fact that in group G1, age correlates inversely with power needs M_{cond} ($r = -0.352$; $p < .001$), and with the needs of realization through work M_{exp} ($r = -0.315$; $p < .004$).

As in the civilian environment, the military also find that some of them have a higher level of education, but also that they often occupy positions inferior to their respective training. The statement is supported by the fact that in both groups significant negative correlations were recorded between age and level of education ($r = -0.410$; $p < .001$ in the military, respectively $r = -0.298$; $p < .007$ in civilians) and significantly positive correlations between age and occupation adequacy at education level of ($r = 0.411$; $p < .001$ in the military, respectively $r = 0.321$; $p < .004$ to civilians).

Conclusion

This research aimed to study the relation between motivation and satisfaction of the personnel working in a military organization – in the defence, public order, and national security system.

First, we can confirm that similarly, for the staff



of military organizations, if employees are satisfied with the environment and working conditions, then they will also be motivated to work accordingly^{58,59,60}. A series of implications follows from here, such as: the need for a rational organization of the military activity; clear definition of tasks; ensuring optimal training and work conditions; achieving a stenic and supportive psychosocial environment; maintaining harmonious interpersonal relationships; building a modern and competent leadership^{61,62}.

Second, and in the case of military organizations personnel we may find that the overall satisfaction felt by employees leads to a strengthening of the sense of personal competence and self-efficacy, which in turn determines an increase in motivation for work and performance^{63,64,65,66}. The satisfaction of successful completion of the mission is the main fulfillment of a military, because it allows them to identify with the goals, values, and the customs of the organization, which guarantees its acceptance and integration in the group. This special satisfaction generates an interdependence between the individual and military organization, which helps activate a higher motivation for successful completion of missions, and subsequently performance will lead to further increase of personal prestige^{67,68,69,70}.

Third, military personnel, as opposed to civil organizations' personnel, maintain a high motivation for performance even in periods of marked economic imbalances, and the level satisfaction is extracted from the proper perception of the manner of organization and communication, from the coherence of management and the intensity of interpersonal relationships or from military experience that may be valuable in the future^{71,72}. Also, the degree of motivation of the military, implicitly the level of satisfaction, emerges from the higher job stability, guaranteeing a relatively secure income, but also from the existence of multiple possibilities for advancement in professional career^{73,74,75,76}.

Fourth, we found that, for the military, compared to civilians, there is no direct relation between the level of satisfaction and rewards attractiveness, and these do not directly influence the valence and attractiveness of the rewards^{77,78}. In the military organizations, though material satisfaction is important, it is not decisive in the intimate economy of the motivation phenomenon at the individual level. Sources of military

satisfaction, such as motivational leverage, seem to be related rather to the particular specifics of the managerial act, of the psychosocial environment, of the organizational culture, as well as the system of values and institutional norms^{79,80,81}.

Fifth, it is easy to see the relevance of the present study for designing human resources policies and specific managerial strategies in the military organization^{82,83,84}.

Finally, we trust that the present study, with all its limitations related to sampling, representativeness, analyzed dimensions, etc. contains the potential seeds for new research directions in the field of national security, which could support multiple psychological resources for the management of military personnel.

NOTES:

1 A.H. Maslow, "A theory of human motivation", *Psychological Review*, July 1943, pp. 370-396.

2 F. Herzberg, B. Mausner & B.B. Snyderman, *The motivation to work*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1959.

3 D.C. McClelland, *The achieving society*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, New York, 1961.

4 C.P. Alderfer, "An empirical test of a new theory of human needs", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(2), 1969, pp. 142-175.

5 J.S. Adams, *Inequity in social exchange*, apud L. Berkowitz (ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Academic Press, New York, 1965.

6 V.H. Vroom, *Work and Motivation*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1964.

7 K. Lewin, *The conceptual representation and the measurement of psychological Forces*, Duke University Press, Durham, N.C., 1938.

8 J. Nuttin, *Théorie de la motivation humaine*, PUF, Paris, 1980.

9 J. Nuttin, *Motivation, planning, and action: A relational theory of behavior dynamics*, R.P. Lorion & J.E. Dumas, Trans., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; Leuven University Press, 1984.

