

## Determinants of Job Satisfaction among Teachers in Vietnam

**Dr. TRAN Ngoc Tien**

Department of English-American Language and Culture  
Faculty of Social Sciences and Humanities  
Hoa Sen University  
Vietnam

### Abstract

*This study investigates the determinants of teachers' job satisfaction in Lam Dong Province, Vietnam and examines the feasibility of applying Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory in Vietnam's educational setting, employing mixed research approaches with survey questionnaire, in-depth interviews, group discussions and observations. The findings supported the application of Herzberg's theory in the educational setting of Vietnam with the exception of recognition. The results showed that satisfiers of teaching career overwhelmingly were phenomena intrinsic to teaching tasks. These include career achievement, work itself, advancement, responsibility, job security, and support from students' parents. Dissatisfiers, on the other hand, were those extrinsic to the teaching core and beyond the ability of teachers including promotion, pay, supervision, students' behavior, job pressure, teacher status, teacher training, working condition, recognition, school policies, relationship with co-workers, school reputation, and career support from school. The research findings provide an analytical framework for policy makers in Vietnam to create appropriate policies for the benefit of teachers, students and the educational system. Furthermore, understanding teachers' career satisfaction may result in higher teachers' job commitment, job performance and attitudes towards work directly leading to higher educational outcomes.*

**Keywords:** Job satisfaction, Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory, Vietnam

### 1. Introduction

Job, according to Spector (1997), is a necessity and a central part of any individual's life. However, not all people have the same level of satisfaction in their jobs. Some people feel that job is a source of happiness. Others, on the other hand, feel that working life is dreadful or miserable. Spector (1997) also argues that job satisfaction is related to individual and organizational outcomes. Furthermore, to some extent, job satisfaction reflects the fairness and good treatment at the place of work and is an indicator for employees' commitment towards their performance at the working place.

Since the 1930s, studies of employees's attitudes towards their work or job satisfaction have begun to have significant contribution to the body of knowledge about the factors making employees satisfied or dissatisfied in their jobs (Locke, 1976). A great number of definitions and theories on job satisfaction and work motivation have been developed. The underlying challenge associated with researches on job satisfaction issues is that there is no universal definition of the term (Evans, 1997). There have been a wide range of concepts and definitions of job satisfaction.

Spector (1997) defines job satisfaction as the degree of satisfaction that employees have towards their jobs and other aspects of the jobs, and it also indicates the level of fairness and good treatment in the work places. Other researchers view job satisfaction as a term indicating individual's need fulfillment at work (Schaffer, 1953; Porter, 1962; Sergiovanni, 1968; Wolf, 1970; Alderfer, 1972), the differences between what an individual expects to receive and what he actually gains from work (Lawler, 1973), a product of behavior and action in a particular context or environment (Nadler & Lawler, 1991), or the state of feeling an employee has resulting from job values (Locke, 1968).

Hulin & Judge (2003), on the other hand, argue that the concept of job satisfaction should comprise of multidimensional psychological responses including the three important aspects namely cognitive (evaluative), affective (emotional), and behavioral components.

Dinham & Scott (1998) consider job satisfaction as a dynamic construct indicating how an employee feels about his or her job. Weiss & Cropanzano (1996) propose a job satisfaction definition in which emotion is given more emphasis. They view job satisfaction as "an evaluative judgment about one's job that partly, but not entirely, results from emotional experiences at work" (p. 2). This disparity among the definitions and concepts are related to data analysis as well as finding interpretation. Although being observed and defined in various ways, the most widely accepted and the most influential definition of job satisfaction is that of Locke (1976) who mentions job satisfaction as "a pleasurable or positive emotional state resulting from the appraisal of one's job or job experiences" (p. 1304).

Many theories have been proposed to offer explanations for job satisfaction. Hackman & Oldham (1976), based on the perception that job characteristics need to be redesigned in terms of job content and nature to replace routine and simple jobs in traditional assemblies and to make jobs less boring and dissatisfying, suggested Job Characteristics Model. The model proposes five core job characteristics (skill variety, task identity, task significance, autonomy, and feedback) leading to three critical psychological states namely experienced meaningfulness, experienced responsibility, and knowledge of results which in turn contribute to job outcomes including work motivation, job performance, job satisfaction, and attendance. Job Characteristics Model believes that employees who love challenges and who are interested in their jobs will have positive attitudes and will be more motivated if they have complex jobs. Furthermore, when employees feel that their jobs are meaningful and enjoyable, jobs will be well performed as employees are more motivated and satisfied. Hackman & Oldham's Job Characteristics Model is appreciated for its significant contributions to the relationship between core job characteristics and critical psychological states. However, the model has its own shortcomings in limiting the range of job characteristics including the absence of management practices and supervisory styles (Fincham & Rhodes, 1999).

Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman (1959) are the pioneers who assumed working environment as one of the determinants affecting employees' job satisfaction. They discovered that factors affecting employees' satisfaction were different from those of dissatisfaction. From these findings, Herzberg, Mausner & Snyderman developed Motivation-Hygiene Theory to explain these results. In Herzberg's works (Herzberg, Mausner, & Snyderman, 1959; Herzberg, 1966; Herzberg, 1976), factors of job satisfaction are divided into two domains: motivation and hygiene factors. Motivators refer to the nature of work and are the sources of job satisfaction. These include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility, advancement, and growth. Hygiene factors, on the other hand, are the factors extrinsic to the central purpose of the employees and jobs such as company policies, supervisory practices, work conditions, salary, or relationship with co-workers or supervisors. Hygiene factors tend to contribute to the dissatisfaction of the employees. Furthermore, Herzberg and his colleagues argued that the factors contributing to job satisfaction are not the negative or opposite to those of job dissatisfaction and vice versa. Furthermore, the negative of job satisfaction is not job dissatisfaction but no satisfaction. Similarly, the negative of job dissatisfaction is not job satisfaction, but rather, no dissatisfaction.

Although there have been criticisms, Herzberg's two-factor theory of job satisfaction-dissatisfaction has been widely accepted and applied in many researches (Dinham & Scott, 1998; Furnham, Petrides, Jackson & Cotter, 2002). The theory has also been replicated and tested in the educational setting including Sergiovanni (1967), Nias (1981) Kaufman (1984) Dinham & Scott (1998). Sergiovanni (1967) conducted interviews with 71 teachers and the same methods were also applied by Nias (1981) with 100 graduates to test Herzberg's two-factor theory in the educational context. These studies confirmed that factors leading to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction are mutually exclusive. The findings showed that motivators in teaching context tend to be the job itself and the hygiene factors tend to be job conditions. Specifically, achievement, recognition and responsibility are predominantly the factors contributing to teacher job satisfaction while interpersonal relations, school policy and administration, physical condition, unfairness and promotion are the main sources of teachers' job dissatisfaction.

Kaufman (1984) examined Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory to check the feasibility of applying the theory. The study reported that Herzberg Two-Factor Theory could be used in educational settings to identify the motivation and hygiene seekers. Kaufman also concluded that motivation seekers are more likely to be committed to teaching than the non-motivation ones. Dinham & Scott (2000) found another factor affecting job satisfaction and dissatisfaction in the teaching profession apart from the general principle of "two-factor" theory. This third domain generally consists of school-related factors such as school leadership, school reputation, and school infrastructure.

The satisfaction level of these factors falls between the satisfiers intrinsic to teaching and the dissatisfiers extrinsic to teaching tasks. Lortie (1975) suggested that the ability to build a productive relationship with students is the key source for teachers' jobs as it would be easier if teachers have a positive and closed relationship with their students. Johnson & Birkeland (2003) believed that teachers would have better relationship with their students if they share some common characteristics such as race, ethnicity, language, social background and expectations.

Several other main theories on job satisfaction attracting the attention of researchers include Discrepancy Theory of Locke (1969), Equity Theory of Adams (1965), and Expectancy Theory of Vroom (1964). Discrepancy Theory describes job satisfaction in three aspects: what an employee wants, what the employee expects to receive from work, and what he or she actually receives. If the difference between the actual outcomes an employee receives and what he or she expects to get exists, job dissatisfaction occurs (Cano & Castillo, 2004). Equity Theory, on the other hand, explains the satisfaction in work places in terms of inputs and outcomes or fair and unfair distribution of resources. According to Equity Theory, employees try to maintain the equity between their contribution to jobs and the outcomes they get from their jobs. Employees compare the relationships between inputs/outcomes they receive with other individuals at the same level. Equity exists when the relationship between inputs and outcomes is similar to other co-workers in their work place or in other organizations with the same context. On the other hand, when employees feel that they are being treated unfairly or unequally, they will be less satisfied in their jobs and the perception of inequity occurs (Mowday, 1987). Vroom's Expectancy Theory is based on the assumption that individuals have different sets of goals in their jobs and they are motivated when they believe that there is a positive relationship between efforts and performance which in turn leads to desirable reward that can satisfy individuals' needs.

According to Dinham & Scott (1998), job satisfiers in the teaching profession, generally, are the factors intrinsic to teaching and student achievement, improving student attitudes and behaviours, positive relationship, recognition, and self-growth. Job dissatisfiers, on the other hand, are normally those extrinsic to the teaching. These include the changes of educational policies and procedures on teaching practices, the high expectations from society on the educational system in terms of solving social problems, declining job status, inadequate supervision, heavy administrative workloads, and interpersonal relationship. Dinham & Scott (1998) also added that satisfiers found in the teaching profession are largely universal irrespective of sex, positions held, experiences, or schools. Job dissatisfiers are generally the factors that are outside the core business of teaching work and beyond the control of teachers and schools.

