

Motivation and Hygienic Factors on Job Satisfaction among Academic Staff in UiTM Puncak Alam

Hatim Akmal Mohd Daneil¹, Wan Marina Wan Ismail^{1*}, Santy Sanusi²

**Corresponding Author*

¹ Centre for Nursing Studies, Faculty of Health Sciences, Universiti Teknologi MARA, Malaysia

² Aisiyiah Bandung University, Indonesia

hatimakmal4516@gmail.com, wanmarina13@gmail.com, santysanusi1410@gmail.com
Tel: +601135661832

Abstract

The study examines factors influencing job satisfaction among UiTM Puncak Alam lecturers using Herzberg's motivation-hygiene theory. Data were collected from 100 lecturers via structured questionnaires. Results show achievement and work nature are top motivators (mean = 4.33), while recognition is lowest (mean = 3.80). Among hygiene factors, peer relationships scored highest (mean = 4.33), and money lowest (mean = 3.59). Overall job satisfaction is high (mean = 4.11). Hygiene factors ($r = 0.864$) have a stronger correlation with satisfaction than motivators ($r = 0.796$). The findings can guide policies to improve job satisfaction and faculty retention.

Keywords: Job satisfaction; Motivation; Hygiene; Academic staff

eISSN: 2398-4287 © 2025. The Authors. Published for AMER by e-International Publishing House, Ltd., UK. This is an open access article under the CC BY-NC-ND license (<http://creativecommons.org/licenses/by-nc-nd/4.0/>). Peer-review under responsibility of AMER (Association of Malaysian Environment-Behaviour Researchers). DOI: <https://doi.org/10.21834/e-bpj.v10i31.6456>

1.0 Introduction

Motivation factors, comprising achievement, advancement, the nature of the work, recognition, and personal and professional growth, stand as catalysts that drive individuals to excel in their roles. Conversely, hygiene factors, encompassing company policies, interpersonal relationships, job security, supervisor relationships, financial compensation, and working conditions, are integral in mitigating dissatisfaction and fostering a conducive work environment (Herzberg, 1966).

Lecturers assume a paramount role, particularly in elevating the corporate image and concurrently fostering the development of exceptional graduates (Baharudin Ahamad & Ridzuan, 2019). To navigate the complexities of contemporary academia, where the roles of academic staff extend beyond traditional teaching to include research, administration, and community engagement, comprehending the elements that underpin job satisfaction becomes not only a scholarly pursuit but an imperative for sustaining academic excellence.

The research seeks to address critical gaps in the existing literature, specifically by investigating how motivation and hygiene factors intersect and collectively contribute to job satisfaction within the unique ecosystem of UiTM Puncak Alam. This study aligns with the broader goals of UiTM, which envisions itself not only as an educational institution but as a nurturing ground for academic excellence, research innovation, and community impact (UiTM, 2020). By focusing on the academic staff at UiTM Puncak Alam, this research aims to provide granular insights into the challenges and opportunities unique to this setting, thus offering practical recommendations that can inform human resource management practices and institutional policies.

2.0 Literature Review

Job satisfaction is a significant determinant of academic staff's well-being and performance in higher education institutions. Understanding its influencing factors is crucial for fostering a conducive work environment and achieving organisational goals. This chapter reviews the literature on the relationship between motivation, hygiene factors, and job satisfaction, applying Herzberg's Two-Factor Theory to the academic context.

Job satisfaction reflects an internal state that can be assessed both subjectively and quantitatively, influenced by intrinsic and extrinsic factors. It encompasses employees' attitudes toward their work, coworkers, and external benefits (Tria, 2023). Psychological and environmental conditions, such as workplace policies and peer relationships, significantly affect satisfaction (Baharudin Ahamad & Ridzuan, 2019; Mehrad, 2020). In academia, job satisfaction is vital for enhancing productivity and commitment among staff.

Herzberg's Motivation and Hygiene Factors Theory categorises job satisfaction into motivators (intrinsic) and hygiene factors (extrinsic). Motivators include achievement, advancement, recognition, the nature of work, and growth. These factors directly contribute to positive job satisfaction by fulfilling intrinsic needs (Zamri, 2023). Hygiene factors such as company policies, relationships with peers and supervisors, job security, salary, and working conditions prevent dissatisfaction but do not necessarily create satisfaction (Omar Din et al., 2023). Herzberg's framework suggests that satisfying fundamental human needs transforms attitudes and fosters self-improvement, linking satisfaction with individual perspectives and development (Mehrad, 2020).