10 A.H. Maslow, "A theory of human motivation", *Psychological Review*, July 1943, pp. 370-396.

11 A.H. Maslow, *Motivation and Personality*, Harper, New York, 1954.

12 A.H. Maslow, *Motivație și personalitate*, Trei Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009.

13 R.L. Berl, N.C. Williamson, T. Powell, "Industrial Salesforce Motivation: A Critique and Test of Maslow's Hierarchy of Need", *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 4:1, 1984, pp. 32-39.

14 M. Daniels, "The development of the concept of self-actualization in the writings of Abraham Maslow", *Current Psychological Reviews*, 2, 1982, pp. 61-75.

15 A. Neher, "Maslow's Theory of Motivation: A Critic", *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Volume: 31, issue: 3, 1991, pp. 89-112.



- 16 D.T. Kenrick, V. Griskevicius, S.L. Neuberg, M. Schaller, "Renovating the Pyramid of Needs: Contemporary Extensions Built Upon Ancient Foundations", *PubMed*, 2010.
- 17 M.K. Koltko-Rivera, "Rediscovering the Later Version of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: Self-Transcendence and Opportunities for Theory, Research, and Unification", *The Review of General Psychology*, 10(4), 2006.
- 18 R.J. Taormina, J.H. Gao, "Maslow and the motivation hierarchy: Measuring satisfaction of the needs", *The American Journal of Psychology*, 126(2), 2013.
- 19 M.A. Wahba, L.G. Bridwell, "Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, Volume 15, Issue 2, 1976, pp. 212-240.
- 20 F. Herzberg, B. Mausner & B.B. Snyderman, *The motivation to work*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1959.
- 21 R.B. Ewen, P.C. Smith & C.L. Hulin, "An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(6), 1966, pp. 544-550.
- 22 G.B. Graen, "Addendum to an empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(6), 1966, pp. 551-555.
- 23 V.V.D.P. Kotni, V. Karumuri, "Application of Herzberg Two-Factor Theory Model for Motivating Retail Salesforce", *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Hyderabad, Vol. 17, Iss. 1, 2018, pp. 24-42.
- 24 D.C. McClelland, "How motives, skills, and values determine what people do", *American Psychologist*, 40(7), 1985, pp. 812-825.
- 25 *Ibidem*.
- 26 C.P. Alderfer, *op.cit.*, pp. 142-175.
- 27 C.A. Arnolds, Ch. Boshoff, "Compensation, esteem valence and job performance: an empirical assessment of Alderfer's ERG theory", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13:4, 2002, pp. 697-719.
- 28 G.L. Wilcove, "The ERG model: Expansion and application to Navy personnel", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 13(3), 1978, pp. 305-316.
- 29 J.R. Caulton, "The Development and Use of the Theory of ERG: A Literature Review", *Regent University Emerging Leadership Journeys*, Vol. 5 (1), 2012, pp. 2- 8.
- 30 T.S. Kian, WFW Yusoff, S. Rajah, "Job satisfaction and motivation: What is the difference among these two", *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2014, pp. 94-102, <http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx>, accessed on 10.08.2021.
- 31 A. Majid, M.B. Fajri, E. Assadam, D. Febrianti, "The Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction to Work Motivation and Employees' Performance", *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management*, 2(3), 2021, pp. 550-560.
