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ABSTRACT

This study was conducted to assess the extent of Herzberg’s research and to examine the applicability of Herzberg’s theory in another type of organization and society. A select group of elementary school teachers in Taiwan was chosen for this study. Herzberg’s Two-Factor theory was used to assist with investigating and determining the level and impact that hygiene and motivation factors have on job involvement. The results showed that both hygiene and motivation factors did have a positive and significant affect on job involvement when tested separately, with the exceptions of monetary rewards (hygiene) and recognition (motivator). However, when both factors were tested together as independent variables through a stepwise regression analysis, hygiene factors completely lost their influence on job involvement. This indicates that Herzberg’s two-factor theory still holds true today, even in a different society.
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INTRODUCTION

Over the past two decades the teaching environment in Taiwan has continued to change due to a series of educational reforms that started in 1990 (MOE, 2015). Changes to the economy and social expectations have led to more parental involvement, which has influenced school management and policies. The situation has also been impacted by a declining birthrate. Unfortunately, school authorities had to implement re-entrenchment plans; a direct result was an increase of jobless teachers, and teachers no longer receive a guarantee of employment. These external and internal changes have placed more pressure on elementary school teachers and made their jobs even more challenging. Chen (2006) suggested that the situation has produced a negative effect on the job involvement level of teachers. An organization cannot effectively achieve its mission without motivating its personnel in working together to achieve the established goals (Zimmerman, 1988), so as educational institutes.

Latham (2012) has mentioned the importance of motivation in the field of human resource management, industrial and organization psychology, and organization behavior. Relevance of this topic is becoming more important in modern management given the importance of motivation at work. Motivating employees is a key element of ensuring optimal use of resources, maintenance of available human resources, creating competitive advantage in the current changing market and bringing goodwill for organization itself. The basic challenge for any organization has been how it could persuade employees to work toward the established goals of the organization (Simon, 1997). Therefore, it is important to understand how to effectively motivate elementary school teachers in order to help maximize their potential and passion for teaching. Pfeffer (1998) argued that creating meaningful work keeps
employees happy and motivated and was a central factor at fostering organizational effectiveness. However, the unified incentive and reward system used for motivating school teachers across Taiwan is either over-motivating or under-motivating because it does not take an individual teacher’s characteristics, or personal needs into consideration (Lin, 1995).

After the Hawthorne studies were published, Terpstra (1979) explained that it was necessary for organizations to understand what motivates their employees and the reasons why employees become motivated. Herzberg’s two-factor theory was the first to demonstrate that satisfaction and dissatisfaction at work arose from different factors and was not simply opposing reactions to the same factors. Even though Herzberg’s concept has been criticized (Vroom, 1964; Hardin, 1965; Opsahl & Dunnette, 1966; King 1970; Hackman & Oldhem, 1976), it is highly credible and well regarded.

The principal purposes for this study was; 1) to assess the applicability of Herzberg’s theory in order to gain a better understanding of what motivates elementary school teachers in Kaohsiung County, Taiwan, 2) to understand if the two factor theory has any effect on the level of a teacher’s job involvement. Herzberg’s two factor theory was adopted as the theoretical foundation for this study because the distinction between the hygiene and motivation factors of the theory was suitable in helping to identify factors that motivate the study’s participants and for identifying what helped to increase their job involvement. Understanding how Herzberg’s theory can be applied to organizations in other societies may also provide other types of information that could be useful in the field of Human Resource (HR).

THEORETICAL BACKGROUND AND HYPOTHESES

Herzberg’s Two-Factor Theory

Motivation is a general term that refers to the entire class of drives, desires, needs, wishes and similar forces that compel people to choose certain options over others (Maicibi, 2003). Motivation involves internal and external forces that influence a person’s choice of action. In 1959, Herzberg conducted a study on the job attitudes for 203 accountants and engineers. The participants were asked to recall when they had felt positive or negative at work and the reasons why. The findings indicated that the job characteristics were related to what an individual does and to the nature of the work that a person performs. Motivation factors did appear to have the capacity to increase the sense of achievement, competency, personal growth, self-realization and status. However, the absence of such gratifying job characteristics does not appear to lead to de-motivation or dissatisfaction. Instead, dissatisfaction results from unfavorable assessments of such job related factors as company policies, interpersonal relations on the job, salary, supervision, technical problems, and the overall working conditions. Unlike the traditional view of dissatisfaction and satisfaction, they are not in a continuum. They are two continua and are independent from each other.