Motivational factors play a significant role in enhancing job satisfaction among academic staff. Achievement, defined as the successful completion of significant tasks, is strongly linked to morale and self-efficacy, fostering further goal-setting and satisfaction (Gricar, 2019; Tria, 2023; Omar Din et al., 2023). When academic staff feel their efforts are recognised, and their contributions are significant, their sense of accomplishment increases, leading to higher job satisfaction. Advancement opportunities, such as promotions and skill enhancement, align personal aspirations with institutional goals, boosting motivation and retention (Zamri, 2023; Omar Din et al., 2023). The intrinsic satisfaction derived from meaningful, challenging academic work, as emphasised by Herzberg's theory, also significantly impacts fulfilment (Tria, 2023; Gricar, 2019; Maru & Omodu, 2020). Recognition, both formal and informal, strengthen morale and satisfaction by acknowledging contributions (Sinniah et al., 2019; Omar Din et al., 2023). Additionally, growth opportunities, such as training and professional development, enhance engagement by providing avenues for continuous learning (Maru & Omodu, 2020; Al-Suraihi et al., 2021). Together, these motivational factors contribute to a sense of purpose, engagement, and fulfilment, driving academic staff to remain committed to their roles and achieve personal and professional goals.

Hygiene factors, while not directly contributing to motivation, are essential in maintaining job satisfaction and preventing dissatisfaction. Organisational policies, such as fairness, transparency, and positive work culture, play a critical role in fostering employee commitment and conflict resolution (Gricar, 2019; Ong et al., 2020). When policies are clear and fair, academic staff feel secure and supported, leading to greater satisfaction. Positive relationships with peers are another important hygiene factor, as they provide social support, improve teamwork, and enhance communication, all of which are critical to a harmonious work environment (Norazahar et al., 2020). Job security, which reduces anxiety and promotes stability, also contributes to higher satisfaction and retention (Zamri, 2023; Alshamrani et al., 2023). Similarly, supportive relationships with supervisors who offer guidance, feedback, and necessary resources foster a positive work environment, improving satisfaction (Gricar, 2019; Ong et al., 2020). Fair financial compensation, including salary and benefits, helps academic staff feel valued and reduces turnover (Omar Din et al., 2023; Alshamrani et al., 2023). Finally, favourable working conditions, such as a safe and resourceful environment, are essential for well-being and productivity, contributing to overall job satisfaction (Gricar, 2019; Al-Suraihi et al., 2021). These hygiene factors are fundamental in creating a stable and supportive work environment, which is crucial for academic staff's overall job satisfaction.

3.0 Methodology

The research aims to study the relationship between motivation and hygiene factors on job satisfaction among lecturers in UiTM Puncak Alam.

3.1 Study design

This study was done quantitatively with a cross-sectional design. A set of self-report questionnaires, which consists of four sections, was adapted from previous open-access research article that was done by Tan and Waheed (2011). The questionnaire was distributed via email to the selected respondents in the sampling frame.

3.2 Setting and sample

The research was conducted at a public university in Selangor which is UiTM Puncak Alam with the academic staff as its study population. In this case, lecturers from UiTM Puncak Alam were chosen as the study population with the size of $N = 772$ lecturers from six different faculties of studies. The faculties involved were Faculty of Health Sciences, Faculty of Business and Management, Faculty of Accountancy, Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management, Faculty of Pharmacy and finally, Faculty of Education. UiTM Puncak Alam serves as multiple centres of study for UiTM programme such as the health sciences and pharmacy programme, which will result in workload and benefits for its lecturers, hence the reason for its choice. The list of lecturers in UiTM Puncak Alam is obtained through the staff directory on the official website of each faculty. Only lecturers based in UiTM Puncak Alam campus were picked in the sampling frame, excluding those from other campus to remain purposeful to the target population. Contract lecturers were also excluded to avoid biases and inconsistencies in answering the survey. In this study, the sample size calculation was calculated using a sample size

calculator by Raosoft Inc., and a sample size of $n = 257$ lecturers was chosen. Considering the 10% dropout rate, the minimum sample size required was $n = 283$ respondents.