- 32 J.S. Adams, S. Freedman, "Equity Theory Revisited: Comments and Annotated Bibliography in Berkowitz", Walster, L.E. (eds). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume 9, Academic Press, 1976, pp. 43-90.
- 33 M.R. Carrell, J.E. Dittrich, "Equity Theory: The Recent Literature, Methodological Considerations, and New Directions", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 3 (2), 1978.
- 34 R.C. Huseman, J.D. Hatfield, E.W. Miles, "A New Perspective on Equity Theory: The Equity Sensitivity Construct", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12 (2), 1987.
- 35 H. Inegbedion, E. Inegbedion, A. Peter, L. Harry, "Perception of workload balance and employee job satisfaction in work organisations", *Heliyon*, Volume 6, Issue 1, 2020.
- 36 V.H. Vroom, *op.cit.*
- 37 V. Barba-Sánchez, C. Atienza-Sahuquillo, "Entrepreneurial motivation and self-employment: evidence from expectancy theory", *Int Entrep Manag J* 13, 2017, pp. 1097-1115.
- 38 R. Isaac, W. Zerbe & D. Pitt, "Leadership And Motivation: The Effective Application Of Expectancy Theory", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(2), 2001, pp. 212-226.
- 39 H.G. Heneman & D.P. Schwab, "Evaluation of research on expectancy theory predictions of employee performance", *Psychological Bulletin*, 78(1), 1972, pp. 1-9.
- 40 R. Lloyd, D. Mertens, "Expecting More Out of Expectancy Theory: History Urges Inclusion of the Social Context", *International Management Review*, Vol. 14 (1), 2018, pp. 28-43, <http://americanscholarspress.us/>, accessed on 10.08.2021.
- 41 M. Renko, K.G. Kroeck & A. Bullough, "Expectancy theory and nascent entrepreneurship", *Small Bus Econ* 39, 2021, pp. 667-684.
- 42 M. Wabba, R.J. House, "Expectancy Theory in Work and Motivation: Some Logical and Methodological", *Issues. Human Relations*, Volume 27, issue 2, 1974. pp. 121-147.
- 43 K. Lewin, *Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers*, Harpers and Row, New York, 1951.
- 44 K. Lewin, "Field Theory and Experiment in Social Psychology: Concepts and Methods", *American Journal of Sociology*, 44(6), 1939, pp. 868-896., <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2769418>, accessed on 05.08.2021.
- 45 B. Burnes, B. Cooke, "Kurt Lewin's Field Theory: A Review and Re-evaluation", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Volume 15 (4), 2012. pp. 408-425.
- 46 A.W. Kruglanski, J.J. Bélanger, X. Chen, C. Köpetz, A. Pierro & L. Mannetti, "The energetics of motivated cognition: A force-field analysis", *Psychological Review*, 119(1), 2012, pp. 1-20.
- 47 F.C. Lunenburg, "Forces for and Resistance to Organizational Change", *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, vol. 27(4), Houston State University, 2010.
- 48 D. Rosenbaum, E. More, P. Steane, "Planned organisational change management: Forward to the past? An exploratory literature reviews", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 2018. pp. 286-303.
- 49 J. Nuttin, *Théorie de la motivation humaine*, PUF, Paris, 1980.
- 50 J. Nuttin, *Motivation, planning, and action: A relational theory of behavior dynamics*, R.P. Lorion & J.E. Dumas, Trans., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; Leuven University Press, 1984.
- 51 R. Kanfer, M. Frese & R.E. Johnson, "Motivation related to work: A century of progress", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102 (3), 2017, pp. 338-355.