## ***2. Research methodology***

This paper is a part of a research conducting in Lam Dong Province, Vietnam, aiming at understanding the issues of job satisfaction and work motivation among the teachers working at elementary, junior high and high school levels. These include the identification of the determinants of job satisfaction among teachers in Vietnam and testing Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory of job satisfaction – dissatisfaction in Vietnam's educational setting. The methodology used for the research is a combination of qualitative and quantitative research approaches. According to Muijs (2004), the combination of qualitative and quantitative approaches in a research can help to enhance the research efficiency and enrich the research results. It also helps to explore the research problems both in depth and width, both testing and developing a hypothesis, and both causative and explanatory. Snape & Spencer (2003) believe that qualitative approaches can be used to acquire subjective perspective of the informants and provide a thorough description of what, why, where and how a phenomenon occurs. Quantitative approaches, however, help to explore the research issues in terms of formulating measurements, and generalizing the research results (Kalof, Dan & Dietz, 2008; Clark-Carter, 2010).

The fieldwork was conducted in 2012 and 2013 in 20 schools in the provincial capital city and other four districts selected by applying the stratified random sampling technique. Research questionnaires were sent to all the teachers present at the school campuses at the time of field work. A total of 650 questionnaires were distributed to the respondents, 502 were returned with the response rate of 77.2%, and 436 (67.1%) were usable for the research. Among the 436 respondents, 115 (26.4%) were males and 321 (73.6%) were females. The age range of the respondents was from 22 to 60 with the mean of 34.7 years old. All the respondents had been involved in teaching from 1 to 38 years. The average teaching experiences of the respondents was 11.3 years.

Of the 436 respondents, 3.2% had upper secondary diplomas, 20.2% had college diplomas, 75.5% possessed university degrees, and 1.1% had masters' degrees. 86.0% of the respondents were classroom teachers, 11.7% were head teachers, and 2.3% were principals or vice principals. Of the 436 respondents, 118 (27.1%) of the respondents were teaching at primary level. The number of respondents teaching at the lower and upper secondary levels were 131 (30.0%) and 187 (42.9%) respectfully.

Purposeful sampling with maximum variation technique was used to pick up the informants for in-depth interviews and group discussions. A number of 32 interviews and group discussions were taken. They were audio-recorded or note-taken upon the consent of the participants. Informal dialogues and observations were also used to confirm and support the findings gained from the survey, in-depth interviews, and group discussions. The research informants were mainly classroom teachers at primary level, junior high school and upper high school levels. Other research informants include school principals and vice principals who hold both teaching and administration positions, and teachers holding administrative positions but having experienced teaching before.

The research was conducted in Vietnamese as this is the official language used in schools and the native language of 93% of the participants. Research questionnaires were distributed to research respondents at schools. Face-to-face interviews, group discussions and observations were done at school campuses, school tenement buildings, or participants' houses. The field research was carried out in four distinct periods including the pilot studies for building and testing the research instrument. Each fieldwork lasted almost from 30 to 45 days. The researcher spent around three days at each school and some schools were visited several times. Before conducting the research at the schools, school management boards were informed the purposes of the study and asked for consensus and permission to conduct the field research in their schools. In order to ensure ethical fieldwork, participants were informed of the objectives of the research and asked for their consent to participate in the study. In addition, all the participants were promised that the provided information as well as their personal identities would be kept confidential and used only for the purposes of this study. This was to encourage the participants to be honest and feel free and safe in providing the information.

Qualitative data were analysed using grounded theory techniques guided by Glaser & Strauss (2009). After the data was collected, transcription and coding were done. Qualitative data were broken into small items, closely examined, compared for the similarity and differences, and categorized under themes. Theme labels were created on the basis of the data interpreted and the themes gained from the review of literature. The items related to the themes of the paper were gathered. These items were then explored to see the relationships with research objectives. Those related were picked up for writing of the paper. Causal and comparative analysis was partially used for the quantitative data analysis. Based on the quantitative data, the reasons for joining the teaching profession were discovered and the differences between the main and targeted career motivations contributing to the overall job satisfaction were explored. Correlation research approaches, on the other hand, were applied to evaluate how well items of career motives significantly predict participants' overall job satisfaction.

### **3. Findings**

Table 1 presents the mean scores of the 20 facets of job satisfaction calculated from the 40 items of job satisfaction using six-point Likert scale, ranging from "strongly disagree" (1) to "strongly agree" (6) with no neutral number. The table shows that the facets having the highest mean scores of job satisfaction are achievement, work itself, personal growth, responsibility, and job security with the mean scores ranging from 4.54 to 5.03. Promotion, pay, supervision, student behavior, and job pressure, on the other hand, are the least satisfied facets reported by teachers in the survey with the mean scores ranging from 2.99 to 3.83.