Herzberg (1966) identified motivators as factors that motivate employees to work. These motivators result in job satisfaction. Motivation factors are based on an individual's need for personal growth. When they exist, motivation factors can help to actively create job satisfaction. If they are effective, they can motivate an individual to achieve an above average effort, or performance. Motivation factors include; challenging/stimulating work, gaining recognition, opportunity for advancement, responsibility, status, a sense of personal achievement, and personal growth in the job.

Motivation factors help to increase the job satisfaction of an employee. This increases their efficiency and ultimately leads to an increase in organizational effectiveness. These have been identified as rewards, or incentives that sharpen the drive to satisfy the wants of an employee (Zimmerman, 1988).
Hygiene factors were identified as factors that prevented job dissatisfaction. The fulfillment of hygiene factors did not make an employee happy or satisfied; it just removed the unhappiness from the work environment. So, if hygiene factors are not satisfied an employee’s efficiency will usually decrease. Hygiene factors are based on the need for an organization to avoid unpleasantness within the working environment. If these factors are considered inadequate by an employee, it causes dissatisfaction. Some typical hygiene factors include: company policy and administration, feelings of job security, financial remuneration (salary/wages), quality of supervision, and the quality of interpersonal relations and working conditions. The concept was developed from Herzberg, Mausner and Snyderman’s study as displayed in Figure 1.

![Figure 1: Different views between traditional motivation and Herzberg’s two-factor theory.](image)


**Job involvement**

Job involvement indicates the degree to which the workplace contributes to one’s self-image (Lodahl & Kejner, 1965), and helps to satisfy an individual’s important needs (Dubin, 1956, 1968). Job involvement utilizes the internalization of values about the goodness of work, or the importance of work to the self-worth of an individual. Research has explored the construct of job involvement from two different perspectives (Sekaran, 1989; Sekaran & Mowday, 1981). When viewed as an individual difference variable, job involvement occurs when the possession of certain needs, values or personal characteristics assist with predisposing an individual to become more (or less) involved with their job.

Rabinowitz and Hall (1977) determined that job involvement was found when it involved a response to specific work, or certain situational characteristics. So, in certain types of jobs the characteristics of the work will have an influence on the degree to which an individual becomes involved in his/her job. Research has also demonstrated that job involvement was related to job characteristics such as; amount of communication, feedback, participative decision making, skill variety and supervisory behaviors like leader consideration, task autonomy, task identity and task significance (Brown, 1996).
The concept of job involvement reflects the extent to which work becomes a central interest in life. Dubin (1956, 1968) described job involvement as the degree to which the total job situation was perceived as being a major source of satisfaction to the important needs of the individual. Along the same line, Lodahl and Kejner (1965) defined job involvement as the degree of one’s work to their total self-image. Therefore, job involvement seems to be primarily determined by an individual’s self-image and understanding of what is important in life and then influenced by the organizational characteristics. These viewpoints seem to indicate that job involvement primarily associates the factors that are related to intrinsic matters rather than extrinsic.

Motivation and job involvement

Lawler and Hall (1970) assessed that a person who is involved in his/her job sees the job “as an important part of their self-concept” (p.311). Kanungo (1982) estimated that job involvement “defines one’s self-concept in a major way” (p.82), and as “the psychological identification with a job” (p.97). Moon (2000) explained that intrinsic motivational factors would be likely to provide more positive effects on job involvement, or job satisfaction than extrinsic motivational factors. These findings were also reported by Naff and Crum (1999), and Rainey (2003).

Park (2007) explained that Herzberg used two types of motivation - a motivator (intrinsic motivation) and a hygiene factor or dissatisfier (extrinsic motivation), and both are associated differently with job attitudes because the motivator was considered to be the higher order. As an individual level predictor, intrinsic motivation significantly increases the level of a public manager’s job involvement and the level of organizational effectiveness. Park (2007) proposed that in a more autonomous or self-determined social context then extrinsic motivation can be easily internalized and transformed into the most advanced form of extrinsic motivation (called integrated extrinsic motivation), or into intrinsic motivation (called inherently autonomous motivation). The transformed autonomous motivation can be operated from the interactive effects between extrinsic motivation and socialization variables, which can have a significant relationship on job involvement (Park, 2007). Indicating that extrinsic factors of an organization could be transformed into intrinsic factors and provide the same effects on job involvement when the environmental climate was autonomous, or self-determined.

