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Abstract

The authors of this study sought to examine the job satisfaction and motivational level of high school teachers regarding the Hygiene and Motivator factors as identified by Herzberg and to find out the effect of fulfillment of Hygiene and Motivator factors on motivation of high school teachers. A questionnaire titled the quantitative data from Lester’s (1987) TJSQ assessment of teacher job satisfaction and Hoy et al. ’s (1991) OCDQ-RS assessment of school climate were used to collect data for the study. While the data for the study was analyzed using multiple statistical procedures: mean point value, standard deviation, and variance, t-test of significance and One-way-analysis of variance (ANOVA). A paper survey has been distributed to 198 respondents who are all actively involved in high school teaching in Isparta, Turkey. However, Frederick Herzberg’s theory which states that what he terms hygiene (job context) factors contribute to dissatisfaction while motivator (job content) factors relate to satisfaction, the study indicates that both hygiene factors and motivation factors contribute to satisfaction and especially, hygiene factors were more satisfying factors in the high school teachers group.
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Introduction

Teachers are noticeably the most important group of professionals as teachers run within the social life of a school and teaching is an inspiring occupation for all the nation and also they focus on the development of children. Much of teaching and learning is about somewhat routine communications but truly high-quality learning comes through the kind of encouraging pedagogic arrangement and it cannot always be shaped by regulation. Hence, it would be disappointing to find that many of today’s teachers were demotivated or unsatisfied with their jobs (Brundrett, 2006).

The most commonly-used definition of job satisfaction is as “a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one’s job or job experiences” ( Locke, 1976). Gruneberg (1976) defined job satisfaction as the total cluster of emotional state an individual who had about his occupation or job. Moreover he interpreted that the nature of the job itself, the pay, the work environment, etc. were all important variables that led to a feeling of job satisfaction.

Neff (1968) reported that the ordinary individual spends two-thirds of his/her life engaged in a work. Most of proportion of our lives is spent in the work, thus it is a fundamental issue to study the “job satisfaction”. It is a worthwhile concept and it is influenced by, and influences other variables. Schultz (1982) defined job satisfaction that is “the psychological disposition of people toward their work”. Thus, as with Gruenberg’s (1976) definition, job satisfaction is not limited to a single factor but it is dependent on a collection of work related tasks or activities. Okafor (1985) described job satisfaction is the worker’s
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criticism of the extent to which the work environment fulfills his or her desires, however job dissatisfaction is a negative feeling toward individual's job that can be associated with outcomes.

In spite of being several definitions which are related to job satisfaction have been suggested, many theories have been developed to clarify why people differ in respect to satisfaction with their jobs. Job satisfaction is not of course synonymous with motivation, motivation is a process and leads to job satisfaction. One of the most important theories about motivation is Herzberg and his friends' theory. Herzberg, Mausner, and Snyderman (1959) developed the two-factor theory of job satisfaction. According to this theory, the main factors of satisfaction are the intrinsic aspects of the job (motivators; e.g. recognition, promotions, etc.), while the main factors of job dissatisfaction are the extrinsic factors (hygienes; e.g. salary, working conditions, etc.). Various workplace factors (supportive principals, focus on academic excellence, morale) were important determinants of job satisfaction among the teachers (Baughman, 1996). Similarly, Perie and Baker (1997) stated that administrative support (among other extrinsic factors) led to teachers’ feelings of job satisfaction. Job satisfaction results when intrinsic aspects of work encourage feelings of happiness in the worker, and job dissatisfaction results when the extrinsic factors are considered. Yet the same factors can be source both satisfaction and dissatisfaction (Brunetti, 2001). Thus, as our research indicated that a single variable alone cannot be a predictor of job satisfaction or dissatisfaction.

Teacher job satisfaction or motivation has been identified as being a determinant of teacher retention, teacher commitment and school effectiveness. Numerous causes have approved as being related to teacher job satisfaction in Western developed countries, such as role overload, leadership, teacher autonomy, salary, parent support, student behavior and school climate (Young, 2000). Besides, studies have confirmed that country and culture can be a source of worker job satisfaction (Saari and Erez, 2002). Thus, the relationship between intrinsic job characteristics and job satisfaction can be experienced by national prosperity and culture (Huang and Van De Vliert, 2003).