A stratified random sampling approach will be utilised in this study to recruit participants from the target population of educators working during research takes place. However, due to low response rate, the sampling method was changed to quota sampling. Six strata or groups were divided according to the faculty of studies which are Faculty of Health Sciences ($n = 42$), Faculty of Business and Management ($n = 96$), Faculty of Accountancy ($n = 38$), Faculty of Tourism and Hotel Management ($n = 27$), Faculty of Pharmacy ($n = 28$) and Faculty of Education ($n = 26$). Though, only 100 respondents were able to be obtained in the study.

To analyse the data, statistical approach was used in the research. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28 was used for data entries and analysis.

3.3 Ethical considerations

Before data collection, ethical approval was obtained from Research Ethic Committee (REC) of Universiti Teknologi MARA (FERC/FSK/MR/2023/00305).

3.4 Variables and Instruments

For the research instrument, a set of self-report questionnaires which consists of four sections was distributed to the selected respondents in the sampling frame via email. The questionnaire is in English language. The sections include A: socio-demographic profile, B: Motivation Factors Questionnaire, C: Hygiene Factors Questionnaire, and D: Job Satisfaction Level Questionnaire. Section B, C and D of the measuring instruments were adapted from previous open access research article that was done by Tan and Waheed (2011). Participants were requested to indicate their level of agreement with the survey questions. Responses were rated on a five-point Likert scale, where 1 corresponds to "strongly disagree," 2 to "disagree," 3 to "neutral," 4 to "agree," and 5 to "strongly agree".

3.5 Data collection

Data were collected by using self-administered questionnaires distributed to lecturers who met the predetermined inclusion criteria using. The purpose of the study was explained briefly, and they were assured of their anonymity as well as the voluntary nature of their participation. A consent form was signed/clicked by lecturers who agreed to participate in the survey. The surveys were administered through an online survey platform which is Google Form. Respondents were given sufficient time to complete the questionnaire, while anonymity and confidentiality of their responses were assured. The chosen method was used in the study to ensure that participants could answer the questionnaires without feeling pressured. This way, their responses would genuinely represent their true opinions. By doing this, any potential response bias caused by time constraints or the researcher's presence was minimized. Furthermore, the practicality of quota sampling enables the researcher to reach bigger audience within the time limit of the research.

3.6 Data analysis

To analyse the data, statistical approach was used in the research. Statistical Package for Social Sciences (SPSS) version 28 was used for data entries and analysis. Prior to data analysis, the data were explored and cleaned from any outliers by using boxplot. Normality distribution of the data was observed by checking histogram and performing Kolmogorov-Smirnov test. Categorical data were reported by using frequency and percentage while normally distributed numerical data were described by presenting means and standard deviation. Estimations were performed using point estimate and 95% confidence interval. Significance level was set as $\alpha < 0.05$ and CI = 95%. Hypotheses testing was completed using analysis of variance (ANOVA) test and independent t-test to determine the relationship between socio-demographic data with job satisfaction levels while correlation analysis was used to determine the relationship between motivation and hygiene factors with job satisfaction levels.

4.0 Findings

Table 1: Sociodemographic Data of Respondents (n=100)

Item	Frequency (n)	Percentage (%)
Gender		
Male	29	29.0%
Female	71	71.0%
Age Groups		
20 - 29 years old	1	1.0%
30 - 39 years old	30	30.0%
40 - 49 years old	48	48.0%
50 years old & above	21	21.0%
Highest Education		
Master Local	39	39.0%
Master Overseas	4	4.0%
PhD Local	41	41.0%
PhD Overseas	16	16.0%
Teaching Experiences		
≤ 5 years	18	18.0%
5 - 9 years	11	11.0%

10 - 14 years	25	25.0%
15 - 19 years	21	21.0%
≥ 20 years	25	25.0%
Faculty		
Faculty of Health Sciences	17	17.0%
Faculty of Business and Management	29	29.0%
Faculty of Accounting	16	16.0%
Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism	17	17.0%
Faculty of Education	9	9.0%
Faculty of Pharmacy	12	12.0%
Salary Groups		
RM2001 - RM3000	1	1.0%
RM3001 - RM4000	9	9.0%
RM4001 - RM5000	9	9.0%
≥ RM5001	81	81.0%
Teaching Grades		
DM 53/54	18	18.0%
DM 51/52	55	55.0%
DM 45/46	25	25.0%
Others	2	2.0%
Experience in Industry		
No	23	23.0%
Yes	77	77.0%
Working Happiness		
No	10	10.0%
Yes	90	90.0%