Research hypotheses

Herzberg (1959) determined that hygiene factors were as important as any other form of employee maintenance plan, but employees will not be satisfied or motivated no matter how well they are provided for. Maidani (1991) argued that research results indicated hygiene factors as well as motivation factors were sources of satisfaction, which was in contrast to Herzberg’s study that concluded hygiene factors were sources of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction. A study conducted by Onen and Maicibi (2004) on 267 non-academic staff of Makerere University in Africa indicated that one of the hygiene factors remuneration (basic salary and allowance) was a motivator and not just a dissatisfier as determined by Herzberg.

Win (2005) researched the impact of Herzberg’s two factors on nurses in Taiwan and Myanmar and found that a nurse’s job satisfaction was positively and significantly related to each intrinsic factor in both countries. The study also found that a nurse’s job satisfaction in Taiwan was positively and significantly related to each extrinsic factor. Park (2007) asserted that extrinsic factors in an organization could be transformed into an intrinsic one, which can have a positive effect on job involvement. Tan & Washeed (2011) found that salespeople in Malaysia place greater emphasis on hygiene factors than motivators such as working condition, money factor and company policy while only recognition is the only significant...
motivator that has positive impact on job satisfaction. It also found that monetary reward has a mediating effect between motivation and employee job satisfaction. Based on the inconsistency of the above research findings, this study hypothesized that all the hygiene factors were motivators rather than demotivators. In order to identify the hygiene factors that were best suitable for the study, a factor analysis was done prior to utilizing the statistical tests. Three major hygienes were extracted; remuneration (salary and monetary rewards), school administration/leadership, and the school working environment (see the factor analysis in the Methodology section), which established Hypothesis 1.

**H1:** Overall, hygiene factors including remuneration, school administration/leadership and school working environment have positive effects on the job involvement of elementary school teachers in Taiwan.

Herzberg’s theory about motivational factors guided the study to use of a factor analysis in order to identify five major motivators; achievement, autonomy, challenging work, professional growth and recognition (see the factor analysis in the Methodology section), which led to Hypothesis 2

**H2:** Overall, the motivation factors including achievement, autonomy, challenging work, professional growth and recognition have a positive effect on the job involvement of elementary school teachers in Taiwan.

Lodahl and Kejner (1965) determined that job involvement was the degree of importance of one’s work to one’s total self-image, which indicates that the individual’s self-image and understanding of what is important in life are most important and are secondarily influenced by the characteristics of an organization. Maidani (1991) summarized that hygienes and motivators do have positive effects on job involvement. Since job involvement has been primarily associated with factors that are related to intrinsic matters rather than extrinsic ones, which established Hypothesis 3.

**H3:** When tested together as independent variables, motivation factors have greater influence on job involvement of the elementary school teachers in Taiwan than the hygiene factors.

These views created a concern about which set of factors might outperform the other, which led to a graphical representation for the relationship between the research antecedents of motivators and hygienes (independent constructs), and the research outcome of the elementary school teacher’s level of job involvement (dependent construct) as shown in Figure 2.

![Figure 2: Graphic portrayal on the relationship between research antecedents and the outcomes](image-url)
METHODOLOGY

This section describes the survey participants, sampling methods, survey instrument, data collection and the statistical analysis used to test the hypotheses.

The participants and sampling

The population of the study was 5213 teachers from 154 elementary schools in Kaohsiung County, Taiwan. Through a sampling calculation formula (Creative Research System, 2010) with requirements of significant level $\alpha = .05$, confidence coefficient=.95, K=1.96, and $p = .5$, the number of participants should be at least 385.

A return rate of 70% was established, meaning that 550 survey instruments needed to be distributed. A stratified sampling method was used for data collection. The quota sampling method was first adopted to divide schools. A total of 154 schools was divided into three sets; above 25 classes (3420 teachers), 13-24 classes (961 teachers) and less than 12 classes (88 teachers). A proportional sampling method was then utilized as shown in Table 1.