- 52 R.B. Miller, S.J. Brickman, "A Model of Future-Oriented Motivation and Self-Regulation", *Educational Psychology Review*, 16, 2004, pp. 9-33.
- 53 J. Simons, M. Vansteenkiste, W. Lens *et al.*, "Placing Motivation and Future Time Perspective Theory in a Temporal Perspective", *Educational Psychology Review*, 16, 2004, pp. 121-139.
- 54 M. Popa, *Psihologie militară*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2012.
- 55 C.E. Cracsner, *Elemente de psihologie militară*, Publishing House of the Academy of Higher Military Studies, Bucharest, 2004.
- 56 T. Constantin, *Evaluarea psihologică a personalului*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2004, pp. 276 - 285.
- 57 *Ibidem*.
- 58 A. Furnham, A. Eracleous, T. Chamorro-Premuzic, "Personality, motivation, and job satisfaction: Hertzberg meets the Big Five", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 24, No. 8, 2009, pp. 765-779.
- 59 J. Nuttin, *Théorie de la motivation humaine*, PUF, Paris, 1980.
- 60 J.P. Meyer, C. Kam, I. Goldenberg, N.L. Bremner, "Organizational Commitment in the Military: Application of a Profile Approach", *Military Psychology*, 25:4., 2013, pp. 381-401.
- 61 D. Katz, "The motivational basis of organizational behaviour", *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 9 (2), 1964, pp. 131-146.
- 62 T.R. Tyler, P.E. Callahan, J. Frost, "Armed, and Dangerous (?): Motivating Rule Adherence Among Agents of Social Control", *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 41(2), 2007, pp. 457-492.
- 63 O. Boe, R. Säfvenbom, R.B. Johansen, R. Buch, "The Relationships Between Self-Concept, Self-Efficacy, and Military Skills and Abilities", *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 14, 2018, pp. 18-42.
- 64 M.J. Chambel, F. Castanheira, F. Oliveira-Cruz, S. Lopes, "Work Context Support and Portuguese Soldiers' Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Autonomous Motivation", *Military Psychology*, Vol. 27, Issue 5, 2015, pp. 297-310.
- 65 M. Gagné, E.L. Deci, "Self-determination theory and work motivation", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26 (4), 2005, pp. 331-362.
- 66 A.D. Stajkovic & F. Luthans, "Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 1998, pp. 240-261.
- 67 A. Alvinus, E. Johansson, G. Larsson, "Job satisfaction as a form of organizational commitment at the military strategic level: A grounded theory study", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 2017, pp. 312-326.
- 68 P. Jakobsen, J. Ringsmose & H. Saxi, "Prestige-seeking small states: Danish and Norwegian military contributions to US-led operations", *European Journal of International Security*, 3(2), 2018, pp. 256-277.
- 69 J.L. Thomas, M.W. Dickson, P.D. Bliese, "Values predicting leader performance in the U.S. Army Reserve Officer Training Corps Assessment Center: evidence for a personality-mediated model", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Volume 12, Issue 2, 2001, pp. 181-196.
- 70 T.D. Woodruff, "Who Should the Military Recruit? The Effects of Institutional, Occupational, and Self-Enhancement Enlistment Motives on Soldier Identification and Behavior", *Armed Forces and Society*, 43 (4), 2017, pp. 579-607.
- 71 J. Fredland, R. Little, "Job satisfaction determinants: differences between servicemen and civilians", *Journal of Political & Military Sociology*, 11(2), 1983, pp. 265-280, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45293388>, accessed on 10.08.2021.
- 72 R.P. Sanchez, R.M. Bray, A.A. Vincus, C.M. Bann, "Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among Active Duty and Reserve/Guard Personnel in the U.S. Military", *Military Psychology*, 16:1, 2004, pp. 19-35.
- 73 T.A. Judge, R.F. Piccolo, N.P. Podsakoff, J.C. Shaw, B.L. Rich, "The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Volume 77, Issue 2, 2010, pp. 157-167.
- 74 M. London, "Toward a Theory of Career Motivation", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 8 (4), 1983.
- 75 J. Österberg, L. Rydstedt, "Job satisfaction among Swedish soldiers: Applying the Job Characteristics Model to newly recruited military personnel", *Military Psychology*, 30:4, 2018, pp. 302-310.
- 76 P. Warr, I. Inceoglu, "Job engagement, job satisfaction, and contrasting associations with person – job fit", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(2), 2012, pp. 129-138.
- 77 D.M. Cable, T.A. Judge, "Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective", *Personnel psychology*, Volume 47 (2), 1994, pp. 317-348.
- 78 C. Stringer, J. Didham, P. Theivananthampillai, "Motivation, pay satisfaction, and job satisfaction of front-line employees", *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2011, pp. 161-179.
- 79 F. Castanheira, M.J. Chambel, S. Lopes, F. Oliveira-Cruz, "Relational Job Characteristics and Work Engagement: Mediation by Prosocial Motivation", *Military Psychology*, Vol. 28, Issue 4, 2016, pp. 226-240.
- 80 M. Fors Brandebo, J. Österberg & A.K. Berglund, "The Impact of Constructive and Destructive Leadership on Soldier's Job Satisfaction", *Psychological reports*, 122(3), 2019, pp. 1068-1086.
- 81 T. Constantin, *Evaluarea psihologică a personalului*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2004, pp. 276 - 285.
- 82 F. Hattke, R. Vogel, J. Znanewitz, "Satisfied with red tape? Leadership, civic duty, and career intention in the military", *Public Management Review*, 20:4., 2018, pp. 563-586.
- 83 G. Liggins, P.A. Attoh, T. Gong, T. Chase, M.B. Russell, P.W. Clark, "Military Veterans in Federal Agencies: Organizational Inclusion, Human Resource Practices, and Trust in Leadership as Predictors of Organizational Commitment", *Public Personnel Management*, 2019.
- 84 J.D. Winkler, T. Marler, M.N. Posard, R.S. Cohen, M.L. Smith, *Reflections on the Future of Warfare and Implications for Personnel Policies of the U.S. Department of Defense*, Defense Technical Information Center, Rand National Defense Research Inst Santa Monica CA., 2019, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/AD108394>, accessed on 10.08.2021.