**Table 1: Facets of Job Satisfaction (N = 436)**

Order	Job satisfaction facets	Minimum	Maximum	Mean	Std. Deviation
1	Satisfaction with achievement	2.50	6.00	5.03	.679
2	Satisfaction with the work itself	2.50	6.00	4.89	.711
3	Satisfaction with personal growth	2.50	6.00	4.85	.671
4	Satisfaction with responsibility	1.50	6.00	4.58	.839
5	Satisfaction with job security	1.50	6.00	4.54	.831
6	Satisfaction with school reputation	1.50	6.00	4.36	.962
7	Satisfaction with co-workers	1.00	6.00	4.34	.962
8	Satisfaction with career support	1.50	6.00	4.28	.934
9	Satisfaction with policies	1.00	6.00	4.16	.938
10	Satisfaction with recognition	1.50	6.00	4.05	.961
11	Satisfaction with student motivation	1.00	6.00	4.00	.999
12	Satisfaction with workload	1.00	6.00	3.98	1.050
13	Satisfaction with job condition	1.50	6.00	3.97	.972
14	Satisfaction with training	1.00	6.00	3.92	1.018
15	Satisfaction with status	1.00	6.00	3.85	.961
16	Satisfaction with job pressure	1.00	6.00	3.83	1.048
17	Satisfaction with student behavior	1.00	6.00	3.82	1.052
18	Satisfaction with supervision	1.00	6.00	3.72	1.098
19	Satisfaction with pay	1.00	6.00	3.04	1.133
20	Satisfaction with promotion	1.00	6.00	2.99	.952
<b>Overall job satisfaction</b>		<b>2.60</b>	<b>5.43</b>	<b>4.11</b>	<b>.607</b>

Principal component analysis was applied to validate the variables of job satisfaction and to theoretically reduce the number of facets to describe the concept of job satisfaction. In the first phase of principal component analysis, nine factors were loaded from 40 variables based on the principal component extraction method, eigenvalues greater than 1, and varimax rotation method were used with the cutoff value for loading higher than .5. Before running the principal component analysis, internal consistency reliability was run to check whether the variables of job satisfaction reflected the same construct or not. The Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ ) found from the model was .950. According to George & Mallery (2003), and Gliem & Gliem (2003), Cronbach's Alpha ( $\alpha$ )  $\geq$  .9 was seen to have excellent internal consistency. The corrected item-total correlation was found ranging from .308 to .705. No Cronbach's Alpha value was higher than .950 if any item was deleted. Thus, all the variables were reliable and reflected the same construct.

Results from the model showed that Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value was .926 and Bartlett's test of sphericity was statistically significant ( $p < .0005$ ). This revealed that principal component analysis was appropriate. However, five components had only two variables. Thus, the second procedure of principal component analysis needs to be run to reduce the number of loaded factors to a statistically meaningful number. A comparison of eigenvalues from principal component analysis and criterion value from parallel analysis was used to select the number of components (Table 2). The criterion value from parallel analysis allowed extracting up to five components from the model.

**Table 2: Comparison of Eigenvalues from Principal Component Analysis and Criterion Value from Parallel Analysis**

Component number	Actual eigenvalue from PCA	Criterion value from parallel analysis	Decision
1	14.124	1.6290	accept
2	2.275	1.5568	accept
3	1.970	1.5005	accept
4	1.607	1.4556	accept
5	1.457	1.4125	accept
6	1.277	1.3754	reject
7	1.182	1.3408	reject
8	1.022	1.3063	reject
9	1.011	1.2729	reject
10	.964	1.2451	reject

The scree plot showed that the slope of the curve sharply leveled off at the second variable. This elbow indicated that two factors should be generated for the analysis. Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory and other researches testing the theory also resulted in the two groups of factors referring to job satisfaction and dissatisfaction. In order to confirm Herzberg's theory in Vietnam's educational setting and to create the rotated factors that makes theoretical sense, the second procedure of principal component analysis with two-factor loaded was applied from 40 variables based on the principal component extraction method, varimax rotation method, and cutoff value for loading higher than .5. The results are indicated in Table 3.

Results from the second procedure of principal component analysis show the two rotated factors extracted from the model with Kaiser-Meyer-Olkin (KMO) value (.926) and Bartlett's test of sphericity ( $p < .0005$ ). This proved that the second procedure of principal component analysis was appropriate. The first component consists of 21 variables. These variables indicate the low level of job satisfaction so it refers to the "hygiene factor". The other component consists of 10 items of the job satisfaction. This factor includes the facets that have higher means of job satisfaction, so it refers to the "motivation factor". Nine variables that have the absolute value below .5 are not included in the model. The overall job satisfaction is then recounted for the analysis of this study based on the mean of thirty-one variables excluding the nine variables removed from the model after running the second procedure of principal component analysis.