![Table 1: Stratified sampling](image)

Survey instrument

The survey instrument consisted of three sections; Hygiene Factors, Motivation Factors and Job Involvement. The first two sections of the survey instrument adopted questions from Chen’s “Hygiene Factors Survey for Teachers in Taiwan” and “Motivation Factors Survey for Teachers in Taiwan” (Chen, 2001). The third section was selected from the “Survey of Job Involvement for Elementary School Teachers in Taiwan” developed by Chung (2004). The numbers of question items in each section were 14, 21 and 16 respectively. A Likert scale of 6 points (1 = strongly disagree; 2 = disagree; 3 = somewhat disagree; 4 = somewhat agree; 5 = agree; 6 = strongly agree) was utilized.

Hygiene Factors section included:
- My pay is matched with my work and responsibility.
- The school environment and the facilities are good.
- School policies and regulations are reasonable.
- My colleagues are able to work together well.
- The principal’s leadership is well accepted by most of the teachers in my school.

Motivation Factors section included:
- I am given enough autonomy in teaching.
- Teaching job is challenging.
- I receive recognition from colleagues when my teaching performance is good.
- I feel joyfully when I help students learn and grow.
- I have gained opportunities for personal growth during teaching.
**Job Involvement section included:**
- I always have materials and teaching aids ready before I go to the class.
- A big part of my enjoyment comes from my job.
- I would search for more teaching materials to assist with students learning.
- I am willing to take extra administrative assignments if the school asks me to.
- I am willing to take part in important policy making.

A pretest was performed on 50 elementary school teachers. To ensure validity of the instrument reliability and factor analysis tests were utilized. The Cronbach’s $\alpha$ of the total questionnaire was .949, of which .874 was for the hygienes section, .923 was for the motivators and .884 was for job involvement respectively. Three constructs of hygienes were extracted and renamed as “administration/leadership,” “remuneration,” and “working environment” with explained variances of 25.81%, 21.739% and 16.891% respectively. Five constructs of motivators were extracted and renamed as “achievement,” “autonomy,” challenging work,” “professional growth,” and “recognition” with explained variances of 18.321%, 13.276%, 14.628%, 12.217% and 12.844% respectively and are displayed in Table 2.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Variables</th>
<th>Constructs</th>
<th>Explained variance %</th>
<th>Cronbach $\alpha$</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td><strong>Hygienes</strong></td>
<td>Administration, and leadership</td>
<td>25.281</td>
<td>.865</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Remuneration</td>
<td>21.739</td>
<td>.784</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Work environment</td>
<td>16.891</td>
<td>.657</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>63.911</td>
<td>.874</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Motivators</strong></td>
<td>Achievement</td>
<td>18.321</td>
<td>.833</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Autonomy</td>
<td>13.276</td>
<td>.839</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Challenging work</td>
<td>14.628</td>
<td>.757</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Professional growth</td>
<td>12.217</td>
<td>.804</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td>Recognition</td>
<td>12.844</td>
<td>.767</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td></td>
<td><strong>Total</strong></td>
<td>71.287</td>
<td>.923</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Job involvement</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.884</td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td><strong>Total survey</strong></td>
<td></td>
<td></td>
<td>.949</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

**Data collection and statistical analysis**

The study participants were elementary school teachers in Kaohsiung County, Taiwan. A total of 550 survey instruments were distributed with a valid return rate of 83.6% (460 participants). Data collection was by return mail and the statistical tests were conducted using SPSS as a tool for data analysis, which included the following:

1. Linear regression analysis to analyze whether:
   - hygiene factors have positive effects on job involvement of the elementary school teachers
   - motivation factors have positive effects on job involvement of the elementary school teachers.

2. A stepwise regression analysis was performed on Hypothesis 3 to determine if motivation factors had a greater influence on power in the job involvement of the elementary school teachers than the hygiene factors.
FINDINGS

Impact level of hygiene factors on job involvement

From the regression analysis, the model was supported \((f=47.355, p=.000 <.001)\) because “working environment” and “administration/leadership” did have a positive effect on job involvement. Surprisingly, remuneration did not have an impact on job involvement, which supports Herzberg’s theory. This was in contrast to Onen and Maici’s (2004) study that determined remuneration was a motivator instead of a dissatisfier. Results of the current study also indicated that the more satisfied an elementary school teacher was with the school administration/leadership and school working environment, the more likely they were to increase their job involvement. The results are displayed in Table 3.