There have been many studies about teacher motivation factors and job satisfaction in the developed countries (Young 2000). On the other hand only some research on teacher job satisfaction and motivation factors that lead job satisfaction have been conducted in developing countries. Furthermore, very few studies have been compared between developing countries and developed countries in terms of sources of teacher job satisfaction. In the study of Liu and Onwuegbuzie (2014) suggested that teachers who participated in a survey in China indicated that the teachers were motivated by both intrinsic (motivation factors) and extrinsic factors (hygiene factors). Furthermore, it showed that teachers who were more intrinsically motivated to enter the teaching profession reported a higher level of job satisfaction. While in developed countries and in more individualistic countries, motivational factors were more intensely related to job satisfaction (Huang 2001). In another study, most of the teachers were satisfied with their job, only some of them were reported dissatisfaction with their jobs (Sweney, 1981). In his survey, Heller (1992) reported that only 58% of the teachers was satisfied with their job, while Moore (1987), reported that more than half of the teachers in her study was dissatisfied with the choice of teaching as a profession. In their studies the reasons which lead to dissatisfaction included were status, pay, and recognition.

As stated by 2014 the Turkish national education statistics figures (2015) that total number of high school students was 5 million 690 thousand and there were 250 thousand high school teachers in Turkey. Regardless of considerable number, research into teacher job satisfaction is still at an early stage, with few studies have been conducted and previous works have been focused on mostly primary schools.

**Herzberg's Theory**

Frederick Herzberg’s motivation-hygiene theory on job satisfaction is considered to be one of the most revolutionary research in this arena. Unlike Maslow's theory, Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory claims that job satisfaction and job dissatisfaction result from different causes. According to Herzberg, satisfaction depends on motivators, while dissatisfaction is the result of hygiene factors. While he defined motivators as intrinsic to the job, he defined hygiene factors as extrinsic to the job. He briefly created a distinction between satisfaction and dissatisfaction as well (Locke,1976).

Herzberg (1971) had conducted a study with two hundred engineers and accountants in the state of Pittsburgh, then modeled the basis of his motivation-hygiene theory. In the study, Herzberg and his friends had questioned the employees about events at work which had either led to remarkable improvement or decrease in their level of job satisfaction. Based on the results of his study (1971), there are five factors that work as strong determiners of job satisfaction. These factors
have an improving effect on the employees’ job satisfaction and they are effective in motivating individuals to higher job performance. Therefore, Herzberg names these factors as motivation factors.

Motivation factors, which are the drivers of human behavior related to the intrinsic nature of the work, but not necessarily to the surrounding circumstances or environment, are achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement. Achievement factor refers to successful performance of individual’s work tasks, solving problems, justification and seeing the results of one’s work. Recognition relays on notice, praise and criticism received from colleagues or management and it mainly means getting recognition due to achievement in tasks. Work itself describes the actual content of one’s job, basically meaning the tasks of the job. Responsibility means the sense of responsibility given to an employee for his/her own work or being given new responsibilities. Lastly, advancement refers to a change in one’s position at work and, therefore, involves the concept of promotion (Herzberg, 1967,1971).

Meanwhile, the hygiene factors, which are contingent factors may demotivate but cannot themselves provide lasting motivation, company policy and administration, supervision, salary, interpersonal relations and working conditions (Herzberg 1971). Company policy and administration relate specifically to organization management at workplaces and they also require personnel policies. Supervision, on the other hand, refers to the actual behavior of managers towards employees, for example how fair or unfair they are and how willing they are to envoy responsibilities. Salary is economic benefit for work. Interpersonal relations refer to the social interactions between colleagues and between workers and their supervisors. Working conditions require the physical environment of working and especially the available facilities with all their space and tools, for instance (Herzberg, 1967).