REFERENCES

- Adams J.S., S. Freedman, "Equity Theory Revisited: Comments and Annotated Bibliography in Berkowitz", Walster, L.E. (eds). *Advances in Experimental Social Psychology*, Volume 9, Academic Press, 1976.
- Alderfer C.P., "An empirical test of a new theory of human needs", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*, 4(2), 1969.
- Alvinius A., E. Johansson, G. Larsson, "Job satisfaction as a form of organizational commitment at the military strategic level: A grounded theory study", *International Journal of Organizational Analysis*, Vol. 25, No. 2, 2017.
- Arnolds C.A., Ch. Boshoff, "Compensation, esteem valence and job performance: an empirical assessment of Alderfer's ERG theory", *The International Journal of Human Resource Management*, 13:4, 2002.
- Barba-Sánchez V., C. Atienza-Sahuquillo, "Entrepreneurial motivation and self-employment: evidence from expectancy theory", *Int Entrep Manag J* 13, 2017.
- Berl R.L., N.C. Williamson, T. Powell, "Industrial Salesforce Motivation: A Critique and Test of Maslow's Hierarchy of Need", *Journal of Personal Selling & Sales Management*, 4:1, 1984.
- Berkowitz L. (ed.), *Advances in experimental social psychology*, Academic Press, New York, 1965.
- Boe O., R. Säfvenbom, R.B. Johansen, R. Buch, "The Relationships Between Self-Concept, Self-Efficacy, and Military Skills and Abilities", *International Journal of Learning, Teaching and Educational Research*, 14, 2018.
- Burnes B., B. Cooke, "Kurt Lewin's Field Theory: A Review and Re-evaluation", *International Journal of Management Reviews*, Volume 15 (4), 2012.
- Cable D.M., T.A. Judge, "Pay preferences and job search decisions: A person-organization fit perspective", *Personnel psychology*, Volume 47 (2), 1994.
- Carrell M.R., J.E. Dittrich, "Equity Theory: The Recent Literature, Methodological Considerations, and New Directions", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 3 (2), 1978.
- Castanheira F., M.J. Chambel, S. Lopes, F. Oliveira-Cruz, "Relational Job Characteristics and Work Engagement: Mediation by Prosocial Motivation", *Military Psychology*, Vol. 28, Issue 4, 2016.
- Caulton J.R., "The Development and Use of the Theory of ERG: A Literature Review", *Regent University Emerging Leadership Journeys*, Vol. 5 (1), 2012.
- Chambel M.J., F. Castanheira, F. Oliveira-Cruz, S. Lopes, "Work Context Support and Portuguese Soldiers' Well-Being: The Mediating Role of Autonomous Motivation", *Military Psychology*, Vol. 27, Issue 5, 2015.
- Constantin T., *Evaluarea psihologică a personalului*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2004.
- Cracsner C.E., *Elemente de psihologie militară*, Publishing House of the Academy of Higher Military Studies, Bucharest, 2004.
- Daniels M., "The development of the concept of self-actualization in the writings of Abraham Maslow", *Current Psychological Reviews*, 2, 1982.
- Ewen R.B., P.C. Smith & C.L. Hulin, "An empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(6), 1966.
- Fors Brandebo M., J. Österberg & A.K. Berglund, "The Impact of Constructive and Destructive Leadership on Soldier's Job Satisfaction", *Psychological reports*, 122(3), 2019.
- Fredland J., R. Little, "Job satisfaction determinants: differences between servicemen and civilians", *Journal of Political & Military Sociology*, 11(2), 1983, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/45293388>
- Furnham A., A. Eracleous, T. Chamorro-Premuzic, "Personality, motivation, and job satisfaction: Herzberg meets the Big Five", *Journal of Managerial Psychology*, Vol. 24, No. 8, 2009.
- Gagné M., E.L. Deci, "Self-determination theory and work motivation", *Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Vol. 26 (4), 2005.
- Graen G.B., "Addendum to an empirical test of the Herzberg two-factor theory", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 50(6), 1966.
- Hattke F., R. Vogel, J. Znanewitz, "Satisfied with red tape? Leadership, civic duty, and career intention in the military", *Public Management Review*, 20:4., 2018.