Table 1 shows the results of socio-demographic variables gathered from the respondents. The respondents' demographics reveal notable patterns. A majority (71%) are female, with males making up 29%. Age-wise, the largest groups are 40-49 years (48%) and 30-39 years (30%), while smaller proportions fall into the 50 years and above (21%) and 20-29 years (1%) categories. Educationally, 41% hold a local PhD, the highest percentage, followed by 39% with a local Master's degree. Those with an overseas PhD and overseas Master's degree represent 16% and 4%, respectively. Teaching experience is evenly distributed, with 10-14 years and more than 20 years being the highest at 25% each, while 15-19 years accounts for 21%, and 5-9 years the lowest at 11%. The Faculty of Business and Management has the highest representation (29%), followed by Health Sciences and Hotel Management & Tourism (17% each). Faculties with lower representation include Accounting (16%), Pharmacy (12%), and Education (9%). In terms of salary, most respondents (81%) earn RM5001 or more, while 9% fall into each of the RM3001-RM4000 and RM4001-RM5000 ranges. The lowest percentage (1%) earns RM2001-RM3000. For teaching grades, the majority are in DM 51/52 (55%), followed by DM 45/46 (25%), DM 53/54 (18%), and 'Other' (2%). Most respondents (77%) have industry experience, and a significant majority (90%) report being happy with their work.

4.1 Motivation factors among lecturers

Table 2: Motivation Factors among Respondents (n = 100)

Factors	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation
Achievement	I am proud to work in this institution because it recognizes my achievements.	4.17	0.82
	I feel satisfied with my job because it gives me feeling of accomplishment.	4.32	0.75
	I feel I have contributed towards my institution in a positive manner.	4.50	0.54
	Total mean score	4.33	0.60
Advancement	I will choose career advancement rather than monetary incentives.	3.62	0.96
	My job allows me to learn new skills for career advancement.	4.36	0.64
	Total mean score	3.99	0.67
Work Itself	My work is thrilling, and I have a lot of variety in tasks that I do.	4.45	0.72
	I am empowered enough to do my job.	4.14	0.78
	My job is challenging and exciting.	4.40	0.65
	Total mean score	4.33	0.57
Recognition	I feel appreciated when I achieved or complete a task.	3.99	1.00
	My manager always thanks me for a job well done.	3.76	0.98
	I receive adequate recognition for doing my job well.	3.66	0.98

	Total mean score	3.80	0.87
Growth	I am proud to work in my institution because I feel I have grown as a person.	4.21	0.88
	My job allows me to grow and develop as a person.	4.34	0.79
	My job allows me to improve my experience, skills, and performance.	4.39	0.74
	Total mean score	4.31	0.76
Overall motivation factors score		4.17	0.56

Table 2 presented the full picture of the motivation factors results. Respondents rated motivation factors positively, with achievement, growth, and the nature of work receiving the highest scores. Achievement factors averaged 4.33 (SD = 0.60), with pride in contributing positively to the institution scoring 4.50 (SD = 0.54). Growth opportunities were also highly rated at 4.31 (SD = 0.76), including personal development (4.34, SD = 0.79) and skill improvements (4.39, SD = 0.74). Work itself averaged 4.33 (SD = 0.57), with respondents finding their roles thrilling (4.45, SD = 0.72) and empowering (4.14, SD = 0.78).

Advancement factors scored lower, averaging 3.99 (SD = 0.67), with career growth opportunities (4.36, SD = 0.64) prioritised over monetary incentives (3.62, SD = 0.96). Recognition factors were the lowest rated at 3.80 (SD = 0.87), reflecting moderate satisfaction with appreciation and managerial recognition. Overall, the average motivation factors score was 4.17 (SD = 0.56).