Table 1. Summary of job-attitude factors by Herzberg et al. (1959)

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Motivators (intrinsic) factors</th>
<th>Hygiene (contingent) factors</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1. Recognition</td>
<td>1. Salary</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2. Achievement</td>
<td>2. Interpersonal relations</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3. Possibility of growth</td>
<td>3. Supervision</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>5. Responsibility</td>
<td>5. Working conditions</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>7. Status</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>8. Job security</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

Some of the studies that used Herzberg’s original methodology have replicated his results. For instance, Myers (1964) interviewed scientists, engineers, supervisors, technicians and hourly-paid assemblers. In the study, Herzberg’s two factor theory was supported for all five groups of Myer’s population, though differences in the modeling of factors occurred. Myers indicated that “workers become dissatisfied” when their “opportunities for meaningful achievement are ignored and they become informed to their environment and begin to find fault”. This suggests that although the reported determinants of dissatisfaction are hygiene factors, the cause of dissatisfaction lies in the motivators. Another study supported Herzberg’s theory which Schwartz (1959) used a questionnaire was parallel to Herzberg’s (1959) interview schedule, on 373 third-level supervisors. He found that the factors most significantly related to satisfaction were achievement, and recognition of achievement (motivators); company policy and administration (hygiene factor) was found to be the basic reason for dissatisfaction.
In the study of Weissenberg and Gruenfeld (1968) whereas both hygiene factors and motivators contributed to civil service supervisors overall satisfaction, it was mostly motivators that did so. However, the relationship of motivators and hygiene factors to dissatisfaction was not reported.

According to Wall (1970) most of the studies strongly suggest that the research results upon which Herzberg’s theory is based on a function of “social desirability”. Individuals with a strong need for social approval, or individuals in a situation requiring highly socially acceptable responses, were shown to give results highly reliable with the two-factor theory. However, individuals with a lesser need for social approval, or in a situation which did not necessarily demand socially acceptable responses, gave results which were much less consistent with the two-factor theory. Furthermore, it was found that the use of a long-lasting recall period tended to maximize the relationship between social desirability and the two-factor theory. Consequently, as a description of the structure of job attitudes and of the determinants of satisfaction and dissatisfaction, the two-factor theory is not acceptable.

Experimental tests of hypotheses derived from the two-factor theory have produced contradictory results, this conflict may, to some extent, be due to the differing interpretations which have been placed upon the theory. However, it is noticeable that those studies which support the two-factor theory tend to use a methodology very similar to that used in the study upon which the two-factor theory is based. Research which refutes the two-factor theory has tended to use different methodologies. It is suggested that the extent to which research supports or negates the two-factor theory is a function of the degree to which socially desirable responses have been encouraged by the methodology employed (Wall, 1970).

Method

This study was a descriptive survey type; the researchers used survey method to collect relevant information from high school teachers who were working in public sector schools of Isparta province, Turkey. All the teachers working at the 9-12 grades of public high schools and teaching social studies and science studies teachers constitute the population of the study. The random sample method was used. All the sampled high school teachers were visited and the questionnaires were distributed for ourselves.

One hundred ninety-eight high school teachers were surveyed using Lester’s (1987) TJSQ assessment of teacher job satisfaction and Hoy et al.’s (1991) OCDQ-RS assessment of school climate were used to collect data for the study. The research participants in the current study were qualified teachers. A total of 250 questionnaires were distributed however 52 of these were rejected. This resulted in response data of 198 (79.2%) completed the survey. The Lester’s (1987) instrument to measure job satisfaction as an instrument uses supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay, responsibility, work itself, advancement, security, and recognition as factors of an educator’s job satisfaction. Job satisfaction is defined as the extent to which a teacher perceives and values various factors including evaluation, responsibility, and recognition.

The instrument was comprised of 45 items in five-point Likert scale format ( strongly disagree, disagree, undecided, agree, strongly agree). Participants respond, one to five, whether they agree or disagree with each item on the scale.

The questionnaire involved of two parts. In the first part demographical information was obtained gender, teaching experience years and lesson branches (social studies and science). The questions were asked related to their current level of motivation. The datasets were analyzed in relation to Herzberg et al.’s (1959) two-factor theory. This part contained questions mainly on extrinsic motivating factors such as supervision, colleagues, working conditions, pay factor. And also, it was tried to stimulate respondents’ attitudes towards the intrinsic factors such as responsibility, advancement, recognition, work itself that keep them motivated. In this part we tried to investigate which intrinsic factors mostly motivate high school teachers. For the statistical analysis of the data was used the statistical package for the social sciences (SPSS) 20 program. The total scale Alpha coefficient of the sample (N = 198) was 0. 81.