| Table 3: Linear regression test for hygiene factors on job involvement |
|--------------------------|--------|----------|-----|-------|
| Factors                  | Beta   | T        | P   | VIF   |
| Administration and leadership | .177   | 2.578*   | .010| 2.827 |
| Remuneration             | .108   | 1.736    | .083| 2.324 |
| Working environment      | .248   | 3.581*** | .000| 2.860 |
| \(F\)-value             | 47.355*** |
| \(R^2\)                 | .238   |
| Adjusted \(R^2\)        | .233   |
| Explained variance       | 23.3%  |

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

Impact level of motivators on job involvement

From the regression analysis of motivators on job involvement, the model was supported \((f=194.761, p=.000 <.001)\). The test results supported Herzberg’s theory, except for the factor of “recognition” \((p>.05)\). The results indicated that the more satisfied an elementary school teacher was with factors like “achievement,” “challenging work,” “autonomy,” and “professional growth,” the more likely they were to increase their job involvement. These results are shown in Table 4.

| Table 4: Linear regression test of motivators on job involvement |
|--------------------------|--------|----------|-----|-------|
| Motivation factors      | Beta   | T        | P   | VIF   |
| Achievement             | .296   | 5.503*** | .000| 4.140 |
| Autonomy                | .096   | 2.820**  | .005| 1.878 |
| Challenging work        | .288   | 7.935*** | .000| 1.668 |
| Professional growth     | .218   | 5.561*** | .000| 2.782 |
| Recognition             | .083   | 1.871    | .062| 2.202 |
| \(F\)                   | 194.761*** |
| \(R^2\)                 | .682   |
| Adjusted \(R^2\)        | .679   |
| Explained variance       | 67.9%  |

***p<.001; **p<.01; *p<.05

The levels of predicting power between hygiene factors and motivation factors on job involvement

From the stepwise regression analysis of hygiene and motivation factors on job involvement, Model 4 was supported \((f=241.252, p=.000<.05)\). The adjusted R square was increased from .565 (Model 1) to .677 (Model 4). The Durbin-Watson value (1.828) was close to 2, which indicated that all the variables were independent and not correlated to one another. So, the test results were acceptable. The four
variables included in Model 4 (see Table 5) were motivation factors; “sense of achievement,” “challenging work,” “professional growth,” and “autonomy.” In order to be consistent with the previous test results the variable “recognition” was excluded from the model, which verified that recognition from peers was not a source of satisfaction for the elementary school teachers. Interestingly, the results of Hypothesis 1 indicated that hygiene factors did have an effect on job involvement of the elementary teachers, but the test results showed that hygiene factors completely lost their influence on job involvement and were excluded.

<table>
<thead>
<tr>
<th>Model</th>
<th>R Square</th>
<th>Adj R Square</th>
<th>F</th>
<th>p-value</th>
<th>Durbin-Watson</th>
</tr>
</thead>
<tbody>
<tr>
<td>1</td>
<td>.566</td>
<td>.565</td>
<td>596.475</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>2</td>
<td>.647</td>
<td>.646</td>
<td>417.448</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>3</td>
<td>.674</td>
<td>.672</td>
<td>313.865</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td></td>
</tr>
<tr>
<td>4</td>
<td>.680</td>
<td>.677</td>
<td>241.252</td>
<td>.000***</td>
<td>1.828</td>
</tr>
</tbody>
</table>

*** p < .001 ** p < .01 * p < .05

Model 1: achievement
Model 2: achievement, challenging work
Model 3: achievement, challenging work, professional growth
Model 4: achievement, challenging work, professional growth, autonomy

DISCUSSIONS AND CONCLUSIONS

Many researchers have conducted studies on Herzberg’s two factor theory with different organizations and in different societies and have produced varying results, which does not necessarily support or fully reject Herzberg’s proposals. The intent of the present study was to assess the extent of Herzberg’s research findings and see if they had any application to the elementary school teachers in Taiwan by looking at the levels that hygiene and motivation factors might have on a teacher’s job involvement.

The results showed that when the hygiene factors were tested separately two of the three hygiene factors (administration/leadership and the working environment) did have a positive and significant effect on the job involvement of elementary school teachers in Taiwan. So, if a teacher’s satisfaction level on these two factors increased, then their level of job involvement also increased. According to Herzberg, hygiene factors did not make employees satisfied. Usually, when employees are not satisfied they are not motivated. The present research findings indicated that hygiene factors do have a positive effect on job involvement except for remuneration, which also supports Maidani’s (1991) study that indicated hygiene and motivation factors were both a source of satisfaction. The results were different to Herzberg’s study, which concluded that hygiene factors were a source of dissatisfaction rather than satisfaction.