**Table 3: The Second Procedure of Principal Component Analysis**

Rotated Component Matrix <sup>a</sup>			
		Component	
		1	2
1	I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	.659	
2	The benefits I receive in this job are as good as most other sectors offer.	.636	
3	I am satisfied with my students' behavior.	.629	
4	Students' behavior is appropriate and they respect their teachers and other staff in the school.	.626	
5	I have a sense of being proud to be a member of the school.	.617	
6	Teachers in my school get well along with each other.	.605	
7	The teaching aids in school are sufficient for teaching and learning.	.591	
8	I am satisfied with the reputation of my school in the educational sector.	.578	
9	The physical working condition of the school is generally good and sufficient for teaching and learning.	.577	
10	Teachers always get support from school to do well their jobs.	.562	
11	The images of teachers portrayed in media make me feel proud of my job.	.547	
12	Teachers have relative good social positions in the community.	.547	
13	Teachers in our school cooperate closely with each other to improve learning and teaching quality.	.546	
14	Those who do well in the job have the same chance of being promoted.	.540	
15	The in-service training I get for my job is relatively sufficient for the changes of the educational program.	.533	
16	Teachers are well informed of the school policies and plans.	.527	
17	I am satisfied with the pressure to fulfill the targets of students' educational attainment set up by school.	.524	
18	My supervisor treats his/ her employees fairly.	.521	
19	The pressure of meeting the preplanned targets motivates teachers to do well their jobs.	.519	
20	School policies and their implementations are suitable and create favor conditions for teachers to do well their jobs.	.519	
21	When I do a good job, I receive the recognition that I should receive.	.515	
22	The pre-service training I learned at teachers' training colleges or universities was suitable for my job.		
23	Working hours and holidays of my job is relatively adequate compared with other careers in general.		
24	The amount of work I need to do in this job is sufficient for my ability.		
25	I don't feel my efforts to do well my job are appreciated in the way they should be.		
26	My supervisor shows little interest in the feelings of subordinates.		
27	There is really too little chance for promotion in my job.		
28	I feel happy when helping students understanding a difficult concept.		.771
29	I am doing a vital job for the benefits of the society.		.764
30	Teaching helps me to improve my personality in my life.		.699
31	The job significantly affects the future of students.		.686
32	I feel satisfied when my students are fond of my teaching methods.		.651
33	Teaching provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally.		.636
34	I am happy with the chance to be responsible for my job.		.584
35	I get adequate support from parents for their children's education.		.584
36	I feel a high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do on this job.		.541
37	Teaching profession guarantees me to have a lifetime job.		.507
38	My students believe that education is closely related to their life outcome.		
39	I am satisfied with the amount of time and energy that my students spend for their learning.		
40	The job provides me a steady employment.		

Extraction Method: Principal Component Analysis.

Rotation Method: Varimax with Kaiser Normalization.

a. Rotation converged in 3 iterations.

As these two components were newly formed, internal consistency reliability was used to check the reliability of the variables among each factor. The Cronbach's Alpha of the 21 hygiene variables was .928. The Corrected Item-Total Correlation ranged from .410 to .689. No Cronbach's Alpha value if item deleted was bigger than Cronbach's Alpha (.928) (Table 4). This indicates that all the variables of the hygiene factor have internal reliability. The same process also applied for motivation factor. The Cronbach's Alpha of the 10 motivation variables was .874. The Corrected Item-Total Correlation ranged from .520 to .715. No Cronbach's Alpha value if item deleted was bigger than the Cronbach's Alpha (.874) (Table 5). This meant that all the variables of the motivation factor were internal reliable.

**Table 4: Internal Consistency Reliability for Hygiene Variables**

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
The in-service training I get for my job is relatively sufficient for the changes of the educational program.	78.67	198.524	.612	.433	.924
Teachers always get support from school to do well their jobs.	78.21	196.395	.687	.573	.923
Teachers in my school get well along with each other.	78.13	195.950	.687	.599	.923
The teaching aids in school are sufficient for teaching and learning.	78.60	198.260	.631	.625	.924
The pressure of meeting the preplanned targets motivates teachers to do well their jobs.	78.63	197.994	.563	.510	.925
My supervisor treats his/ her employees fairly.	78.46	199.743	.507	.366	.926
Teachers are well informed the school policies and plans.	78.05	198.855	.606	.533	.924
I feel I am being paid a fair amount for the work I do.	79.11	198.204	.521	.572	.926
When I do a good job, I receive the recognition that I should receive.	78.22	201.715	.587	.397	.925
I am satisfied with the reputation of my school in the educational sector.	78.22	197.013	.654	.578	.923
Teachers have relative good social positions in the community.	78.81	200.153	.547	.456	.925
Students' behavior is appropriate and they respect their teachers and other staff in the school.	78.57	196.816	.666	.596	.923
Teachers in our school cooperate closely with each other to improve learning and teaching quality.	78.19	198.591	.689	.613	.923
I am satisfied with the pressure to fulfill the targets of students' educational attainment set up by school.	78.70	200.624	.543	.500	.925
School policies and their implementations are suitable and create favor conditions for teachers to do well their jobs.	78.64	201.566	.576	.533	.925
The benefits I receive in this job are as good as most other sectors offer.	79.81	201.440	.482	.578	.927
Those who do well in the job have the same chance of being promoted.	79.15	203.563	.410	.225	.928
I have a sense of being proud to be a member of the school.	78.06	198.817	.683	.592	.923
The images of teachers portrayed in media make my feel proud of my job.	78.48	200.526	.587	.514	.925
I am satisfied with my students' behavior.	78.78	196.229	.641	.587	.923
The physical working condition of the school is generally good and sufficient for teaching and learning.	78.46	198.755	.661	.649	.923