- Heneman H.G. & D.P. Schwab, "Evaluation of research on expectancy theory predictions of employee performance", *Psychological Bulletin*, 78(1), 1972.
- Herzberg F., B. Mausner & B.B. Snyderman, *The motivation to work*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1959.
- Huseman R.C., J.D. Hatfield, E.W. Miles, "A New Perspective on Equity Theory: The Equity Sensitivity Construct", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 12 (2), 1987.
- Inegbedion H., E. Inegbedion, A. Peter, L. Harry, "Perception of workload balance and employee job satisfaction in work organisations", *Heliyon*, Volume 6, Issue 1, 2020.
- Isaac R., W. Zerbe & D. Pitt, "Leadership And Motivation: The Effective Application Of Expectancy Theory", *Journal of Managerial Issues*, 13(2), 2001.
- Jakobsen P., J. Ringsmose & H. Saxi, "Prestige-seeking small states: Danish and Norwegian military contributions to US-led operations", *European Journal of International Security*, 3(2), 2018.
- Judge T.A., R.F. Piccolo, N.P. Podsakoff, J.C. Shaw, B.L. Rich, "The relationship between pay and job satisfaction: A meta-analysis of the literature", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, Volume 77, Issue 2, 2010.
- Kanfer R., M. Frese & R.E. Johnson, "Motivation related to work: A century of progress", *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 102 (3), 2017.
- Katz D., "The motivational basis of organizational behaviour", *Behavioral Science*, Vol. 9 (2), 1964.
- Kenrick D.T., V. Griskevicius, S.L. Neuberg, M. Schaller, "Renovating the Pyramid of Needs: Contemporary Extensions Built Upon Ancient Foundations", *PubMed*, 2010.
- Kian T.S., WFW Yusoff, S. Rajah, "Job satisfaction and motivation: What is the difference among these two", *European Journal of Business and Social Sciences*, Vol. 3, No. 2, 2014, <http://www.ejbss.com/recent.aspx>
- Koltko-Rivera M.K., "Rediscovering the Later Version of Maslow's Hierarchy of Needs: Self-Transcendence and Opportunities for Theory, Research, and Unification", *The Review of General Psychology*, 10(4), 2006.
- Kotni V.V.D.P., V. Karumuri, "Application of Herzberg Two-Factor Theory Model for Motivating Retail Salesforce", *IUP Journal of Organizational Behavior*, Hyderabad, Vol. 17, Iss. 1, 2018.
- Kruglanski A.W., J.J. Bélanger, X. Chen, C. Köpetz, A. Pierro & L. Mannetti, "The energetics of motivated cognition: A force-field analysis", *Psychological Review*, 119(1), 2012.
- Lewin K., "Field Theory and Experiment in Social Psychology: Concepts and Methods", *American Journal of Sociology*, 44(6), 1939, <http://www.jstor.org/stable/2769418>
- Lewin K., *The conceptual representation and the measurement of psychological Forces*, Duke University Press, Durham, N.C., 1938.
- Lewin K., *Field theory in social science: selected theoretical papers*, Harpers and Row, New York, 1951.
- Liggans G., P.A. Attoh, T. Gong, T. Chase, M.B. Russell, P.W. Clark, "Military Veterans in Federal Agencies: Organizational Inclusion, Human Resource Practices, and Trust in Leadership as Predictors of Organizational Commitment", *Public Personnel Management*, 2019.
- Lloyd R., D. Mertens, "Expecting More Out of Expectancy Theory: History Urges Inclusion of the Social Context", *International Management Review*, Vol. 14 (1), 2018, <http://americanscholarspress.us/>
- London M., "Toward a Theory of Career Motivation", *Academy of Management Review*, Vol. 8 (4), 1983.
- Lunenburg F.C., "Forces for and Resistance to Organizational Change", *National Forum of Educational Administration and Supervision Journal*, vol. 27(4), Houston State University, 2010.
- Majid A., M.B. Fajri, E. Assadam, D. Febrianti, "The Moderating Effect of Job Satisfaction to Work Motivation and Employees' Performance", *International Journal of Science, Technology & Management*, 2(3), 2021.
- Maslow A.H., "A theory of human motivation", *Psychological Review*, July 1943.
- Maslow A.H., *Motivation and Personality*, Harper, New York, 1954.
- Maslow A.H., *Motivație și personalitate*, Trei Publishing House, Bucharest, 2009.
- McClelland D.C., *The achieving society*, Van Nostrand, Princeton, New York, 1961.
- McClelland D.C., "How motives, skills, and values determine what people do", *American Psychologist*, 40(7), 1985.