Interestingly, salary (monetary rewards) was not a factor that affected an elementary school teacher’s job involvement. The mean score for salary and monetary rewards was 3.85 out of 6 points. However, it did not affect a teacher’s willingness to be involved in their job. These results contradicted Onen and Maicibi’s (2004) study that the hygiene factor of remuneration (basic salary and allowance) was a motivator and not a dissatisfier as stated by Herzberg.

Feng (2007) conducted a study on insurance agents in Taiwan, which indicated that monetary reward does have a significant effect on job involvement. However, insurance agents usually work for a commission instead of a monthly salary. As for the elementary school teachers in Taiwan; their purpose is to educate students and their salary is mandated and based on seniority. Another possible reason might be
because Herzberg’s research subjects were working in a for-profit organization, which was different from the non-profit environment of elementary school teachers. Further studies need to be performed in order to verify if the findings of this study are consistent with other non-profit organizations.

The test results also indicated that motivation factors were motivators except for recognition. The present study did support Bassett-Jones and Lloyd’s (2005) research, which suggested that money and recognition did not appear to be primary sources of motivation that stimulate employees to contribute ideas. The possible reason for this result might be because school teachers work independently and their primary subjects to interact with are mainly their students. So, gaining recognition from their colleagues does seem to be insignificant to their work life. Additional studies could add the recognition from students and their parents, since the effectiveness of a school teacher does have a direct reflection on a student’s performance.

In comparison with the predictions of the two-factors on job involvement; the research results were aligned with Herzberg’s predictions. Factors associated with intrinsic satisfaction do play a major role in increasing job involvement of the elementary teachers. Even though some extrinsic hygiene factors did have an effect on job involvement of the elementary school teachers, these factors completely lost their predicting power when they were tested together with the motivation factors. The results indicated that for motivating elementary school teachers to increase their job involvement more emphasis needs to be placed on the motivational factors that will lead to an increased sense of accomplishment, autonomy and more challenging work that provides for more opportunities in professional growth. So, one could conclude that Herzberg’s two-factor theory still holds true today, even in a different society.

**RECOMMENDATIONS AND NEW HR KNOWLEDGE**

The study results suggest that the importance of hygiene factors cannot be ignored since they do have an effect on the job involvement of participants, though the impact level is significantly less than the motivators. The more motivated an elementary school teacher is leads to an increase with job involvement. So, a greater emphasis should be placed on the motivation factors that would lead to an increased sense of accomplishment, autonomy, more challenging work situations and provide more opportunities for professional growth.

Additional studies could be conducted in different societies to determine if the current findings can be replicated, which would also assist with determining the overall feasibility of Herzberg’s two factor theory. The current study does indicate that there are characteristics of Herzberg’s findings that can be applied to developed (or developing) societies and the entire field of HR. No matter what type of organization, the hygiene and motivation factors can lead to improved organizational effectiveness and these need to be (and should be) constantly assessed.

By offering viewpoints from other societies, the entire field of HR will have added benefits that can assist an organization with keeping its employees motivated. In order for HR to be effective, it must be able to help an organization establish methods on how it can achieve the goals of the organization. Evaluating the effectiveness of HR does require measurable proof, which enhances the need for additional studies that could assist with assessing the cultural norms and values that are connected to the hygiene and motivational factors that are present in today’s multicultural workforce.
LIMITATIONS

The study was limited to the generalized findings on elementary school teachers, so it was not inclusive to the other levels of educators across Taiwan. Additionally, since the study participants were elementary school teachers in Kaohsiung County, further studies on teachers at other levels nationwide might provide a better understanding of the factors that could help to increase the level of a teacher’s job involvement. Recognition has been tested and proved to be important in motivating employees, but that was not the case in this study. Further studies might add more questions related to recognition from students, parents of the students, principals, and other administrators concerning evaluations of a teacher’s performance.

Another limitation was the fact that the study did not take into consideration how cultural differences might affect the study. It was not intended for the study to try and determine if there were any issues dealing with the differences between collectivist and individualist societies. That issue might need to be assessed in order to determine if there are significant differences between the two types of societies and if it could have an impact on the job involvement of teachers (at any level).
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