**Table5: Internal Consistency Reliability for Motivation Variables**

Item-Total Statistics					
	Scale Mean if Item Deleted	Scale Variance if Item Deleted	Corrected Item-Total Correlation	Squared Multiple Correlation	Cronbach's Alpha if Item Deleted
I feel satisfied when my students are fond of my teaching methods.	42.47	28.732	.561	.383	.864
Teaching provides me with an opportunity to advance professionally.	42.69	28.669	.577	.370	.863
The job significantly affects the future of students.	42.65	28.362	.600	.414	.862
I feel a high degree of personal responsibility for the work I do on this job.	42.95	28.060	.520	.404	.868
I get adequate support from parents for their children's education.	43.22	26.988	.577	.353	.865
I feel happy when helping students understanding a difficult concept.	42.42	28.267	.653	.488	.858
Teaching profession guarantees me to have a lifetime job.	42.97	28.286	.522	.316	.868
Teaching helps me to improve my personality in my life.	42.56	28.200	.664	.486	.857
I am happy with the chance to be responsible for my job.	42.83	27.216	.617	.479	.860
I am doing a vital job for the benefits of the society.	42.53	27.321	.715	.534	.853

## 4. Discussion

### 4.1 Facets with high satisfaction level

Result from the second procedure of principal component analysis showed that ten out of forty items of job satisfaction appeared in one component with the mean score of 4.75 indicating that respondents reported to be satisfied in these variables. These ten items referred to career achievement, work itself, advancement, responsibility, job security, and support from students' parents. With the exception of job recognition, the results were in line with Herzberg' Motivation – Hygiene Theory which found that the motivators leading to job satisfaction include achievement, recognition, work itself, responsibility and advancement.

Qualitative data from interviews and group discussions showed that teachers were satisfied with the teaching tasks and with their success in teaching. Respondents said that they were happy with teaching tasks and the success of their career. They were happy to educate young people to be good citizens and to see their students successful in their life. Several teachers indicated that they were satisfied when their students could understand their lessons or when their students were interested in their teaching methods as well as their teaching subjects. Teachers also said that they were happy when their efforts in teaching were acknowledged by their students, their colleagues and their school managerial boards. Furthermore, respondents were happy with the chance of working with children, and the ways their students smiled, talked and thought. Some respondents indicated that they were happy to see their students respecting their teachers, having positive learning attitudes, and improving their academic skills. Teachers were also satisfied when their former students still remembered them, showed their gratitude, and visited them on special holidays or ceremonies.

There were also stories of success in the study. These teachers were those who felt effective and successful in their teaching. They gained confidence and competence in their teaching. They were happy about the opportunities for personal growth from the teaching profession. Respondents said that they needed to explore new knowledge, prepare their lessons and search for better teaching methods to make their lessons more successful. This helped them to improve professional skills and gain new knowledge. Some teachers, after several years of teaching, found that teaching was a suitable career where they could utilize their ability and skills. These satisfied teachers also found much support from their students' parents. Some teachers said that although they were teaching in remote and economically disadvantaged areas, people still took good care of their children's education and sympathized with teachers' difficulties in teaching their children.

### 4.2 Facets with low satisfaction level

Results from the second procedure of principal component analysis also indicated that twenty-one out of forty items of job satisfaction were variables indicating low satisfaction level. They had a mean score of 3.93. These reflected various aspects of the teaching job including promotion, pay, supervision, students' behavior, job

pressure, teacher status, teacher training, working condition, recognition, school policies, relationship with co-workers, school reputation, and career support from school. The results generally confirmed Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory indicating that company policy, supervision, salary, interpersonal relation, and working condition were the main factors leading to the employees' dissatisfaction.

Promotion was shown to be the least satisfied facet. Respondents were not satisfied with promotion not because they were not promoted but because of the unfair promotional procedure in their schools. A teacher admitted that the promotional procedure generally affected their job satisfaction and their commitment in pursuing the teaching career. Those with ability were not promoted and those who were promoted did not deserve it. The promotion was not based on ability but on "connections" or some other reasons. Another teacher added that the required procedure in promoting a teacher to a key position within schools was merely symbolic and not followed in reality. The principals normally took advantage of their power to appoint those that they preferred. Teachers who did not support the pre-selected candidates and the principals' decision would be mistreated in various ways.

Teachers' inadequate compensation was the most complained issue found in the interviews and group discussions. A group of teachers showed their concern about the low salaries and declining status. They indicated that the inadequate salary system existing in the teaching profession meant that teaching was not valued or appreciated as it should be. Another teacher said that she was unsatisfied with her teaching job as the income was only enough for her basic life although she tried to save every bit she earned. A teacher admitted that poor treatment from the educational system of its employees in terms of compensation and ability resulted in the negative feeling. The consequence would be reflected in poor educational quality. A suggestion from a respondent was that teachers needed to have a decent life to be dedicated to their career.

Critical attitude of principals and deputy principals towards their teachers was another major reason for teacher dissatisfaction. A teacher said that disrespect from school managerial boards towards teachers and from some teachers towards their colleagues lowered teacher status and made them less satisfied in their career. Several teachers reported that they faced arbitrary, abusive, or neglectful principals and unsupportive colleagues in their schools. Teachers were left alone to struggle in their work. However, they faced severe criticisms from their managerial boards if they did not complete the required targets set up by the schools for students' academic attainment.