Meyer J.P., C. Kam, I. Goldenberg, N.L. Bremner, "Organizational Commitment in the Military: Application of a Profile Approach", *Military Psychology*, 25:4., 2013.

Miller R.B., S.J. Brickman, "A Model of Future-Oriented Motivation and Self-Regulation", *Educational Psychology Review*, 16, 2004.

Neher A., "Maslow's Theory of Motivation: A Critic", *Journal of Humanistic Psychology*, Volume 31, issue 3, 1991.

Nuttin J., *Théorie de la motivation humaine*, PUF, Paris, 1980.

Nuttin J., *Motivation, planning, and action: A relational theory of behavior dynamics*, R.P. Lorion & J.E. Dumas, Trans., Lawrence Erlbaum Associates, Inc; Leuven University Press, 1984.

Österberg J., L. Rydstedt, "Job satisfaction among Swedish soldiers: Applying the Job Characteristics Model to newly recruited military personnel", *Military Psychology*, 30:4, 2018.

Popa M., *Psihologie militară*, Polirom Publishing House, Iași, 2012.

Renko M., K.G. Kroeck & A. Bullough, "Expectancy theory and nascent entrepreneurship", *Small Bus Econ* 39, 2021.

Rosenbaum D., E. More, P. Steane, "Planned organisational change management: Forward to the past? An exploratory literature reviews", *Journal of Organizational Change Management*, Vol. 31, No. 2, 2018.

Sanchez R.P., R.M. Bray, A.A. Vincus, C.M. Bann, "Predictors of Job Satisfaction Among Active Duty and Reserve/Guard Personnel in the U.S. Military", *Military Psychology*, 16:1, 2004.

Simons J., M. Vansteenkiste, W. Lens *et al.*, "Placing Motivation and Future Time Perspective Theory in a Temporal Perspective", *Educational Psychology Review*, 16, 2004.

Stajkovic A.D. & F. Luthans, "Self-efficacy and work-related performance: A meta-analysis", *Psychological Bulletin*, 124(2), 1998.

Stringer C., J. Didham, P. Theivananthampillai, "Motivation, pay satisfaction, and job satisfaction of front-line employees", *Qualitative Research in Accounting & Management*, Vol. 8, No. 2, 2011.

Taormina R.J., J.H. Gao, "Maslow and the motivation hierarchy: Measuring satisfaction of the needs", *The American Journal of Psychology*, 126(2), 2013.

Thomas J.L., M.W. Dickson, P.D. Bliese, "Values predicting leader performance in the U.S. Army Reserve Officer Training Corps Assessment Center: evidence for a personality-mediated model", *The Leadership Quarterly*, Volume 12, Issue 2, 2001.

Tyler T.R., P.E. Callahan, J. Frost, "Armed, and Dangerous (?): Motivating Rule Adherence Among Agents of Social Control", *Law and Society Review*, Vol. 41(2), 2007.

Vroom V.H., *Work and Motivation*, John Wiley & Sons, New York, 1964.

Wabba M., R.J. House, "Expectancy Theory in Work and Motivation: Some Logical and Methodological", *Issues. Human Relations*, Volume 27, issue 2, 1974.

Wahba M.A., L.G. Bridwell, "Maslow reconsidered: A review of research on the need hierarchy theory", *Organizational Behavior and Human Performance*. Volume 15, Issue 2, 1976.

Warr P., I. Inceoglu, "Job engagement, job satisfaction, and contrasting associations with person – job fit", *Journal of Occupational Health Psychology*, 17(2), 2012.

Wilcove G.L., "The ERG model: Expansion and application to Navy personnel", *Journal of Vocational Behavior*, 13(3), 1978.

Winkler J.D., T. Marler, M.N. Posard, R.S. Cohen, M.L. Smith, *Reflections on the Future of Warfare and Implications for Personnel Policies of the U.S. Department of Defence*, Defence Technical Information Center, Rand National Defence Research Inst Santa Monica CA, 2019, <https://apps.dtic.mil/sti/citations/AD108394>

Woodruff T.D., "Who Should the Military Recruit? The Effects of Institutional, Occupational, and Self-Enhancement Enlistment Motives on Soldier Identification and Behavior", *Armed Forces and Society*, 43 (4), 2017.