4.2 Hygiene factors among lecturers

Table 3: Hygiene Factors among Respondents (n = 100)

Factors	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation
Organization policy	The attitude of the administration is very accommodative in my institution.	3.63	1.03
	I am proud to work for this institution because its policy is favourable for the worker.	3.69	0.98
	I completely understand the mission of my institution.	4.22	0.80
	Total mean score	3.85	0.80
Relationship with peers	It is easy to get along with my colleagues.	4.31	0.71
	My colleagues are helpful and friendly.	4.26	0.72
	Colleagues are important to me.	4.41	0.61
	Total mean score	4.33	0.60
Work security	I believe safe working at my workplace.	4.40	0.71
	I believe my job is secure.	4.27	0.78
	My workplace is in an area where I feel comfortable.	4.24	0.78
	Total mean score	4.30	0.65
Relationship with supervisor	I feel my performance has improved because of the support from my supervisor.	3.70	0.96
	I feel satisfied at work because of my relationship with my supervisor.	3.71	0.95
	My supervisor are strong and trustworthy leaders.	3.75	0.98
	Total mean score	3.72	0.92
Money	I am encouraged to work harder because of my salary.	3.68	1.12
	I believe my salary is fair.	3.50	1.13
	Total mean score	3.59	1.00
Working conditions	I feel satisfied because of the comfort I am provided at work.	3.90	0.87
	I am proud to work for my institution because of the pleasant working conditions.	3.96	0.92
	Total mean score	3.93	0.85
Overall hygiene factors score		3.98	0.63

Table 3 shows the result descriptive statistics of hygiene factors. Organisational policy was rated moderately, with accommodating administration (mean = 3.63, SD = 1.03) and favourable policies (mean = 3.69, SD = 0.98). Understanding the institution's mission scored higher (mean = 4.22, SD = 0.80). Relationships with peers were rated highly, with respondents valuing ease of interaction (mean = 4.31, SD = 0.71), friendliness (mean = 4.26, SD = 0.72), and importance of colleagues (mean = 4.41, SD = 0.61). Job security also scored well, with workplace safety (mean = 4.40, SD = 0.71) and job security (mean = 4.27, SD = 0.78) receiving positive ratings. Relationships with supervisors were moderate, with support for improved performance (mean = 3.70, SD = 0.96) and trustworthiness (mean = 3.75, SD = 0.98). Salary satisfaction was the lowest, with motivation to work harder scoring 3.68 (SD = 1.12) and fairness perceptions at 3.50 (SD = 1.13). Working conditions were rated moderately (mean = 3.93, SD = 0.85). Overall, hygiene factors averaged 3.98 (SD = 0.63), with relationships with peers and job security scoring the highest, while salary factors scored the lowest.

4.3 Job satisfaction levels among lecturers

Table 4: Job Satisfaction Levels among Respondents (n=100)

Factors	Items	Mean	Standard Deviation
Job satisfaction	I am satisfied with my job.	4.25	0.78
	I was happy with the way my colleagues and superiors treat me.	3.89	0.89
	I am satisfied with what I achieved at work.	4.09	0.83
	I feel good at work.	4.21	0.81
	Total mean score	4.11	0.69

Table 4 shows the job satisfaction levels among respondents. Job satisfaction among respondents was generally high, with an overall mean score of 4.11 (SD = 0.69). Satisfaction with achievements at work scored 4.09 (SD = 0.83), while general job satisfaction was slightly higher at 4.25 (SD = 0.78). Happiness with treatment by colleagues and superiors scored lower at 3.89 (SD = 0.89), and overall feelings of well-being at work had a mean of 4.21 (SD = 0.81).

4.4 Relationship between socio-demographic data with job satisfaction level

Table 5: Comparing Mean Job Satisfaction Score between Socio-demographic Groups using T-test (n=100)

Variables	n	Mean (SD) Average Job Satisfaction Score	Mean diff. (95% CI)	t-stats (df)	P-value*
Gender					
Male	29	4.16 (0.66)	0.08 (-0.23, 0.38)	0.50 (98)	0.62
Female	71	4.09 (0.71)			
Experience in Industry					
Yes	77	4.16 (0.71)	-0.20 (-0.52, 0.13)	-1.22 (98)	0.23
No	23	3.96 (0.60)			
Working Happiness					
Yes	90	4.26 (0.52)	-1.46 (-1.81, -1.10)	-8.12 (98)	<0.001
No	10	2.80 (0.71)			