Data Analysis and Results

In the eight high schools, 198 teachers responded to questionnaires. Of these, 38.4% were female, and 61.6% male taught in high schools in Isparta. As for number of years teaching, 3.5 % reported between 0 and 5 years’ experience, 7.1 % reported between 6 and 9 years, 16.2 % reported between 10 and 14, 29.3 % reported between 15 and 19 years, 23.2 %
reported between 20 and 24 years, 20.7% reported 25 and over teaching experience. 32.3% were science teachers and 64.6% were social science teachers who constituted the study.

Table 2. Effect of Teaching Experience Years on Motivation Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>241,269</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>48,254</td>
<td>1.065</td>
<td>.381</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>8701,822</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>45,322</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>8943,091</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

A one-way between-groups analysis of variance was conducted to explore impact the years of teaching experience on levels of motivation factors and hygiene factors as measured by the tests. Participants were divided into six groups according to their teaching experience years (Group 1: 0-5 years; Group 2: 6-9 years; Group 3: 10-14 years; Group 4: 15-19 years; Group 5: 20-24 years and Group 6: 25 years and above). There was not a statistically significant difference among the mean scores on motivation factors p < .05 level in the test scores for the six groups of teaching experience: F (5, 192) = 1.0, p = .381.

Table 3: Effect of Teaching Experience Years on Hygiene Factors

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th></th>
<th>Sum of Squares</th>
<th>df</th>
<th>Mean Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Between Groups</td>
<td>2491,993</td>
<td>5</td>
<td>498,399</td>
<td>3.767</td>
<td>.003</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Within Groups</td>
<td>25400,962</td>
<td>192</td>
<td>132,297</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Total</td>
<td>27892,955</td>
<td>197</td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

There was a statistically significant difference among the mean scores on hygiene factors for six groups. Group 3, group 4 and group 6 were statistically significantly different from one another. That is 10-14, 15-19, 25+ experience years groups different significantly in terms of hygiene factor scores. The effect size, calculated using eta squared, was .03. Post-hoc comparisons using the Tukey HSD test indicated that the mean score for Group 3 (M = -7.58, SD = 2.53), Group 4 (M = 7.58, SD = 2.53) and Group 6 (M = -7.85, SD = 2.34) were significantly different from one another.

Table 4: Robust Test of Equality of Means

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Statistic</th>
<th>df1</th>
<th>df2</th>
<th>Sig.</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>Welch</td>
<td>3,545</td>
<td>42,236</td>
<td>.009</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>Brown-Forsythe</td>
<td>4,066</td>
<td>99,618</td>
<td>.002</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the unsatisfying factor (hygiene) scores for males and females. There was a significant difference in scores for males (M = 80.36, SD = 12.53) and females (M = 87.27, SD = 9.41; t (189, 14) = 4.41, p = .000, two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = 6.91, 95% CI: 3.82 to 10.0) was moderate effect (eta squared = .09). The guidelines (proposed by Cohen 1988, pp. 284–7) for interpreting this value are:

.01 = small effect
.06 = moderate effect
.14 = large effect
An independent-samples t-test was also conducted to compare the satisfying factor (motivation factor) scores for females and males. There was a significant difference in scores for females (M = 67.36, SD = 5.25) and males (M = 65.34, SD = 7.42; t(192.75) = 2.41, p = .026, two-tailed). The magnitude of the differences in the means (mean difference = 2.02, 95% CI: 2.24 to 3.80) was small size effect (eta squared = .002).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the satisfying factor (motivation factor) scores for science teachers and social science teachers. The value was above 0.05, so there was not a statistically significant difference in the mean the satisfying factor (motivation factor) scores for science teachers and social science teachers. For science teachers (M = 66.07, SD = 6.77) and social science teachers (M = 66.05, SD = 6.83; t(190) = .022, p = .982, two-tailed).