Student behavior was also reported as another source of job satisfaction that teachers in the province experienced. When student behavior turned worse, teachers faced more difficulties in managing the classes. Teachers expressed their wish of having a supportive system or principles to deal with inadequate student behavior. Teachers indicated that they needed carefully designed plans in which school managerial council, teachers and students established the norms of behavior, discipline, and routine that could create an orderly environment for learning and teaching. A teacher expressed his concern that the rapidly declining student behavior was a reason for making school work less successful. A female teacher said that students' conduct is much different in comparison to the former generations. They disrespect their teachers by their dress styles, their thoughts and their attitudes. She concluded that this was due to a lack of teaching life skills to students in the educational system. A teacher revealed in the interview that:

In the classes I was teaching, at least 10% of students come to school just to have fun and avoid housework. These students are very slow learners; they do not care about schoolwork. They do not listen to us when I and some other teachers express our concerns. Sadly, they even wrote obscenities and insulted their own teachers in the tests instead of answering the questions. Such kinds of things make me very sad and concerned about the quality of education.

The pressure to meet the targets set up by their schools in terms of students' educational performance was indicated by some respondents as the factor contributing to job dissatisfaction. Schools and departments of education and training at municipal and provincial levels wanted their own students to have high educational performance. Consequently, they set high targets and forced their teachers to fulfill. Teachers struggled to complete such tasks. In cases where students were not qualified enough, teachers had to give them extra points to meet the requirement. This caused unfairness in school and in society. The pre-planned target fulfillment also created extra work for teachers. Teachers needed to visit students' families to encourage them to return to school if they played truant or intended to give up their schooling. This was not easy as not all the parents cooperated with teachers and not all the students appreciated their teachers' visits.

Teachers' declining image, the rising expectations of the public and the increasing responsibilities of teachers caused teachers' job dissatisfaction. The lower recognition from society together with poor image from the media made teachers feel that their status was declining. Some other reasons for teacher dissatisfaction found in the study were teacher training, working conditions, recognition, school policies, relationship with co-workers, school reputation, and career support from school. Although these reasons did not appear to be the least satisfied facets in quantitative data and not discussed regularly in qualitative methods, they should not be ignored as they were also the causes for career dissatisfaction of a significant section of teachers. Teacher respondents claimed that the pre-service training they got was far from reality, and the in-service training was not adequate for their teaching. A teacher said that she did not even have a chance for professional skill discussion for a year. Although they had regular meetings for those teaching the same subjects, time was normally spent for discussion of the school activities. Working conditions were indicated to be one source that makes teachers less satisfied in their jobs.

When choosing teaching as a career, teachers expect to have adequate support and resources that could help them to succeed. A teacher said that teaching equipment within schools revealed limitations. The teaching aids did not meet the requirement and expectation in terms of quantity, quality and their functions. They were easily broken after putting into operation several times.

#### 4. Conclusion

The findings show that the motivators of job satisfaction among teachers were career achievement, teaching tasks, personal growth, responsibility, job security, and support from students' parents. These factors were generally intrinsic to teaching tasks and other aspects contributing to the teachers' career success and personal improvement. Hygiene factors of job satisfaction, on the other hand, were found to be promotion, pay, supervision, students' behavior, job pressure, teacher status, teacher training, working condition, recognition, school policies, relationship with co-workers, school reputation, and career support from school. These factors were generally extrinsic to the teaching profession.

The research findings indicate the feasibility of applying Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory in Vietnam educational setting with the exception of recognition which was found to be a dissatisfied rather than a satisfying factor. The findings showed that the factors leading to job satisfaction are related to job content and factors contributing to job dissatisfaction are related to job context. Among more than 13,000 teachers currently working for the educational sector of the province, it is inevitable that every individual has different feeling and opinion towards his or her jobs. The findings might help those in authority of the educational system to have an insight about how teachers viewed their jobs as motivation seekers are more likely to be committed to teaching than the non-motivation seekers and teachers' job satisfaction might be directly correlated to job performance and educational quality.

#### 5. References

- Adams, J.S. (1965). Inequity in social exchange. In L. Berkowitz, *Advances in experimental social psychology* (pp. 267-299). New York: Academic Press.
- Alderfer, C. P. (1972). *Existence, relatedness, and growth: Human needs in organizational settings*. New York: Free Press.
- Cano, J., & Castillo, J. X. (2004). Factors explaining job satisfaction among faculty. *Journal of Agricultural Education*, 45(3), 65-74.
- Clark-Carter, D. (2010). *Quantitative psychological research: The complete student's companion*. Hove & New York: Psychology Press.
- Dinham, S. and Scott, C. (2000), Moving into the third, outer domain of teacher satisfaction, *Journal of Educational Administration*, Vol. 38 No. 4, pp. 379-96.
- Dinham, S., & Scott, C. (1998). A three domain model of teacher and school executive career satisfaction. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 36(4), 362-378.
- Evans, L. (1997). Addressing problems of conceptualization and construct validity in researching teachers' job satisfaction. *Educational Research*, 39(3), 319-331.
- Fincham, R. & Rhodes, P.S. (1999). *Principles of organizational behavior* (3<sup>rd</sup> ed.). Oxford: Oxford University Press.