* Independent t-test

Table 6: Comparing Mean Job Satisfaction Score among Lecturers with Different Socio-demographic Data using ANOVA (n = 100)

Variables	n	Mean (SD) Average Job Satisfaction Score	F-statistics ^a (df)	P-value
Age Groups				
20 - 29 years old	1	3.75 (0)	0.93 (3, 96)	0.43
30 - 39 years old	30	4.23 (0.55)		
40 - 49 years old	48	4.00 (0.68)		
50 years old & above	21	4.21 (0.88)		
Highest Education				
Master Local	39	4.15 (0.56)	0.79 (3, 96)	0.50
Master Overseas	4	4.50 (0.58)		
PhD Local	41	4.10 (0.78)		
PhD Overseas	16	3.94 (0.77)		
Teaching Experiences				
≤ 5 years	18	4.07 (0.68)	1.86 (4, 95)	0.12
5 - 9 years	11	4.34 (0.56)		
10 - 14 years	25	3.86 (0.74)		
15 - 19 years	21	4.06 (0.86)		
≥ 20 years	25	4.33 (0.45)		
Faculty				
Faculty of Health Sciences	17	4.19 (0.66)	1.23 (5, 94)	0.30
Faculty of Business and Management	29	3.98 (0.82)		
Faculty of Accounting	16	4.34 (0.48)		
Faculty of Hotel Management and Tourism	17	4.28 (0.64)		

Faculty of Education	9	3.97 (0.71)		
Faculty of Pharmacy	12	3.85 (0.65)		
Salary Groups				
RM2001 - RM3000	1	3.50 (0)	0.81 (3, 96)	0.49
RM3001 - RM4000	9	4.31 (0.48)		
RM4001 - RM5000	9	3.89 (0.70)		
≥ RM5001	81	4.12 (0.71)		
Teaching Grade				
DM 53/54	18	4.15 (0.53)	0.64 (3, 96)	0.59
DM 51/52	55	4.10 (0.78)		
DM 45/46	25	4.06 (0.60)		
Others	2	4.75 (0.35)		

^a One-Way ANOVA test

Table 5 and 6 shows the relationship between socio-demographic data with job satisfaction level. Inferential analysis showed no significant differences in job satisfaction scores based on gender, industry experience, age, education level, teaching experience, faculty, salary, or teaching grades ($P > 0.05$). However, a significant difference was found between lecturers with working happiness (Mean = 4.26, SD = 0.52) and those without (Mean = 2.80, SD = 0.71); $t(98) = -8.12$, $p < 0.001$. The mean difference was -1.46, with a 95% confidence interval of -1.81 to -1.10.

4.5 Relationship between motivation and hygiene factors with job satisfaction level

Table 7: Correlations of Motivation Factors Score with Job Satisfaction Score (n = 100)

Job Satisfaction Score		
	<i>r</i>	<i>P-value*</i>
Achievement Factors Score	0.726	<0.001
Advancement Factors Score	0.479	<0.001
Work Itself Factors Score	0.533	<0.001
Recognition Factors Score	0.692	<0.001
Growth Factors Score	0.709	<0.001
Overall Motivation Factors Score	0.796	<0.001

* Pearson correlation

Table 8: Correlations of Hygiene Factors Score with Job Satisfaction Score (n = 100)

Job Satisfaction Score		
	<i>r</i>	<i>P-value*</i>
Organization Policy Factors Score	0.778	<0.001
Relationship with Peers Factor Score	0.674	<0.001
Work Security Factor Score	0.637	<0.001
Relationship with Supervisor Factor Score	0.706	<0.001
Money Factor Score	0.638	<0.001
Working Conditions Factor Score	0.722	<0.001
Overall Hygiene Factors Score	0.864	<0.001

* Pearson correlation

Table 7 and 8 shows the correlations of motivation and hygiene factors score with job satisfaction score. Correlation analysis revealed significant positive relationships between all motivation and hygiene factors with job satisfaction ($P < 0.001$). Strong correlations were observed for achievement ($r = 0.726$) and growth ($r = 0.709$) among motivation factors, and organization policy ($r = 0.778$), supervisor relationships ($r = 0.706$), and working conditions ($r = 0.722$) among hygiene factors. Overall, hygiene factors showed a stronger correlation with job satisfaction ($r = 0.864$) compared to motivation factors ($r = 0.796$).