An independent-samples t-test was conducted to compare the satisfying factor (hygiene factor) scores for science teachers and social science teachers. The value was above 0.05, so there was not a statistically significant difference in the mean the hygiene factor scores for science teachers and social science teachers. For science teachers (M = 83.07, SD = 12.34) and social science teachers (M = 82.84, SD = 11.84; t(190) = 127, p = .283, two-tailed). The test indicated that there was not a statistically significant difference in the mean the satisfying factor (motivation factor) scores and the unsatisfying factor (hygiene) scores for science teachers and social science teachers.

Frederick Herzberg’s theory which states that what he terms hygiene (job context) factors contribute to dissatisfaction while motivator (job content) factors relate to satisfaction, the study indicates that both hygiene factors and motivation factors contribute to satisfaction and especially, hygiene factors were more satisfying factors in the high school teachers group. Hygiene factors were more effective satisfying factors on female teachers than male. And also, motivator factors were almost same satisfying effect on male and female high school teachers.

The eight schools were demographically and academically very similar, they had similar levels of job satisfaction and school climate. The job satisfaction and school climate levels were significantly higher at the schools.

Although there was a statistically significant difference among the mean scores on hygiene factors for group 3, group 4 and group 6, we may conclude that there was not enough important difference to justify to data.

Moreover there was not a statistically significant difference in the mean the satisfying factor (motivation factor) scores and the unsatisfying factor (hygiene) scores for science teachers and social science teachers. It was notable that responsibility factor (M=26.4, SD=3.3), supervision factor (M=26.3, SD=6.06), colleagues factors (M=25.1, SD=3.2), were rated highest factors and the other motivation and hygiene factors such as working conditions factor (M=17.5, SD=2.6), pay factor (M=10.9, SD=3.3), advancement factor (M=9.1, SD=2.5), recognition factor (M=5.1, SD=1.5), and security factor (M=2.9, SD=1.1) followed.

Conclusion and Discussion

Confidently, there are many ways to justify the theory of Herzberg. The defenders who support the motivation-hygiene theory may fail to defend the theory if do not use the methodology which Herzberg used. Now and then the researchers used the Herzberg’s same methodology of getting the data although they failed to find same results (Gardner, 1970).

It is obvious that the two-factor theory is a controversial issue so differing interpretations have been engaged and the validity of these interpretations has itself become a subject of controversy. French and his friends (1973) stated that in the most of the studies, only few interview method of data collection and unstructured approach were used. And also few studies used the critical incident technique as a means of data reduction, though a variety of data analysis techniques were employed. The recent studies have used as Herzberg's methodology and acquired results supportive of the theory. Others who applied different methodologies, either in terms of data collection, reduction or analysis, failed to obtain results supportive of the two-factor theory. The main polemic of this research has been that Herzberg can be replicated when certain key factors in the experimental process are held constant. In this case it was possible to obtain statistically similar results using oral and written data collection techniques. It is clear that researches in this area become increasingly aware of these difficulties and control them.
Majority of the teachers of high schools in district Isparta, in their overall response to hygiene variables, realized their satisfaction with Hygiene factors on their jobs. Their feeling of satisfaction with Hygiene factors was the disapproval of Motivation -Hygiene theory in respect of hygiene factors, because Herzberg's theory regarded satisfaction at workplace is the outcome of motivators, not of hygiene factors.

The research reveals that high school teachers' motivation was mostly dependent on both the fulfillment of Hygiene and Motivator factors. Nevertheless high school teachers' motivation was more at the mercy of Hygiene factors rather than motivator factors. According to the research of Wall (1970) on university teachers, strong significant relationships were found between the satisfaction of Hygiene and Motivator.

The high school teachers were satisfied with the hygiene factors such as relation with administration or supervision, relation with colleagues, pay factor or salary and security and also they were very pleased with motivation factors such as responsibility, advancement, recognition and work itself. We can conclude that the high school teachers’ motivation was relied on both the fulfillment of hygiene and motivator factors and the teachers’ job satisfaction and school climate levels were significantly higher.

The development of effective and planned teacher policies in Turkey depends upon careful consideration of the motivational factors and hygiene factors involved in engagement an upon close hearing to the voices of the teachers.
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