- Furnham, A., Petrides, K. V., Jackson, C. J., & Cotter, T. (2002). Do personality factors predict job satisfaction?. *Personality and individual differences*, 33(8), 1325-1342.
- George, D., & Mallery, P. (2003). *SPSS for Windows step by step: A simple guide and reference. 11.0 update* (4<sup>th</sup> ed.). Boston: Allyn & Bacon.
- Glaser, B. G., & Strauss, A. L. (2009). *The discovery of grounded theory: Strategies for qualitative research*. Transaction Publishers.
- Gliem, J. A., & Gliem, R. R. (2003). Calculating, interpreting, and reporting Cronbach's alpha reliability coefficient for Likert-type scales. Midwest Research-to-Practice Conference in Adult, Continuing, and Community Education.
- Hackman, J. R., & Oldham, G. R. (1976). Motivation through the design of work: Test of a theory. *Organizational behavior and human performance*, 16(2), 250-279.
- Herzberg, F. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. New York: World Publishing Company.
- Herzberg, F. (1976). Motivational type: Individual differences in motivation. In F. Herzberg (Ed.), *The managerial choice* (pp. 1059-1076). Homewood, IL: Dow Jones-Irwin.
- Herzberg, F., Mausner, B. & Snyderman, B. B. (1959). *The motivation to work*. New York: John Wiley & Sons.
- Hulin, C. L., & Judge, T. A. (2003). Job attitudes. In W. C. Borman, D. R. Ilgen, & R. J. Klimoski (Eds.), *Handbook of psychology: Industrial and organizational psychology* (pp. 255-276). Hoboken, NJ: Wiley.
- Johnson, S. M., & Birkeland, S. E. (2003). Pursuing a "sense of success": New teachers explain their career decisions. *American Educational Research Journal*, 40(3), 581-617.
- Kalof, L., Dan, A. & Dietz, T. (2008). *Essentials of social research*. Berkshire: Open University Press.
- Kaufman, J. W. (1984). Relationship between teacher motivation and commitment to the profession. *Paper presented at the Annual Meeting of the American Educational Research Association*. New Orleans, LA.
- Lawler, E. E. (1973). *Motivation in work organizations*. California: Brooks/Cole Publishing Company.
- Locke, E. A. (1968). What is job satisfaction. *Speech presented at the American Psychological Association Convention, San Francisco, California, August 30-September 3, 1968*, (pp. 1-43). California.
- Locke, E. A. (1969). What is job satisfaction? *Organizational Behavior & Human Performance*, 4(4), 309-336.
- Locke, E. A. (1976). The nature and causes of job satisfaction. In M. D. Dunnette (Ed.), *Handbook of industrial/organizational psychology* (pp. 1297 – 1349). Chicago: Rand McNally.
- Lortie, D. C. (1975). *Schoolteacher: A sociological study*. Chicago: University of Chicago Press.
- Mowday, R. T. (1987). Equity theory predictions of behavior in organizations. In R. M. Porter, *Motivation and work behavior* (pp. 89 - 108). New York: McGraw-Hill.
- Muijs, D. (2004). *Doing quantitative research in education with SPSS*. London: Sage Publications.
- Nadler, D., & Lawler, E. (1991). Motivation: a diagnostic approach. In D. R. Kolb, *The Organizational Behaviour Reader*. Prentice-Hal: Englewood Cliffs, NJ.
- Nias, J. (1981). Teacher satisfaction and dissatisfaction: Herzberg's 'two-factor' hypothesis revisited. *British Journal of Sociology of Education*, 2(3), 235-246.
- Porter, L. W. (1962). Job attitudes in management: I. Perceived deficiencies in need fulfillment as a function of job level. *Journal of applied Psychology*, 46(6), 375.
- Schaffer, R. H. (1953). Job satisfaction as related to need satisfaction in work. *Psychological Monographs: General and Applied*, 67(14), 1-29.
- Sergiovanni, T. (1967). Factors which affect satisfaction and dissatisfaction of teachers. *Journal of Educational Administration*, 5(1), 66-82.
- Sergiovanni, T. J. (1968). New evidence on teacher morale: A proposal for staff differentiation. *North Central Association Quarterly*, 42, 259-66.
- Snape, D., & Spencer, L. (2003). The foundations of qualitative research. In J. Richie & J. Lewis (Eds.), *Qualitative research practice: A guide for social science students and researchers* (pp. 01-23). London: Sage Publications.
- Spector, P. E. (1997). *Job satisfaction: Application, assessment, causes, and consequences*. Thousand Oaks: Sage Publications.
- Vroom, V. H. (1964). *Work and motivation*. New York: Wiley.
- Weiss, H. M., & Cropanzano, R. (1996). *Affective Events Theory: A theoretical discussion of the structure, causes and consequences of affective experiences at work*.
- Wolf, M.G. (1970). Need gratification theory: A theoretical reformulation of job satisfaction/dissatisfaction and job motivation. *Journal of Applied Psychology*, 54(1), 87-94.