5.0 Discussion

The study aimed to study the factors influencing job satisfaction among lecturers in context of Herzberg's motivation and hygiene factors theory.

5.1 Motivation factors

The study at UiTM Puncak Alam found that lecturers experienced high levels of job satisfaction due to their sense of achievement and the nature of their work. These factors, along with the stimulating nature of their work, are significant motivators for job satisfaction. However, recognition was the lowest factor, with respondents expressing moderate agreement with the recognition they received for their work. This suggests that while lecturers feel valued for their achievements, there is room for improvement in how their efforts are acknowledged by management.

5.2 Hygiene factors

Hygiene factors were also important, with relationships with peers scoring the highest, with a mean of 4.33. Strong peer relationships contribute significantly to job satisfaction by providing social support and fostering a collaborative environment (Alshamrani et al., 2023). However, salary was a notable area of dissatisfaction, with a mean score of 3.59, indicating low perception of salary fairness. This highlights the need for fair and competitive compensation to prevent dissatisfaction.

5.3 Level of job satisfaction

Overall, job satisfaction among lecturers at UiTM Puncak Alam was high, with a total mean score of 4.11. Most lecturers expressed happiness with their treatment by colleagues and superiors, satisfied with their achievements at work, and feel good when working. High job satisfaction is essential for fostering a positive work environment, reducing turnover, and enhancing overall performance (Alshamrani et al., 2023; 2. Al-Suraihi et al., 2021).

5.4 Relationship between socio-demographic data with level of job satisfaction

Socio-demographic variables did not significantly affect job satisfaction, except for working happiness. This finding supports research showing that subjective well-being at work is a critical determinant of job satisfaction, outweighing demographic variables (Baharudin Ahamad & Ridzuan, 2019). However, variations in job satisfaction may be influenced by various factors, including institutional policies, cultural norms, and personal experiences.

5.5 Relationship between motivation and hygiene factors with level of job satisfaction

The study analysed the relationship between motivation and hygiene factors with job satisfaction using Pearson correlation analysis. Results showed significant positive correlations between all motivation and hygiene factors. Achievement was the most significant motivator, with a sense of accomplishment leading to job satisfaction. Advancement had the lowest correlation, suggesting that career advancement opportunities are often secondary to immediate job-related factors (Sinniah et al., 2019). Organisational policy had the strongest correlation among hygiene factors, indicating that clear and fair policies are crucial for job satisfaction. Work security had a moderate positive correlation, but its impact may be less immediate. Overall, hygiene factors had a higher association with job satisfaction compared to motivation factors. In institutions where basic needs are not adequately met, hygiene factors might overshadow the impact of motivators.

5.6 Implications

In terms of organization, the study shows that universities should prioritize creating a culture that values and recognizes academic contributions, offering regular professional development and career advancement opportunities. Implementing structured recognition programs that celebrate lecturers' achievements can boost morale and motivation, leading to higher job satisfaction and productivity. Meanwhile, for individuals, lecturers can leverage this knowledge to seek opportunities for professional development and career advancement proactively. Engaging in continuous learning and skill enhancement can lead to a greater sense of achievement and personal fulfilment which can lead to higher job satisfaction.

6.0 Conclusion & Recommendations

In conclusion, this study provides valuable insights into the factors influencing job satisfaction among academic staff. High degree of job satisfaction among academic staff, was shown in the study, influenced by both motivation and hygiene factors. The association between hygiene factors and job satisfaction level ($r = 0.864$) was found to be larger than the link between motivation elements and job satisfaction level ($r = 0.796$). The positive impact of motivation factors (achievement, advancement, work itself, recognition, growth) and hygiene factors (organization policy, relationship with peers, work security, relationship with supervisor, money, working conditions) on job satisfaction level highlight the importance of supportive and enriching work environment for the lecturers. While the study has several strengths, including a comprehensive dataset, it also has limitations related to unfulfilled sample size and potential response bias. Overall, these findings can inform institutional policies and practices aimed at enhancing job satisfaction and faculty retention.

Acknowledgements

We greatly appreciate the supervisor, colleagues, lecturers and participants for their contribution in carrying out this study.

Paper Contribution to Related Field of Study

The study primarily falls under organisational behaviour and human resource management while intersecting with higher education administration, industrial and organisational psychology, sociology, educational leadership, and labour economics. These interdisciplinary connections make the research highly relevant across multiple domains that seek to improve workplace satisfaction and organisational performance.

References

- Alshamrani, M., Alharthi, S., Helmi, M., & Alwadei, T. (2023). Determinants of Employee Retention in Pharmaceutical Companies: Case of Saudi Arabia. *Journal of Business and Management Studies*, 5(2), 08–22. <https://doi.org/10.32996/jbms>
- Al-Suraihi, W. A., Samikon, S. A., Al-Suraihi, A.-H. A., & Ibrahim, I. (2021). Employee Turnover: Causes, Importance and Retention Strategies. *European Journal of Business and Management Research*, 6(3), 1–10. <https://doi.org/10.24018/ejbmr.2021.6.3.893>
- Baharudin Ahmad, A. N., & Ridzuan, A. R. (2019). Measuring The Factors of Employees' Job Satisfaction Among Lecturers in UiTM Melaka. *E-Journal of Media & Society*, 2(3), 23–43. <https://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ejoms/article/view/15472>
- Gricar, J. C. (2019). *Faculty Job Satisfaction at an Urban Health Science Community College* (Doctoral dissertation, University of Houston).
- Herzberg, F. I. (1966). *Work and the nature of man*. World.
- Maru, G. W., & Omodu, M. (2020). Compensation Management System and Employee Retention Practice in The Niger Insurance Plc, Port Harcourt. *International Journal of Advanced Academic Research*, 6(5). <https://doi.org/10.46654/ij.24889849.s6527>
- Mehrad, A. (2020). Evaluation of Academic Staff Job Satisfaction at Malaysian Universities in the Context of Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene Theory. *Journal of Social Science Research*, 15(1), 157–166. <https://doi.org/10.24297/jssr.v15i.8725>
- Norazahar, N., James, B. B., & Harun, N. H. (2020). *Factors Contributing to Job Satisfaction Among Lecturers in Politeknik*. <https://www.researchgate.net/publication/361733096>
- Omar Din, N. N., Zainal, N., & Balakrishna, S. (2023). Factors Influencing Job Satisfaction of Employees in The Higher Education Institutions in Malaysia. *International Journal of Education and Pedagogy (IJEAP)*, 5(2), 112–125. <http://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijeapJournalwebsite>:<http://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijeaphttp://myjms.mohe.gov.my/index.php/ijeap>
- Ong, C. H., Chong, H. S., Tan, O. K., Goh, C. F., & Lim, L. P. (2020). Factors influencing job satisfaction among academic staffs. *International Journal of Evaluation and Research in Education*, 9(2), 285–291. <https://doi.org/10.11591/ijere.v9i2.20509>
- Sinniah, S., Mohamed, R. K. M. H., Mior, W. R., Harith, A., Izni, W. N., & Rawshdeh, Z. A. (2019). Talent retention in private universities of Malaysia. *International Journal of Engineering and Advanced Technology*, 8(6S3), 233–239. <https://doi.org/10.35940/ijeat.F1038.0986S319>
- Tan, T. H., & Waheed, A. (2011). Herzberg's Motivation-Hygiene and Job Satisfaction in The Malaysian Retail Sector: Mediating Effect of Love of Money. *Asian Academy of Management Journal*, 16(1), 73–94. <https://mpr.ub.uni-muenchen.de/id/eprint/30419>
- Tria, J. Z. (2023). Job satisfaction among educators: A systematic review. *International Journal of Professional Development, Learners and Learning*, 5(2), ep2310. <https://doi.org/10.30935/ijpdl/13212>
- UiTM. (2020). *Vision, Mission & Values - Universiti Teknologi MARA Official Website*. <https://www.uitm.edu.my/index.php/en/discover-uitm/vision-mission-values>
- Zamri, M. N. (2023). Factors Influencing Employee Retention Among Lecturers in Higher Education Institutions. *Advanced International Journal of Business, Entrepreneurship and SMEs*, 5(18), 33–47. <https://doi.org/10.35631/AIJBS.518004>